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Abstract

Inspired by creative class theory, municipal policymakers across North America are focusing on urban lifestyle amenities to attract and retain creative workers. Based primarily on the analysis of U.S. metropolitan areas, this theory is being adopted internationally, raising the issue of its applicability in divergent social and geographical settings. Using 2006 Canadian Census data and interviews with creative workers living in St. John’s, Newfoundland, this study examines one of creative class theory’s fundamental concepts— that tolerance is a creative class value that manifests in their preference to live in socially diverse and amenity rich urban settings. Census data reveals a large presence of creative workers in urban and rural settings, while the interviews illuminate the complexity of lifestyle and migration decisions. This thesis highlights the possible pitfalls of understanding the creative class as a monolithic social group and approaching strategies to attract and retain creative workers with this narrow focus.
Acknowledgements

Supervisor: Dr. Josh Lepawsky, Department of Geography, Memorial University

Supervisory Committee: Dr. Kelly Vodden, Department of Geography, Memorial University

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

Leslie Harris Center of Regional Policy and Development
# Table of Contents

List of Tables vi
List of Figures vii
List of Abbreviations ix

1. Introduction 1

2. The tenets and criticisms of creative class theory 12
2.1 How creative class theory links the 'creative city' to innovation and economic growth 12
2.2 Creative class theory and the Canadian context 18
2.3 Exclusive landscapes? A discussion of social exclusion and creative city strategies 22
2.4 Analyzing the use of culture and the arts in creative city strategies 27
2.5 Focus on geography: the significance of size on the analysis of the creative class 30

3. Methods 32
3.1 Definitions 32
3.2 Study site 36
3.3 Locating the creative class: census definitions of space 40
3.4 Location Quotient 46
3.5 Census Data 49
3.6 Using interviews to explore individual values and perceived levels of social capital 50
3.7 Photographs as an analytical tool 59

4. St. John’s and creative class theory 61
4.1 Location of creative workers in the St. John’s CMA 62
4.2 Area A 70
4.3 Area B 76

5. Talking with the creative class in St. John’s, NL 88
5.1 Community values and place attachment 90
5.2 The matters of size and location 105
5.3 Dissecting the purported mobility of the creative class of St. John’s 112

6. Discussion/Conclusion 118
List of Tables

Table 3.1.1 Class divisions by occupation as identified in *Rise of the Creative Class* (Source: Florida 2002b) 33

Table 3.1.2 Florida’s divisions adapted for Canadian research (Source: Spencer and Vinodrai 2006) 34

Table 4.1.5 Rates of change of total population, total labour force, and creative work force in Areas A and B broken down by census tract for years 2001-2006 (Source: Statistics Canada 2001, Statistics Canada 2006g) 68

Table 4.1.6 Immigrant population by period of immigration in Area A, B, and the St. John’s CMA (Source: Statistics Canada 2006g) 69

Table 5.1.1 Location Quotient values for Families with Children living in the home in Area A measured against the CMA and National levels (2006) 103
List of Figures

Figure 2.1.1 The purported links between the creative milieu and economic growth as suggested in creative class theory 13

Figure 3.2.1 Map of population change in the St. John’s CMA 2001-2006 (Source: Statistics Canada 2006a) 38

Figure 3.2.2 Photo of downtown retail stores on Duckworth Street (Source: City of St. John’s 2002) 39

Figure 3.2.3 Photo of Garrison Hill, a street in the downtown core of St. John’s (Source: City of St. John’s 2002) 40

Figure 3.3.1 Census tract boundaries for the St. John’s CMA (Source: Statistics Canada 2008) 42

Figure 3.3.2 Inset map of census tract boundaries (Source: Statistics Canada 2008) 43

Figure 4.1.1 Location quotient results determining the spatial distribution of creative workers in St John’s. Area A indicates urban core census tracts with the highest proportion of creative workers, and Area B (B1 and B2) indicates rural fringe census tracts with the highest proportions of creative workers (See Figure 4.1.2 - 4.1.6 for detailed maps of the census tracts in Area A and Area B) 63

Figure 4.1.2 Map of census tract 13 (Area A) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006b) 64

Figure 4.1.3 Map of census tract 10 (Area A) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006c) 64

Figure 4.1.4 Map of census tract 17 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006d) 65

Figure 4.1.5 Map of census tract 202.01 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006e) 66

Figure 4.1.6 Map of census tract 202.02 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006f) 67

Figure 4.2.1 Monkstown Road (Area A, census tract 10) 71

Figure 4.2.2 Monkstown Road (Area A, census tract 10) 72

Figure 4.2.3 Mullock Street (Area A, census tract 10) 72

Figure 4.2.4 Pine Bud Place (Area A, census tract 13) 75
Figure 4.3.1 Entrance to Country Gardens development site, Country Gardens Rd (Area B, census tract 202.02) 80

Figure 4.3.2 Master plan for Country Gardens Estate residential development in the St. John’s CMA (Source: Fowler 2006) 81

Figure 4.3.3 Property on Country Gardens Road (Area B, census tract 202.02) 82

Figure 4.3.4 Street view of Country Gardens Road (Area B, census tract 202.02) 83

Figure 4.3.5 Almond Crescent (Area B, census tract 17) 84

Figure 4.3.6 Almond Crescent (Area B, census tract 17) 85
List of Abbreviations

(CA) census agglomeration
(CMA) census metropolitan area
(CT) census tract
(LQ) location quotient
(MSA) metropolitan statistical area
1. Introduction

In 2009, artist and mother of three Sheilagh O’Leary gathered support for her bid for councilor at large in the St. John’s municipal elections using the online social network, Facebook. On the “Support Sheilagh O’Leary for St. John’s City Council” Facebook group webpage, is a photo of Richard Florida’s book *The Rise of the Creative Class*, and a link to his consultancy group’s website. By advertising this book, O’Leary’s webpage demonstrates the far-reaching influence that creative class theory is having in political circles, even in smaller Canadian municipalities like St. John’s. Since its release in 2002, city officials across the United States (U.S.) have been using this book as a guide to enhancing the ‘coolness factor’ of their cities – promoting the cultural scene, design districts, trendy bars and other urban amenities – in an effort to attract and retain skilled workers (see Malanga 2004, Nathan 2005, Peck 2005, Zimmerman 2008).

Dissecting the innovative capacities of regions like New York City, Boston, and San Francisco, Richard Florida (2002b) avers that these economically healthy city-regions share a common landscape of tolerance, technology, and talent, qualities of place that are mutually reinforcing. Determined by levels of social diversity, Florida argues that tolerance indicates a creative milieu, an atmosphere that facilitates creativity that may lead to high-tech innovations. In turn, these innovations are believed to contribute to regional economic growth provided there is sufficient technology (e.g. universities and research and development firms) and talent present. The core of this theory however lies
in the ‘talent’. Referred to as the creative class, this is the portion of the labour-force “engage[d] in complex problem solving that involves a great deal of independent judgment and requires high levels of education...” (Florida et al. 2008, 625). In categorizing the creative class, Florida departs from human capital theory (see Storper and Scott 2009), which correlates education with talent, and instead uses occupation to measure talent. This is the crux of the idea of creative capital, which addresses human capital theory’s inability to recognize entrepreneurs who lack advanced degrees (Florida et al. 2008).

Within the creative class, Florida distinguishes between the ‘super creative core’, who are the prime producers of new ideas such as scientists and engineers, and ‘creative professionals’, whose work requires employing innovative thinking, such as business managers and healthcare professionals. Analyzing creative capital in U.S. metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), Florida’s (2008a) research shows a positive relationship between creative capital and innovation. As such, creative class theory suggests that city officials should focus on attracting creative workers rather than industries, banking on the belief that creative workers are mobile, choosing places to live before choosing places to work, and that jobs will follow people, not the other way around.

Through focus group discussions, Florida (2002b) observed that creative workers value the livability of a city above job opportunities:

Many [creative workers] will not even consider taking jobs in certain cities or regions – a stark contrast to the organizational age, when people moved to chase jobs and gladly let firms shuttle them from one backwater to another as part of the price of climbing the corporate ladder...[Some creative workers] will pick a place they want to live, then focus their job search there (95).
He goes on to describe how these places are rich in small-scale amenities, cultural
diversity, and an air of openness and tolerance, using examples that include
neighbourhoods in New York City, Seattle, and Austin, mainly places in densely
populated city-regions.

In creative class theory, Florida draws from earlier research revealing the
connection between place and creativity, such as Jane Jacobs’ (1961, 1969) work on the
growth and decline of city-regions and urban livability. Florida also builds on the concept
of the *creative milieu* (an atmosphere of openness and tolerance that facilitates
innovation) that can be traced back to Swedish geographer Gunnar Törnqvist in 1978 and
French geographer Philippe Aydalot, who analyzed the synergies that occurred in places
dense with creative individuals (Hall 2000). Creative class theory unveils the abstract
quality of the creative milieu by employing quantitative methods to reveal its location.
According to creative class theory, a creative milieu attracts creative and open-minded
people, whom Florida refers to as *bohemians* (generally individuals engaged in artistic
and cultural activities). As such, their presence in a city is linked to the existence of a
creative milieu, and therefore, the stronger the presence of bohemians, the stronger the
creative milieu.

Research has shown cases of how bohemians have shaped declining
neighbourhoods into living spaces that appeal to the middle class through establishing
various small-scale businesses such as art galleries, cafés, and music venues, and small-
scale improvements to the housing stock (see Bain 2006, Lloyd 2004, Markusen and
Schrock 2006, Smith 1996). According to Florida (2002b), by adding much cultural (and
some economic value to these places, bohemians help produce the types of
neighbourhoods that creative workers seek.

Creative class theory’s roots in specific urban contexts give it a particular spatial
element. Many city officials who follow its tenets employ strategies to emulate the
cultural scenes of well-known bohemian neighbourhoods like Wicker Park, Chicago (see
Lloyd 2002, Lloyd 2004), and famous neighbourhoods in New York City, such as Soho
and Greenwich Village (Podmore 1998), known to be artist enclaves and home to many
avant-garde American and immigrant artists (see Monk et al. 1994). Such strategies
include promoting certain amenities a city-region has to offer, such as a vibrant cultural
scene and a multitude of participatory activities (e.g. restaurants, cafés, bicycle paths and
running trails), amenities which are believed to be paramount in attracting and retaining
creative workers (Florida 2002b). Because large urban centers are more likely to have
these features, the creative class is believed to be metro-centric. Although the creative
class is composed of workers of all life stages and lifestyles, creative class theory asserts
that the majority prefers the urban environment. As such, many policy makers are
modeling suburban communities after urban centres by increasing residential density and
providing mixed amenities as a way of competing with larger cities (see Florida 2002b).

Geography is a significant component of creative class theory because of the
uneven distribution of the creative class across space and because innovations that may
lead to economic growth are believed to require face-to-face interactions, a feature of
social capital. Many definitions of social capital exist that attempt to capture its complex
multifaceted nature, yet here we are concerned with those definitions that pertain to social
capital’s relationship to innovation. Early classical and neoclassical economists viewed
the social dimension of innovation as an impediment to economic growth (Granovetter 1985) but it is now understood as integral to the competitiveness of small and medium enterprises (Cooke et al. 2005, Hoyman and Faricy 2009). According to Staber (2007), the effects of social capital are difficult to demonstrate empirically because much of the current research ignores the context in which social capital has formed, which determines whether social capital impedes or benefits a region’s economy. The two main types of social capital relevant to this argument are strong and weak, also known as formal and informal (Kassa 2009). Strong social capital refers to relationships built on trust and personal bonds that lead to group solidarity and a strong sense of community (Crowe 2006) but is also believed to be detrimental to job growth because it potentially acts as a barrier to innovation due to its tendency to contribute to insularity, overdependence, and aversion to new ideas (Hoyman 2009). Similarly, creative class theory posits that cities with high levels of strong social capital can be insulated from new ideas and challenges, ultimately stifling innovation (Florida et al. 2002). Weak social capital is composed of business contacts/networks and cooperation between institutions (Cooke et al. 2005). According to creative class theory, weak social capital is key to the modernization of society, because “weak ties are critical to the creative environment of a city or region because they allow for rapid entry of new people and rapid absorption of new ideas and are thus critical to the creative process (Florida 2002b, 277).

Though similar research exists, creative class theory in particular has gained considerable currency, inspiring academic debates (e.g. Healy 2002, Rausch and Negrey 2006, Thomas and Darnton 2006, McGranahan and Wojan 2007, Peck 2005, Scott 2007a, Markusen 2006, Malanga 2004, Nathan 2005), policy prescriptions (see Petrov 2008),
civic boosterism (see Leslie 2005, Zimmerman 2008) and broader popular appeal to the ‘creative class’, evidenced by Richard Florida’s television appearance on The Hour with George Stromboulopoulos, and many features in business magazines such as the Harvard Business Review and Business Weekly (see Florida 2008b, McConnon 2006). In an article in the 2008 fall issue of the Montreal Gazette, Richard Florida (2008c) asserts that Montreal has a better opportunity to emerge from the current economic crisis than other Canadian cities because its social and physical density and historical buildings attract creative workers and facilitate innovations, borrowing the idea from Jane Jacobs that ‘new ideas require old buildings’.

The contention that creative city strategies can contribute to the growth and stability of regional economies has prompted many Canadian city officials to promote it as a viable path of development. Officials in Ottawa apply creative class metrics in their city to measure progress in the arts (Duxbury 2004) and Toronto’s Culture Plan for the Creative City (2003) celebrates the quality of life brought about by cultural amenities. The popularity of creative class theory has even spread to smaller Canadian cities and towns such as Sackville, New Brunswick (Sackville 2009) and Halifax, Nova Scotia (Halifax 2004).

While creative class theory is popular amongst city officials across geographical and cultural contexts, its original findings are based on the analysis of American city-regions. Researchers have since expanded its scope to examine smaller U.S. counties (McGranahan and Wojan 2007), cities in the UK (see Clifton 2008, Houston et al. 2008) and Sweden (see Hansen and Niedomysl 2008), and Canadian cities (see Donald and Morrow 2003, Gertler et al. 2002; Sands and Reese 2008), including peripheral Canadian
communities like Yellowknife and Iqaluit (see Petrov 2008). Current research however, is limited to analyzing economic and migration data at the city-region level for comparison across the country. There is limited case study analysis focused on social, cultural and geographical contexts, especially in small Canadian cities and rural regions.\(^1\)

Doing so requires a critical analysis of whether the creative class (defined by a specific and varied set of occupations) can also be identified through a purportedly shared value system, outside of the original context of creative class theory.\(^2\) Because the creative class is identified by occupation alone, it is easy to discover their existence across cultural contexts through census data (since all cities will invariably have workers of these types (see Table 3.1.1). However, to categorize these workers, and subsequently speculate about their purported lifestyle values, might produce artificial conclusions with little analytical value. Critics of creative class theory Storper and Scott (2009), observe that without examining the cultural and social particularities of city-regions in-depth, analysis of this kind is at risk of falling into a circular logic – whereby the statistical presence of creative workers may lead city officials to assume that creative workers are attracted to the region due to urban lifestyle amenities. The potential result may be investment of public dollars into creative city strategies that cater to a specific lifestyle when in fact the presence of creative workers might be attributable to a variety of other characteristics, such as a different set of lifestyle values, and/or economic opportunities unique to the region. Current research demonstrates mixed results. For instance, Wojan et al. (2007), examining all counties in the continental U.S. for arts share of employment, suggest that

\(^1\) Currently, the Innovation Systems Research Network is conducting research across Canadian metropolitan regions. Some of their data are used in this research (see Methods chapter, sections 3.1 and 3.6).

\(^2\) This issue is addressed in detail in the Methods chapter, section 3.1.
the presence of bohemians is higher in college towns and university cities, regardless of overall metropolitan size. While the significance of supporting educational facilities is paramount in Florida’s second book, *The Flight of the Creative Class*, many city officials still focus on small-scale consumer amenities. On the other hand, in an investigation of the distribution of creative workers (including bohemians) across 500 regions in seven European countries, Boschma and Fritsch (2009) found that educational facilities had little impact on the location of creative workers, while employment opportunities and cultural climate are far more significant. Such contrasting findings suggest that place particularities may require greater attention in light of the cultural and economic differences in city-regions internationally and within North America.

To address whether the notions of a creative class lifestyle and value system have wider applicability in the context of small Canadian census metropolitan areas (CMA)\(^3\), this thesis presents a case study of St. John’s, Newfoundland. The St. John’s CMA represents an intriguing place to test the utility and validity of the creative class hypothesis for a number of reasons. First, it has the sixth largest proportion of bohemians in Canada (Hill 2006) despite being the 20\(^{th}\) largest of the nation’s 33 CMAs. Moreover, statistically it has a larger creative class (38.2%) than the average Canadian CMA (29.2%) (Spencer and Vinodrai 2006). If the tenets of creative class theory are applicable in the social and geographical context of St. John’s, it should be reflected in the geography and lifestyle of the city’s creative class. The purpose of this thesis is to examine a small

\(^3\) "Area consisting of one or more neighbouring municipalities situated around a major urban core" (Statistics Canada 2007a). See Chapter 3 for a more detailed definition.
Canadian CMA from a creative class approach by addressing the following questions, using Florida’s definitions throughout:

1) Where does the creative class of St. John’s live within the CMA?

2) Do the values of creative workers in St. John’s support creative class theory’s assumption that they share a common value system?

3) What implications might these findings have on the use of creative class theory as a tool for attracting and retaining the ‘creative class’ in small Canadian CMAs?

While St. John’s has yet to employ such strategies, creative class theory is starting to permeate municipal political discourse, as suggested by the overt reference to Florida’s work on Sheliagh O’Leary’s campaign website (and her subsequent election to council), and across Atlantic Canada more broadly, where the municipal governments of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and most recently, Sackville, New Brunswick hosted Richard Florida to speak about urban-based growth strategies (see Halifax 2004, Sackville 2009). Bringing the architect of creative class theory to town shows the serious interest and investment of policy-makers in the potential of creative city strategies to contribute to economic growth.

To address my research questions I use data from the 2006 Census of Canada to calculate location quotients (LQ) to analyze the spatial distribution of creative workers at the census tract level within the St. John’s CMA. I do this in order to examine whether creative workers are unevenly distributed within the city-region to provide a starting point for examining potential areas and amenities that may be attractive to creative workers in the St. John’s CMA. To preview the findings of my research: while there is a distinct concentration of creative workers in the urban core of the St. John’s CMA, there is also a
significant proportion living in the rural fringe, a finding which raises questions about the claims creative class theory makes about the location preferences of members of the creative class.

I also conducted interviews to gain perspective on how creative workers value and experience the city-region, comparing this to what creative class theory proposes. Employing a snowball recruitment technique, I interviewed 13 creative workers and drew 12 additional interviews from another study. I transcribed and organized material from the interviews using HyperResearch software, a program designed for qualitative research (see Methods section for further details about the interview processes and the use of the software). The analysis of these interviews revealed that many creative workers who were born and raised in Newfoundland regard family and community/place attachment as important factors when making migration decisions. This indicates the role that strong social capital plays in the attraction and retention of these creative workers. In addition, the role of economic opportunity in migration decisions arises in the discussions with creative workers in St. John's, a factor often perceived as secondary to lifestyle amenities in much creative class discourse. Such differences highlight the possibility that the propositions of creative class theory may be less generalizable than is claimed by the theory's main proponents.

The remainder of this thesis is constructed as follows: In chapter 2, I outline the theoretical positions of creative class theory and debates surrounding it that are relevant to this thesis including: the crux of creative class theory – the link between creative workers, innovation, and economic growth; the applicability of creative class theory to the Canadian context; the issue of gentrification and social exclusion that surrounds creative
city strategies; how art and culture are often utilized to promote creative city strategies; and how geographic scale of inquiry can impact research outcomes. In chapter 3, I establish the definitions of terms and methods I use to answer my research questions, including the LQ and interviews. In chapter 4, I analyze two areas that emerged from the LQ calculations as areas with the highest proportions of creative workers in the CMA in both the urban core and rural fringe. In chapter 5, I examine the interviews, exploring the issues that arise in the conversations, namely, sense of place, community attachment, lifestyle preferences, perception of ‘urbanity’, economic opportunity, and more implicitly, life stage. Finally, in chapter 6, I conclude the thesis with a discussion of the overall findings and end with recommendations for a cautious adaptation of creative city strategies in smaller Canadian CMAs like St. John’s.
2. The tenets and criticisms of creative class theory

Municipal policy-makers across the globe are increasingly looking to creative class theory as a guide to urban development. Yet, as this trend spreads, it is met with criticism regarding its proposed benefits and relevance (see Peck 2005). This chapter explores the tenets of creative class theory and the accompanying criticisms, including: 1) How creative cities are purported to facilitate economic growth; 2) The potential issues associated with applying creative class theory to the Canadian context; 3) The debate regarding social inequity and exclusivity in the urban setting, as many critics are linking creative city strategies to the issue of gentrification; 4) The role of arts and culture in creative class theory and the contentious ways in which they are often employed in creative city strategies; and lastly 5) The way research at different geographical scales can impact findings (and the comparability of those findings) across urban contexts. By reviewing these issues in detail, this chapter is meant to provide a critical background to the case study of St. John’s.

2.1 How creative class theory links the ‘creative city’ to innovation and economic growth

Creative class theory explores how city-regions with high levels of creative capital (i.e. the proportion of creative workers) are better equipped to produce innovations than city-regions that have low levels of creative capital. I constructed a simple illustration (Figure 2.1.1) based on the tenets of creative class theory showing the basic links of how ‘creative cities’ are believed to attract creative workers in the first place, and how this
might lead to innovation and ultimately, economic growth. As this figure illustrates, the 
creative milieu of certain city-regions (i.e. creative cities) are believed to provide an 
atmosphere of tolerance and openness, something that Sharp and Joslyn (2008) have also 
found in their study of culture and tolerance in the U.S. According to creative class 
theory, this tolerant atmosphere attracts members of the creative class, especially the 
bohemian super-creative core, who bring with them ideas that may be new or 
unconventional. A number of accounts in Canada and the U.S. (see. Smith 1996, Bain 
2006) have demonstrated that bohemians add cultural value to declining inner city 
neighbourhoods (see also Ley 1996). Creative class theory proposes that these 
neighbourhoods, in turn, will attract creative workers to reside there as well. The theory 
goes on to suggest that the combination of the creative milieu and a high concentration of 
creative workers will result in the cross-fertilization of ideas between creative workers, 
such that innovations can occur that may lead to economic growth.

Figure 2.1.1 The purported links between the creative milieu and economic growth 
as suggested in creative class theory
To measure the overall level of tolerance in any given city-region, creative class theory employs three analytical tools: the melting pot index, the gay index, and the bohemian index (Florida 2002b). The melting pot index measures the proportion of foreign-born residents; the bohemian index measures the proportion of residents working in the arts and culture sector; and the gay index measures presence of a gay and lesbian population. This last index is founded on the assumption that cities with strong gay populations are at the forefront of tolerance. Using these indices in a study of U.S. metropolitan areas, Lee et al. (2004) discovered that cities with large foreign-born populations have low rates of new firm birth but that gay and creative capital are positively correlated. In turn, they found positive links between creative capital and the formation of new firms. Following this study, Florida et al. (2008) found tolerance is significantly associated with creative capital; he uses the gay and bohemian index to demonstrate this, but not the melting pot index.

These two studies support the earlier work of Robert Cushing, which is discussed in The Rise of the Creative Class. Cushing analyzed three theories of capital: social capital (determined by social activities such as volunteerism, community leadership, religious affiliations), human capital (determined by education), and creative capital (determined by occupation), and attempted to determine their relationships — if any — to innovation. “He found no evidence that social capital leads to regional economic growth; in fact the effects were negative...[according to Cushing’s findings] the creative capital model generates equally impressive results as the human capital model and perhaps better”(Florida 2002b, 276). In a recent study, Hoyman and Faricy (2009) also found strong social capital negatively correlated with economic growth. The type of social
capital important in creative cities is one that is composed of a density of ‘contacts’ (i.e. weak social capital) rather than the close friends, family and community connections that mark strong social capital. Florida (2002b) contends that relationships based on weak social capital are easy to maintain because they require little personal investment, thus creative workers tend to have more of them. In this way, creative workers are believed to be capable of maintaining dense social networks, increasing the potential flow of ideas that might lead to economically successful innovations.

Attention to the social aspects of creative cities and their purported ability to attract creative workers and subsequent business investment is growing (Currid 2009). At the same time, critics are questioning the validity of using creative class theory’s measures to evaluate these supposed links. Malanga (2004) for instance, argues that the top creative cities, by Florida’s measures, actually demonstrate lower than average economic growth and tend to be tech poles that flourished in the 1990s. Scrutinizing creative class theory’s tolerance indicators, Thomas and Darnton (2006) contend that using census data in this manner can be misleading, claiming that “gays” are still not tolerated in much of society, therefore people who might identify themselves as gay are not necessarily ready to do so in a census. They go on to observe that the melting pot index lumps all “non-whites” into a single group, undermining the different challenges and histories of ethnic groups in America. Storper and Manville (2006) disagree with the reliability of assessing the notion of tolerance in the first place, arguing that tolerance as a concept is not necessarily related to acceptance or progressive values but is more a function of suppressing an urge to confront difference. Storper and Scott (2009) contend that large U.S. metropolitan areas remain segregated despite overall population diversity,
where talented workers, such as those deemed as the creative class, live in relatively homogenous upscale suburbs.

Regardless of such criticisms, tolerance remains a major component of creative class theory’s concept of the creative milieu, specifically its ability to attract creative workers who in turn are believed to be responsible for innovation and subsequent economic growth. Stolarick and Florida (2006) demonstrate the link between the creative milieu and economic growth through the example of Cirque du Soleil. The Montréal-based show combines art, culture, engineering, and technological and artistic innovation, and through its international economic success it has bolstered the city’s reputation in the realm of culture and innovation. Using this example, the authors argue that only places with a strong creative milieu and a diversity of talent can such innovative collaborations occur. In another example, Currid (2006) demonstrates how New York City remains economically viable because of its cultural industries: fashion, film, and television, which have given rise to many innovative productions and top artists. Similarly in Los Angeles, the large film and television industry’s niche labour market, high costs of production, and weak social capital networks requires the clustering of creative individuals (Markusen and Schrock 2006).

On the other hand, critics contend that if economically healthy city-regions owe their success to the processes proposed in creative class theory, then places like New York and Los Angeles would attract a diverse range of creative workers, and not rely on the success of single industries (Storper and Scott 2009). Markusen and DiGiovanna (1999) describe many of the same cities Florida categorizes as creative cities, such as Silicon Valley and Boston, as “second-tier” cities, “...spatially distinct areas of economic activity
where a specialized set of trade-oriented industries takes root and flourishes, establishing employment and population-growth trajectories that are the envy of many other places” (3). Rather than a diversity of creative workers, these authors observe that transnational investment, global trade, and regional policies are the main causes of growth in these (generally single-industry) regions. In addition, Rausch and Negrey (2006) argue that innovation is the province of industries and universities. While human capital is still at the heart of this concept, they assert that facilitating worker’s capabilities and increasing collaboration between the two sectors might be a much better and far more direct way of encouraging innovation than attracting a diversity of creative workers through lifestyle amenities. Florida (2005) addresses this criticism in his second book, *Flight of the Creative Class* where he focuses on the role of government policy. In reference to the U.S., he posits that the Federal government needs to address long-term strategies of creative class attraction and retention such as investments supporting local creativity (e.g. funding for public schools and universities). And with cities competing at the international level for creative workers, he argues that policy-makers who do not accommodate the migration of skilled international creative workers will lose talent to city-regions in countries that do.

Addressing the way creative class theory links the creative milieu to growth in high-tech industry, Scott (2004) contends that the theory’s conclusions are too simplistic, “...[ascribing] altogether too much social autonomy to the rise of this fraction of the workforce and pays far too little attention to the concrete technological, organizational, and geographic conditions that [underlie] the actual formation of labor markets” (468). Others see cities as spaces of consumption rather than spaces of innovation. Glaeser and
Gottlieb (2006) argue that despite the influx of human capital, when costs of living are accounted for, wages have actually been falling in creative cities:

Standard economic theory tells us that this means that urban resurgence is not primarily the result of rising urban productivity. Instead, falling relative wages are better seen as evidence for an increased desire of people to live in urban areas. Big cities are having a renaissance as places of consumption, not production (Glaeser and Gottlieb 2006, 1276).

They also argue that rather than contributing to economic innovations, the greatest social benefit of urban density is meeting potential partners.

As this section illustrates, many of the basic tenets of creative class theory are under dispute. Nonetheless, the purported ability of creative city strategies to contribute to economic growth is a large part of their appeal for city officials. If small cities like St. John’s adopt a policy agenda based on creative class theory, the uncertainty of the theory’s links to economic development must be taken into account. Similarly, such cities need to evaluate the limitations to the success such strategies can have under different circumstances. In the case of St. John’s, some of the overwhelming factors concern differences in size, location, and governance, which are discussed in the following section.

2.2 Creative class theory and the Canadian context

Creative city strategies often recreate culturally specific ideas of urban lifestyle, a tendency Zimmerman (2008) attributes to his observation that creative class theory provides richly illustrated examples of streetscapes taken from places like the San Francisco Bay Area, New York City, and Austin, Texas. He contends that public officials then use these examples as a guide for recasting their cities as ‘cool’. Using such distinct
models as a vision for other cities poses a potential obstacle since many cities differ substantially in their underlying social, economic and geographical circumstances. For this reason, assessing the applicability of creative city strategies in the Canadian context necessitates an examination of the underlying structural conditions that have helped shape Canadian cities in ways that diverge from those in the U.S. that are considered ‘creative’ in the creative class discourse.

Every nation has core social values that inform its government’s policies. For instance, creative city strategies are often market-oriented and appeal to individualism, values that Aucoin (2006) associates with the U.S. In Canada comparatively, stronger public transportation, higher land costs, and fewer expressway developments (Storper and Manville 2006) are a few factors shaping Canadian cities that Boddy (2004) contends stem from Canada’s governance philosophy. Canada’s “constitutional need for ‘peace, order and good government’ contrasts heavily with the American’s quest of ‘freedom, and the pursuit of happiness’” (Boddy 2004, 15), dictums that have helped direct each nation’s path of development. Such a fundamental difference illustrates how underlying public forces might impact the applicability of creative city strategies in Canada, strategies frequently criticized for being too consumer oriented and individualistic (see Peck 2005, Zimmerman 2008). Despite such governance differences, Canadian politicians are looking to the U.S. for ideas in public policy, including ones based on creative class theory (see Potter 2009).

In addition to governance philosophy, the physical and social characteristics that set Canadian and U.S. cities apart also require consideration. Size and density differences are a concern since research forming the conclusions of creative class theory generally
rely on the analysis of large U.S. MSAs. Canada, by comparison, is sparsely populated, with only nine metropolitan areas with populations over 500,000 clustered along the southern border (Partridge et al. 2007), one tenth of those in the U.S. Considerable population growth is occurring in Canada's three largest metropolitan areas: Toronto, Vancouver, and Montréal. The prominent reason for this is immigration, as many newcomers cite the presence of family and friends as the main reason for choosing to settle in these areas, followed by employment opportunities (Malenfant et al. 2007).

Since Canada has only a handful of urban centres, many Canadians live in small towns and lower-tiered cities, which results in many socioeconomic links between rural and urban regions (Ferguson et al. 2007). This is an important socio-spatial distinction between Canadian and U.S. city-regions. Regions exemplified as creative cities like the San Francisco Bay Area, are composed of multiple urban cores with strong urban-urban links (Scott 2007b). Therefore, creative city strategies might be applicable to certain metropolitan areas across Canada exhibiting similar conditions, however the same may not hold true in the many smaller city-regions isolated from other urban centres.

The United Kingdom (see Smith 2007), Australia, Canada, and the U.S. (see Costello 2007, Saint Onge et al. 2007) are experiencing population growth in many rural regions traditionally inhabited by resource workers and their families. The new residents are filtering in from the larger cities, endure longer commutes to live in the countryside, and are generally middle class professionals. Social conflict often accompanies this drastic change in population, as the physical landscape of these regions changes in response to the lifestyle preferences of these new residents (see Malenfant et al. 2007, Masuda and Garvin 2008, Meijering et al. 2007, Mitchell 2004). The natural amenities
available in rural settings, particularly rural metro-adjacent regions, are the main draw for many middle class migrants. In a critical analysis of creative class theory’s applicability in rural U.S. counties, McGranahan and Wojan (2007) found rural areas abundant in natural amenities have large concentrations of older creative workers. They observe that this phenomenon may be attributed to the fact that creative workers who are advanced in their careers are more likely to have the financial security to allow them to choose lifestyle preferences over job opportunities. Here they begin dissecting the purported creative class lifestyle by introducing the variables of age, and career stage. Glorioso and Moss (2007) use the term amenity migration to describe the phenomenon of lifestyle-led residential choices that lead middle class professionals to reside in sparsely populated mountain regions that have many natural amenities. They review the potential environmental and economic consequences that may occur when middle class professionals (comparable to the creative class) locate in such areas. Because Canada has fewer large CMAs comparables to U.S. MSAs, a smaller population, and many rural-to-urban links, some smaller Canadian CMAs may exhibit structural and geographic differences that impede its comparability to creative cities as evaluated in creative class theory.

Geographical links at the international scale also create differences in Canadian and U.S. city-regional policies and social compositions. Although both nations were built on immigration, the differences in immigration history have created divergent social, economic, and political situations. Lee et al. (2004) examined a number of studies of immigration in the U.S., demonstrating that the majority of new immigrants are generally uneducated and have few social connections, and are thus more likely to be
entrepreneurial. Walsh (2008) observes that the growing number of uneducated immigrants in the U.S. stems from the high rate of undocumented migration, particularly from Mexico, and Central and South America. In contrast, immigrants to Canada have a higher level of education and are often over-qualified for the employment they obtain once in the country (Wald and Fang 2008). This is due to the fact that Canadian immigration policy gives preferential treatment to educated individuals and immigrants with family networks (Smick 2006), and Canada's geographical position contributes to low rates of undocumented immigration, allowing the country greater control over the 'filtering' of immigrants to satisfy the needs and desires of the nation (Walsh 2008). And so while Florida (2002a) argues that the innovative capacities of creative cities rely partially on ethnic pluralism, this may be a shallow evaluation.

As a result of the differences between Canadian and U.S. urban development, caution may need to be taken when adapting creative class principles to the Canadian context, and especially to Newfoundland, as underlying factors may hinder their applicability. In regions where creative city strategies have already been adopted, there comes a new set of concerns related to social inequity and exclusion, which I turn to in the following section.

2.3 Exclusive landscapes? A discussion of social exclusion and creative city strategies

Creative class theory has helped reinvigorate the demand for urban living and has also popularized the use of amenities as a strategy to attract potential creative class residents. Florida (2002b) argues that creative workers seek the vibrant and 'authentic'
(e.g. designer boutiques and high-end cafés) (Zukin and Kosta 2004). In this way, building owners help control the social and cultural aspects of their neighbourhood. By catering to the needs of only a small segment of the population, the issue of social exclusion arises. And because creative city strategies often promote this type of development, critics like McCann (2007) and Zimmerman (2008) link them to other forms of social inequity, such as gentrification and social dislocation.

As a process, gentrification has reshaped neighbourhoods in U.S. city-regions (see Smith 1996) and pockets of Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal since the 1960s (Walks and Maaranen 2008). The term describes housing restoration in disinvested inner-city neighbourhoods and is often associated with social dislocation and urban segregation as well, since it can mean a change of residents – such as from working class to middle class newcomers (Slater 2008). Zimmerman (2008) examines this process in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where he argues creative city strategies have turned the inner city into a playground for the middle class by turning affordable housing into high-end condominiums and narrowing the consumer amenities available to appeal to this new clientele (see also Davidson 2007, Kern 2007, Podmore 2008). Smith (1996) identifies early gentrification of the 1960s and 1970s with unplanned influxes of middle class residents who, through private investment and sweat equity, renovated old inner city neighbourhoods. Today, it often takes the form of corporate funded projects such as condominium developments (Smith 2002). With the support of city officials and a New Urbanist framework, many developers are renovating urban neighbourhoods to appeal to middle class buyers, increasing the scale of gentrification and its associated social impacts (see Barnes et al. 2006, Breen 2007, Ley 1996, McCann 2007, Newman and Wyly 2006,
Smith 1996). Whether market-led or state-led, the consumer-oriented dimension of gentrification often caters to the lifestyles and desires of affluent consumers, not necessarily all residents (Zukin et al. 2009). In this way, Zimmerman (2008) argues, decision-makers normalize the exclusive use of urban space, exacerbating the socio-spatial changes that can contribute to "a dual city of inner city regeneration and a surrounding sea of increasing impoverishment" (Harvey 1989, 16). And while creative class theory recognizes the social polarization present in the top creative cities, it is not a subject approached as a consequence of the rising creative class, but as merely a social problem that requires action (Atkinson and Easthope 2009).

As part of a strategy to combat the issue of socio-spatial inequity raised by critics, some creative class-inspired strategies promote mixed-income urban developments. However, anti-poverty activists recognize the euphemism in this phenomenon too. Slater (2008) observes that in the case of plans for mixed-income units in the reconstruction of New Orleans:

Gentrification sweeps the 'badly behaved' urban poor from sight, and in the case of New Orleans is becoming the official post-Katrina reconstruction strategy. It is connected to efforts to create a new global city on the Gulf Coast, housing and catering primarily to Richard Florida's creative class (Hurricane Richard, still raging today, hit the city just before Katrina, where he was invited to keynote at a civic attempt to re-brand the city the 'Port of Cool' (213).

Here Slater (2008) recognizes how utilizing creative city strategies for rebuilding New Orleans has led to the exclusive planning of space for creative workers – ultimately resulting in the displacement of former residents.

August (2008) observes that mixed-income housing simply translates into a more publicly acceptable form of gentrification. He describes how low-income public housing
in prime inner city locations of Toronto are being replaced with mixed-income developments, resulting in a loss of the majority of low-income units and the ultimate replacement of previous residents with middle income earners. Furthermore, Cheshire (2006, 124) argues that “by forcing neighborhoods to be mixed in social and economic terms is treating the symptoms of inequality, not the cause” and may in fact destroy the welfare benefits and social support networks that similar household groupings share. While creative city strategies celebrate social diversity, they may do so without acknowledging the reality of intergroup tensions, and historically established stereotypes that fuel many racial tensions in multiethnic city-regions across the U.S. (Greif 2009). In response to such accounts, cultural planners are showing how social inclusion can be a process of recognizing commonalities while respecting differences (Donald and Morrow 2003). Donald and Morrow (2003) assert that while using the creative class model, cities can promote tolerance and social inclusion with economic goals in mind, through such efforts as creating policies that break down barriers for participation in the workforce.

While the issues of gentrification and social dislocation have predominated much of the criticism of creative city strategies, there is also much debate on their purported social benefits, such as the promotion of cultural participation and the arts. The following section dissects how culture and the arts are often utilized in creative city strategies, and the potential consequences of merging social and economic goals.

2.4 Analyzing the use of culture and the arts in creative city strategies

Many municipal decision-makers are focusing on how creativity contributes to economic development by examining the role of the arts and culture industry (see Currid
2009). This focus has increased concurrently with the popularity of creative class theory, which advocates arts and culture, in terms of their value in attracting creative workers and as viable industries. In an article for the American Prospect, writer Alexis MacGillis gives an example of how this has manifested in Elmira, NY. She observes that:

Inspired [by creative class theory], Elmira’s newly elected mayor, John Tonello, hung artwork on City Hall's walls, installed "poetry posts" around town featuring verses by local writers, and oversaw the redevelopment of several buildings downtown. [Stating that] "the grand hope was to create retail spaces that would enable people to make money and serve the creative class Florida talks about (MacGillis 2010, 1).

Critics are paying attention to such efforts, particularly how politicians and entrepreneurs engage the social values of arts and culture to promote creative city strategies. By encouraging the development of amenities imbued with values like community cohesion and cultural participation (e.g. art galleries and music venues), the social benefits of creative city strategies are accentuated. Yet critics observe that when city officials approach arts and culture through an economic lens, it has the potential to undermine their important social role (see Banks 2006, Gibson and Kong 2005, Strom 2002). For example, Goff and Jenkins (2006) argue that many strategies used to encourage innovation are based on economic imperatives, measuring success on “hard” indicators like profit margins. This leaves innovations that have social benefits undervalued if economic benefits do not follow, such as community arts programs that increase the quality of life for local residents.

Rather than actually including socially progressive policy recommendations, creative city strategies often use anodyne phrasing that draws on the idea of social progress in a way that underplays the potential political charge of their actual policy
implications. For example, Silicon Valley’s *The Creative Community* strategy declares that by:

Building on its economic and technologic success, Silicon Valley can become a new kind of Creative Community, leveraging creativity and cultural participation to sustain a prosperous economy and achieve a vital community. The region can evolve a distinctive identity as a place that nurtures creative exchange and cultural connections among people—a cultural milieu (Walesh and Henton 2001, 12).

An appeal to specific values (e.g. creativity, cultural participation, economic health) emerges from this statement, though without indications of what strategies will actually be put forth, bringing to mind Markusen’s (2006) argument that the fuzziness of creative class theory creates analytical and conceptual difficulties, as well as being politically vacuous.

According to Scott (2007a), urban policies influenced by entrepreneurial economic theories like creative class theory are replacing the role of the state in planning, resulting in a loss of essential social services that are increasingly being downloaded onto non-profit organizations (Evans and Shields 2006). With less government intervention and fewer subsidies, these organizations have a more difficult task. The weakening of social infrastructure can possibly be exacerbated by creative city strategies, as creative class theory hands the responsibility of relieving urban social problems from governments to creative workers, to ‘solve’ through their innovative capacities. This may prove detrimental, as creative city strategies are often built upon market values, crippling their ability to play a socially mediating role in urban society. For instance, citing Ware (1999), Evans and Shields (2006) demonstrate what they see as the contradictory nature of market values and community values:
Communities are the place for public moral activity, while markets are the place for private economic activity. Communities, at their best, foster recognition, care and co-operation. Markets foster anonymity, independence and competition. Communities are considered the place for openness, security and trust. Markets are the place for secrecy, insecurity and distrust...Communities look for dignity and equality. Markets look for fitness and success...the problem is that our society is awash with markets but in need of substantive community with public values (146).

Despite such testaments to the incommensurable nature of these two value systems, creative class theory often merges them without acknowledging the inherent contradictions, which Peck (2005) observes are implicit throughout creative class discourse. However, regardless of intent, creative city strategies are bringing more attention to arts and culture, which can mean more funding and positive advertisement for local artists.

The next section of this chapter delves into the ways research at different geographical scales can impact the comparability of findings across urban contacts and finishes establishing the context for the remainder of this study.

2.5 Focus on geography: the significance of size on the analysis of the creative class

The process of mapping the creative class is as broad and contested as the notion of the creative class itself. In McGranahan and Wojan’s (2007) study, they discover that variables such as life stage and age complicate creative class theory’s assumptions about mobility and lifestyle preferences. Similar issues regarding the particularities of smaller places arise in Sands and Reese’s (2008) exploration of midsized Canadian urban centres with populations between 75,000 and 350,000 (see also Lewis and Donald 2010). Using
data from Statistics Canada and Industry Canada, they found no significant relationship between diversity, the creative class, and economic growth. They question whether smaller city-regions can reasonably strive for the same atmosphere of amenity and cultural diversity that larger ones boast, like those explored in The Rise of the Creative Class. Furthermore, they question whether such city-regions even endeavor to replicate ‘creative cities’ and follow development strategies based on creative class theory.

Studies like those of McGranahan and Wojan (2007) and Sands and Reese (2008) examine the creative class using statistical analysis at a county or CMA level, raising questions about place particularities that require more in-depth case study work. This thesis attempts to do so using a case study of St. John’s. I use 2006 Census of Canada data at the census tract level, as well as an interview component as a means of exploring the social and cultural dimension of the creative class in St. John’s. In doing so, this study attempts to understand if, or how, creative class theory is relevant to the social and economic context of St. John’s, and simultaneously evaluates the potential pitfalls of using creative class definitions for social analyses. The following chapter describes the methods used to undertake this task, provides definitions of key terms, and introduces the case study site.
To fully explore the research questions of this thesis I employ multiple methods. This is necessary as I make use of statistical data and qualitative interview data in this thesis that explores social/cultural matters across space. Madsen and Adriansen (2004) call for greater use of multiple methods when researching topics that combine land use and social values, arguing that there are many ways to answer the same question, and that these answers can be complementary. In the case of this thesis, I approach each question using methods that are best suited to explore them, and together allow for a more rounded analysis.

Addressing the first question of this thesis: “Where do the creative class of St. John’s live?” requires a detailed definition of the creative class occupational categories and an exploration of the study site using census data. The second question: “Do the values of creative workers in St. John’s support creative class theory’s assumption that these workers share a common value system?” requires a more qualitative approach. I use interview material from two different sets of interviews to answer this question. This chapter describes the processes of data collection and rationale for the methods chosen to approach these questions.

3.1 Definitions

Table 3.1.1 describes the broad occupational groupings that make up the creative class as described in *The Rise of the Creative Class* (Florida 2002b). For this study I use
a modification of this framework (see Table 3.1.2) taken from a current study on innovation in Canadian cities that has already adapted Florida's definitions of the creative class to the National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2001 system used in the Canadian census of the population (see Spencer and Vinodrai 2006). I employ the same definitions for comparative consistency. Spencer and Vinodrai (2006) allocate the occupational codes into Florida's four classes: the creative class, service occupations, trades and manual, and agriculture. While their divisions do not differentiate between the super creative core and creative professionals, this does not pose a problem since the focus of this thesis is on the lifestyle and landscape features associated with the creative class as a whole.

Table 3.1.1 Class divisions by occupation as identified in *Rise of the Creative Class* (Source: Florida 2002b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Creative Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super Creative Core</td>
<td>Computer and mathematical occupations, Architecture and engineering occupations, Life, physical, and social science occupations, Education, training, and library occupations, Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Professionals</td>
<td>Management occupations, Business and financial operations occupations, Legal occupations, Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations, High-end sales and sales management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Class</td>
<td>Health care support occupations, food preparation and food-service-related occupations, building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations, personal care and service occupations, low-end sales and related occupations, office and administrative support occupations, community and social services occupations, protective service occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>Construction and extraction occupations, installation, maintenance, and repair occupations, production occupations, transportation and material moving occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Class</td>
<td>Farming, fishing and forestry occupations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1.2 Florida’s divisions adapted for Canadian research (Source: Spencer and Vinodrai 2006)

| Creative class occupations categories | A0<sup>4</sup> Senior management occupations; A1 Specialist managers; A2 Managers in retail trade, food and accommodation services; A3 Other managers, B0 Professional occupations in business and finance; B1 Finance and insurance administrative occupations, C0 Professional occupations in natural and applied sciences; C1 Technical occupations related to natural and applied sciences, D0 Professional occupations in health; D1 Nurse supervisors and registered nurses; D2 Technical and related occupations in health, E0 Judges, lawyers, psychologists, social workers, ministers of religion, and policy and program officers; E1 Teachers and professors, F0 Professional occupations in art and culture; F1 Technical occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport |
| Service occupations | B2 Secretaries; B3 Administrative and regulatory occupations; B4 Clerical supervisors; B5 Clerical occupations, D3 Assisting occupations in support of health services, E2 Paralegals, social service workers and occupations in education and religion, n.e.c., G0 Sales and service supervisors; G1 Wholesale, technical, insurance, real estate sales specialists, and retail, wholesale and grain buyers; G2 Retail salespersons and sales clerks; G3 Cashiers; G4 Chefs and cooks; G5 Occupations in food and beverage service; G6 Occupations in protective services; G7 Occupations in travel and accommodation, including attendants in recreation and sport; G8 Child care and home support workers; G9 Sales and service occupations, n.e.c. |
| Trades and Manual | H0 Contractors and supervisors in trades and transportation; H1 Constructions trades; H2 Stationary engineers, power station operators and electrical trades and telecommunications occupations; H3 Machinists, metal forming, shaping and erecting occupations; H4 Mechanics; H5 Other trades, n.e.c., H6 Heavy equipment and crane operators, including drillers; H7 Transportation equipment operators and related workers, excluding laborers; H8 Trades helpers, construction and transportation laborers and related occupations, I2 Primary production laborers, J0 Supervisors in manufacturing; J1 Machine operators in manufacturing; J2 Assemblers in manufacturing; J3 Laborers in processing, manufacturing and utilities |
| Agriculture | I0 Occupations unique to agriculture, excluding laborers; I1 Occupations unique to forestry operations, mining, oil and gas extraction and fishing, excluding laborers |

<sup>4</sup> The alpha-numerical designations that precede each occupational heading signifies the class of occupations as designated in Statistics Canada and are used to identify occupation categories within the NOC system.
Criticisms of the creative class definition bear potential obstacles for research that uses this framework to make social and/or economic inquiries. Markusen (2006) argues that the major categories of the creative class are too broad, encompassing such occupations as claims adjusters and tax collectors that are arguably un-creative jobs. At the same time, the creative class definition excludes occupations like tailors and ship engineers that may be considered more creative. Similarly, Healy (2002) poses the question of how a computer support specialist might be considered creative, since the job “...mainly involves mechanically navigating pre-generated questions...and then reading out the prewritten answer” (99). The way the NOC system is regrouped here to reflect to Canadian creative class raises similar issues. For instance, one might consider that a minister of religion, a policy and program officer, or a technician in sports and recreation do not require innovative or creative thinking in their work. In addition, these occupational categories themselves are broad, and each category heading (e.g. A0, A1, A2) contains more specific sub-categories. For instance, A0-641 is the NOC occupational code for commissioned police officers, which are under the A0 category of managers, and considered part of the creative class according to the framework in Table 3.1.2.

Given these conceptual difficulties, one might argue that certain occupational categories should be removed or reorganized. However, I refrain from doing so in this study, not because I agree that bundling occupational groups in this manner is unproblematic, but because changing the parameters of the study changes the comparability to Florida’s original thesis. Since my purpose here is to make such a comparison, I use the original categories proposed by Florida (2002b) and adapted by Spencer and Vinodrai (2006). Doing this allows the differences to reveal themselves that
may potentially be obscured had I changed the categories; doing so also helps reveal the inherent difficulties in speculating about a particular group of people who may not necessarily share common social or economic characteristics.

According to Danermark et al. (2002), social research based on broad occupational groupings can undermine the weight of socioeconomic issues that cross these boundaries and also underestimate important divisions within these groupings. Due to the inclusion of so many occupations (and exclusion of others), it is plausible that the economic and social impact of the creative class is exaggerated. Or, its use as an analytical tool may obscure more significant social or economic trends that might otherwise emerge using more specifically defined criteria. Though this study uses the term creative class as it is defined in creative class theory, it does so to test its robustness. It is with an awareness of these potential problems that I critically pose my research questions.

3.2 Study site

I chose the St. John's CMA as my study site for a number of reasons. First and foremost being a student of Memorial University located in St. John's, gave me easy access to this study site. I am also a research assistant for the St. John's portion of the aforementioned ISRN study from which I have drawn the creative worker definitions. This position gave me access to background literature and interview material that I use here. St. John's is also appropriate because it has a high concentration of creative workers (38.2% of the total workforce), and when viewed in light of its unique geography, history, and society, it is an appropriate study site to analyze the relevancy of creative class theory. As the eastern-most Canadian city and capital of Newfoundland, St. John's is the
hub of the province’s economic and government activities. Over 181,000 people reside in the CMA and from 2001-2006, the city-region saw population growth of 4.7% amidst a provincial loss of 1.5% (Statistics Canada 2007b). Communities throughout Newfoundland are generally rural and tied to the resource industry (Summers 2001). Historically a port town, St. John’s relied on fisheries exports and mining and is now developing its offshore energy resources, though tourism is also a major part of their economy (Duxbury 2004). The government of Newfoundland expects the completion and operation of the Voisey’s Bay nickel mining project in Labrador and Hebron offshore oil project will curtail population loss in the near future and bring workers back from Alberta (Labrador 2008). Three current offshore oil fields in the province are responsible for approximately 35% of nominal gross domestic product in the St. John’s CMA; an industry whose growth is dictated by global market trends (St. John's 2008). The reliance on such resource-based projects for economic growth makes St. John’s a good candidate for study since creative class theory bases its theory of growth on high-tech innovations. In the case of St. John’s growth may be tied to its location near valuable natural resources, stimulated by global financial investment – not the amenities theorized in the creative class literature. At the same time, industries such as offshore-oil and gas employ engineers and scientists (among others) who, according to Florida, constitute the ‘super creative core’ of the creative class.

The St. John’s CMA is composed of thirteen census subdivisions (see Figure 3.2.1). St. John’s, the largest city within the CMA, is located in the heart of the urban core. Despite overall growth in the CMA, the city of St. John’s is actually losing population, and growth is occurring along the periphery of the region. Mount Pearl is the
second largest city in the CMA and is also experiencing population decline. Bay Bulls, Bauline, Petty Harbour-Maddox Cove, Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove, Pouch Cove, Flatrock, Witless Bay, Torbay, Portugal Cove-St. Phillip’s, Conception Bay South (CBS), and Paradise are the other communities in the CMA, with populations ranging from 379 in Bauline to just under 22,000 in CBS. These areas are all experiencing population growth as seen on Figure 3.2.1.

Figure 3.2.1 Map of population change in the St. John’s CMA 2001-2006 (Source: Statistics Canada 2006a)
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St. John’s is well known for its historical significance as the oldest city in Canada. The city’s Department of Economic Development uses this cultural advantage to develop its niche in heritage tourism (Duxbury 2004).

Figure 3.2.2 Photo of downtown retail stores on Duckworth Street (Source: City of St. John’s 2002)
3.3 Locating the creative class: census definitions of space

My research begins by locating the creative class at the census tract level, which will expose the variegated presence of creative workers within the CMA, a noteworthy distinction made invisible by regional-level analysis. Boundaries identified in this study follow those set by Statistics Canada (2007a), which defines census tracts as:

...Small, relatively stable geographic areas that usually have a population of 2,500 to 8,000. They are located in census metropolitan areas and in census agglomerations with an urban core population of 50,000 or more in the previous census. A committee of local specialists (for example, planners, health and social...

---

5 These photos come from the City of St. John’s website. Of the dozen photos provided on the website’s photo album I chose a photo of a downtown retail street and a downtown residential street with the intention of providing illustrations of the physical structure of urban streets in St. John’s. In both photos, the photographer, and the city that posted the pictures focus on the unique aesthetic qualities of the downtown core that speak to its cultural heritage value, as some residential and retail buildings downtown date as far back as the late 1800s (see O’Dea 1976).

6 The population range in census tracts in the St. John’s CMA is between 508 to 7821 (Statistics Canada 2006a)
workers, and educators) initially delineates census tracts in conjunction with Statistics Canada. Once a census metropolitan area (CMA) or census agglomeration (CA) has been subdivided into census tracts, the census tracts are maintained even if the urban core population subsequently declines below 50,000.

Due to privacy concerns, Statistics Canada limits the release of details depending on the scale of inquiry. This does not impede my analysis since the occupational data required to distinguish the creative class from other workers is available at the census tract level. Figure 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 illustrate the boundaries of the 46 census tracts in the CMA.

The 2006 Census of Canada characterizes the St. John’s CMA as an urban core surrounded by a rural fringe, with a small secondary urban core that lies south of the urban core but still within the limits of the City of St. John’s. Delineating areas based on population, the 2006 Census Dictionary defines an urban core as:

A large urban area around which a Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is delineated. The urban core must have a population (based on the previous census) of at least 50,000 persons in the case of a CMA, or at least 10,000 persons in the case of a CA.\(^7\)

The rural fringe is described as:

All territory lying outside urban areas. Taken together, urban and rural areas cover all of Canada. Rural population includes all population living in the rural fringes of census metropolitan areas (CMAs) and census agglomerations (CAs), as well as population living in rural areas outside CMAs and CAs.

\(^7\) A CA is similar to a CMA in that it consists of one or more adjacent municipalities. However, it is smaller in population size but must contain at least 10,000 residents to maintain its designation as a CA.
Figure 3.3.1 Census tract boundaries for the St. John's CMA (Source: Statistics Canada 2008)
The census dictionary describes a secondary urban core as "all small urban areas within a CMA or CA that are not contiguous with the urban core of the CMA or CA". The distinction between urban core and rural fringe has significant implications for analysis of the St. John's city-region for a number of reasons. Florida's original analysis of the creative class locates the creative class at the MSA level, resulting in the potential blanketing of variation in social and physical form of areas that the creative class lives. At the same time, these variations in terms insinuate stark differences that can be misleading. In St. John's, the rural fringe is geographically close and economically and socially integrated with the urban core. Rural areas like this are known as 'rural metro-
adjacent' regions by Statistics Canada definitions - areas within a commuting distance to an urban core that are likely to see population growth (Bollman and Clemenson 2008). Also referred to as peri-urban regions, their growth is tied to the economy of the urban core (Masuda and Garvin 2008).

Figure 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 show the boundary defined by Statistics Canada that distinguishes the urban core from the rural fringe showing in some cases, census tracts that fall into both categories. For instance, CT 202.04, which is 5.57 km² in size, is considered half urban and half rural according to this definition. In this case, the differences between rural and urban may have no impact on individual’s perception or use of these spaces.

Differences between rural and urban areas may be greater in larger city-regions like Toronto or Vancouver and the many U.S. metropolitan areas that are prominent in creative class discourse where urban densities are greater. However, Statistics Canada’s definitions are not designed to account for such nuances. All areas of Canada are designated as either rural or urban areas based on a single size or density requirement, where a rural area consists of a “population living outside places of 1,000 people or more [or a] population living outside places with densities of 400 or more people per square kilometer” (Statistics Canada 2007a). Statistics Canada recognizes the implications of this simplistic definition, such as the fact that when political boundaries change, definitions of areas can change from rural to urban and vice versa without any demographic or physical changes taking place. Considering the analytical implications, they suggest that the definition used should match the questions being asked, in terms of scope and focus (e.g. economic, social, geographic) (Bollman and Clemenson 2008).
Despite such caveats, Roy MacGregor (2007a, 2007b), columnist for the Globe and Mail, contends that Statistics Canada needs to update their definitions of ‘urban’ and ‘rural’, which date back to 1951. He argues that these antiquated definitions create the illusion that Canada is more urban than it really is, since places with populations over 1,000 and with at least 400 persons per square kilometer are considered urban. This can result in a disconnect between the concept of ‘urban’ as imagined in much of the creative city discourse and the actual city, which may have a population of only 1,001 residents and be more comparable to what some may consider ‘rural’. In the case of urban regions, Statistics Canada does not distinguish between the sizes of CMAs for statistical purposes, such that a CMA of 50,000 residents and one with 5,000,000 are lumped into the same category. This can result in a similar veiling of difference when analyzing the applicability of creative class strategies on Canadian CMAs, differences between Canadian CMAs, and between Canadian CMAs and US MSAs.

While I use the Statistics Canada boundaries to delineate rural from urban, there is also the issue of how individuals conceptualize ‘urban’ and ‘rural’, which can differ substantially from the Statistics Canada definitions, and from person to person. The potential difference between the statistical and perceived definitions of ‘urban’ is one of the reasons I chose to include qualitative interviews as part of my research. I discuss these differences as I analyze the interview material in Chapter 5.

8 ‘Urban areas’ as defined by Statistics Canada (2007a) can exist in Canada independent of CMAs, CAs, or urban cores.
3.4 Location Quotient

Following data collection, I used a location quotient method to examine the spatial distribution of the creative class within the St. John’s CMA at the census tract level to examine where creative workers are over-represented and under-represented in comparison to the total labour force of each census tract. I did this in order to determine what types of landscapes creative workers are living in within St. John’s and to compare this to the type of landscape that is illustrated in creative class theory and promulgated by many developers and city officials.

Typically, researchers use location quotients to measure ratios of local versus national employment in specific sectors (O’Donoghue and Gleave 2004) “to distinguish the proportion of a business’s workforce serving local or nonlocal markets” (Hustedde et al. 2005, 13). Hustedde et al. (2005) use this method to determine the amount of business activity that exceeds local needs, using the formula:

\[
\text{Location Quotient} = \frac{\% \text{ of Local Employment in Activity } X}{\% \text{ of National Employment in Activity } X}
\]

A location quotient of 1 would indicate that the percent of local employment in activity X is equal to the percent of national employment in activity X. A location quotient greater than 1 would indicate the percent of local employment in activity X is higher than the percent of national employment in activity X and, vice versa, a location quotient less than 1 would indicate the percent of local employment in activity X is less than the percent of national employment in activity X. Hustedde et al. (2005) contend that a location quotient greater than 1.25 represents a substantial amount of activity that exceeds local needs, and a location quotient of less than 0.75 demonstrates that an activity is not meeting local
needs. Strictly speaking, however, how much of a difference from equality (i.e., a location quotient of 1) is significant is not objectively calculable. A location quotient can only measure whether a phenomenon at one location (e.g., a city-region or CMA) is more, less, or equally concentrated in comparison to (i.e., relative to) another location.

This method has also been used outside the economic/industrial realm (see Brenden et al. 2008), and here I use it to determine the relative concentration of creative workers in the labour force residing in each census tract. The formula I use is as follows:

\[
\text{Location Quotient} = \frac{\text{(Total # of creative workers in CT/Total labour force in CT)}}{\text{(Total # of creative workers in CMA/Total labour force in CMA)}}
\]

Where: \text{Location Quotient} < 1 \text{ fewer creative workers than expected}  \\
\text{Location Quotient} = 1 \text{ expected amount of creative workers}  \\
\text{Location Quotient} > 1 \text{ more creative workers than expected}

One potential problem with using this method is how the area of comparison influences results. For instance, the St. John’s CMA has a higher proportion of creative workers than the average for all Canadian CMAs; had I compared each census tract to the average of the entire nation (rather than comparing individual census tracts to the St. John’s CMA average) the calculation would show higher levels of creative workers present in all census tracts across the CMA, which may overstate their presence. Exaggerating the results even more would be a comparison of the proportion of creative workers in the CMA to that of the province of Newfoundland, which has a much lower ratio than the national average due to the tendency of economic and government functions to cluster in the St. John’s city-region. For the purposes of this study, I chose to analyze the location quotient results of each census tract compared to the CMA average of creative workers because it has the overall highest ratio of creative workers to total labour
force of all three possible areas of comparison. Doing this allows census tracts with the highest possible concentrations of creative workers to emerge, thus avoiding overstating the presence of creative workers across the whole CMA.

The next potential problem pertains to how to derive information from the location quotient once the calculation is performed. O’Donoghue and Gleave (2004) contend that, despite being one of the most popular methods of finding clusters, there is no general standard to determine at what level it exposes concentrations that are exceptional, which means they tend to be arbitrarily defined. They point to examples in the literature where one author uses the value of 3.0 or greater to define a cluster, while another author uses the value of 1.25 or greater. The values in this study range from 0.35 to 1.76. Although O’Donoghue and Gleave’s argument is based in the context of industrial clustering, it has similarities with creative class analysis. Their critique examines the use of the location quotient to locate “technological external economies”, the type of clusters that are “associated with the transmission of information and ideas often via face-to-face communications” (421), where geographical proximity is important. O’Donohue and Gleave’s technological external economy is therefore comparable to the creative milieu concept. As such, these innovative spheres of influence are often bounded at the city-region level without addressing the heterogeneity that exists within cities, which, as I have already indicated, is one of the criticisms of creative class theory (see Nathan 2005).

To display the location quotient calculations in this study (see Figure 4.1.1) I divided the results into the following groups: 0-1.00, 1.01-1.25, 1.26-1.50, 1.51-1.75, 1.76

9 Because of the size of the dataset, the location quotient calculations are not included in the main body of this thesis. They are available in Appendix 1.
- 2.00. All values below 1.00 are grouped together to avoid drawing unnecessary attention to census tracts with lower than expected concentrations of creative worker residents. Similarly, census tracts with LQ values of 1.00 to 1.25 are not examined in this thesis as they reflect areas of expected or slightly higher than expected concentrations of creative workers. Since this study focuses on areas with high concentrations of creative workers, I draw attention to census tracts with values between 1.26 and 2.00 because they represent areas with notably higher concentrations of creative workers.

After using these groupings to construct Figure 4.1.1, I examine two census tracts with the highest LQ values within the urban core and the three census tracts with the highest LQ values within the rural fringe. Those in the rural fringe are particularly important for exploring the questions this thesis poses because the creative class is usually understood to be an urban phenomenon (see Florida 2002b).

### 3.5 Census Data

I retrieved the following types of census data at the census tract level to examine the social and physical variation within the CMA: population, family data, citizenship data, and household income statistics (see Appendix 2 for categories and Appendix 3 for data). Social diversity is measured using citizenship data to determine the proportion of residents that are born outside of the province, and foreign-born. Data on gay populations is not available at the census tract level so it is not used here. If it were available, it would necessitate a discussion on the ability to speculate on the analytical value of such data, a topic already discussed by Thomas and Darnton (2006) and not focused on here.
To ascertain the type of built landscape that exists within the CMA I drew from building-type and construction data, which is also detailed in Appendix 2 and 3. I collected data for the St. John’s CMA and the National level only in cases where comparisons are necessary such as in the case of family data, immigration, and population change but not in terms of building construction or building type. I use the building construction and building type data to provide statistical details on the areas that emerge from the location quotient calculations as census tracts with the highest proportions of creative workers.

3.6 Using interviews to explore individual values and perceived levels of social capital

Through interviews I address the research question: “Do the values of the creative class in St. John’s support creative class theory’s assumption of a shared value system?” Exploring how creative workers in St. John’s value the city and comparing this to the assertions made in Florida’s (2002b) original thesis requires an analysis of two different concepts: social capital and individual values. As I discussed briefly in the introductory chapter, social capital has many definitions and social implications. How to measure it depends on which definition the researcher uses. The Canadian Social Survey on Social Engagement uses the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s definition of social capital, which focuses on overall wellbeing and civic engagement. This survey indicates the strength of social capital in a region by determining the frequency of various individual behaviours such as volunteer activity, number of group memberships, and voting activity (Frank 2005). In a study of European nations, Kassa
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(2008) measures social capital using 20 indicators in an attempt to encompass a broad range of factors that engender social capital. Through the analysis of surveys, the author observes that weak social capital can be determined by the frequency of meetings between friends and colleagues, while strong social capital can be determined by memberships in voluntary organizations, voting activity, and levels of trust. However, as Putnam (2005) observes, there are drawbacks to measuring social capital in this way. He shows how membership in American organizations has increased in recent years, but argues that membership does not necessarily signify active group participation, thus making it difficult to determine actual levels of social capital. I do not employ survey techniques in this thesis due to the small sample size. Instead I opt to explore individual concepts of social capital in an interview setting, using semi-structured questions.

I combine data retrieved from two sets of interviews, one conducted specifically for this study and another set of interviews collected from the St. John’s segment of a major collaborative research study launched in 2006 by the Innovations Systems Research Network (ISRN) from which I also selected the creative class occupational definitions. The ISRN study examines the social dynamics of innovation in city-regions across Canada (including St. John’s), using a structured interview question set to inquire into subjects such as mobility, place, and creativity. Interviewees included creative workers, employers, and representatives of organizations. For the first set of interviews I used a snowball recruitment technique to find volunteers, conducting thirteen interviews in person\(^{10}\) beginning with a personal contact, Barbara, a university colleague. All interviews took place in the interviewee’s place of work, home, or at a coffee shop – with

\(^{10}\) One interview, with Harold required telephone follow-up/clarification
the participant choosing the interview location. One focus group also took place with three individuals present, chosen through the snowball recruitment technique as well. The snowball method is a widely used qualitative process for gaining access to specific social groups that relies on the social network of the researcher who then has initial participants recruit other participants (Noy 2005). It is advantageous for this study because it is assumed that creative workers are likely to know other creative workers either through their professional or personal ties. However, by using this technique the researcher relinquishes much of his/her control over the type of participants included in the study. As a means of reclaiming some of this control, I chose (within the names given) those that fit the description of a creative worker in terms of occupation as defined by Spencer and Vinodrai (2006), and those that live within the CMA. Other criteria requiring consideration include variables that influence lifestyle values and residential decisions, such as homeownership (see Walks 2006), which, along with gender, life stage, and ethnicity, can determine access to certain social and physical spaces and partially define individuals’ experiences within them (Warr 2006, Fincher 1998, Phillips et al. 2007).

With this in mind, I attempted to choose a mix of male and female participants from a range of life stages, ages, and participants who have immigrated from different provinces or countries. I recorded all interviews using a digital voice recorder with the permission of the interviewees. Each interview lasted between 20 minutes to an hour, as some participants had more to say than others.

Similar to my own study, the ISRN study’s set of questions directed at creative workers asks participants questions related to the attractiveness of place, and the perceived positive and negative attributes of St. John’s. This considerable overlap enabled
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me to analyze interviews with creative workers from the ISRN project along with the interviews conducted for my own study. As such, there are two sets of interview questions used (see Appendix 4 and 5). As a research assistant for the St. John’s segment of the ISRN study, I contacted potential participants, conducted and transcribed interviews in the fall of 2008. I followed the same procedure for recording interviews for my own thesis.

The following list contains information for all 25 interviewees (13 recruited for my own study and 12 from the ISRN study). Not all interviewees divulged the same amount of personal information and pseudonyms are used to protect their identity. Due to the relatively small population of St. John’s I have also not divulged names of the specific work positions of creative workers (i.e. place of work, position), as this would make some of the creative workers easily identifiable.

1) Amber is a 25-year-old, Caucasian, female provincial employee (NOC classification E0) who was born and raised in Mount Pearl, a city within the St. John’s CMA. She currently lives there with her parents and younger brother in a detached dwelling. Her parents were also born in Mount Pearl. After graduating with her M.A. in Political Science at Memorial University of Newfoundland, she landed a job with the provincial government of Newfoundland.

2) Barbara is a 24-year-old Caucasian, female provincial employee (NOC classification E0) who was born and raised in Vancouver, B.C. She moved to St. John’s to attend graduate school and received her M.A. in political science. She lives in an apartment in downtown St. John’s that she shares with a roommate.

3) Beverly is a 56-year-old, Caucasian, female Environmental Consultant (NOC classification C0). She is married and has adult children. She lived in Logy-Bay Middle Cove Outer Cove but moved closer to the core of the city of St. John’s (Georgestown) when her children became school-aged, because she wanted the freedom to walk to work, and for her children to have access to extra curricular activities, such as music and sports activities, without having to drive them. She lives in a detached home.

4) Bobby is a 30-year-old, Caucasian, male computer engineer (NOC classification C0) who was born and raised in Clarenville, NL, a town of 7,175 (according to the 2006 Census of Canada, which includes Shoal Harbour) which lies about 193 kms Northwest of St. John’s. He moved to St. John’s to attend Memorial University in
the late 1990s and stayed because of employment opportunities. He currently lives in the Churchill park area of St. John’s.

5) Gertrude is a 26-year-old, mixed ethnicity, female Biologist (NOC classification C0) who came to St. John’s from her hometown of Montreal, QC where she received her B.Sc. from McGill in Biology, to attend a graduate program in Biology at Memorial University, and stayed for an employment opportunity. She lives in a downtown St. John’s row house with her roommate who recently purchased the house and is also a Biologist.

6) Harold is a 39-year-old Caucasian male Environmental Researcher (NOC classification C0) originally from Gaultois, NL, a small community that sits within Gros Morne National Park. He is married and has two children, ages six and two. He lives in the Churchill suburb area of St. John’s but has recently purchased a home in York Harbour, NL that he plans to keep as a summer home but wishes to move to full time.

7) Jimmy is a 25-year-old Caucasian male nurse from Conception Bay South (CBS), (populations of 21, 860 according to the 2006 Census of Canada) a community within the St. John’s CMA. He continues to live in CBS to be close to his family, but commutes to work in the Memorial University Health Science Centre hospital as a registered nurse. He received his Bachelor of Nursing at Memorial University.

8) Lenny is a 28-year-old Caucasian male middle school teacher (NOC classification E1) who lives in downtown St. John’s in an apartment he shares with a roommate. He was born and raised in Norman’s Cove (population of 795 according to the 2006 Census of Canada) and moved to St. John’s to attend Memorial University where he received his B.Ed. and M.Ed and now teaches at a high school in the city of St. John’s.

9) Parvinder is a 48-year-old Indian male chemical engineer (NOC classification C0) who moved from India to work on a project in St. John’s.

10) Rosetta is a 34-year-old, Caucasian, female municipal employee (NOC classification E0) who was born in the province.

11) Eli is a 25-year-old, Caucasian, male musician (NOC classification F) who lives in downtown St. John’s and was born in the CMA.

12) Jill is a 25-year-old Caucasian female writer/film-maker (NOC classification F) who was born in St. John’s, NL. She has lived in other cities in Canada, including Halifax and Toronto but currently resides in St. John’s.

13) Hilary is a 45-year-old Caucasian female musician (NOC classification F) who lives in downtown St. John’s in a detached house. She is divorced and has adult children. She was born and raised in Woody Point, a community situated within Gros Morne National Park, in Northern Newfoundland. She received her B.Sc. in Biology at the University of Guelph, Ontario, and then returned to St. John’s, and studied computer science at Memorial University. After working in this field for a number of years and playing music part time she decided to pursue a music career full time, teaching and playing for private events. She supplements her income by renting out rooms in her house to students. She plans to build a house in Woody Point and live and work there full time as a musician.
14) Jean is a 25-year-old Caucasian French Canadian marine researcher (NOC classification CO) born and raised in Quebec City, QC. He moved to St. John’s to study at Memorial University’s Marine Institute and stayed to work at the Marine Institute as a researcher. He lives in the Churchill Park suburb area with two roommates. His future plans are to work on fish farming sturgeon in his hometown of Quebec City.

15) Hugo is a 28-year-old Caucasian male filmmaker (NOC classification F) who was born and raised in St. John’s. He currently resides in downtown St. John’s.

16) Aaron is a 28-year-old Caucasian male musician and music teacher (NOC classification F). He was born in the city of St. John’s and at a young age moved to Toronto. Because of health reasons (air quality), his family moved back to St. John’s. He lives in a house with roommates in downtown St. John’s and plays in a Fusion Funk band and is also a music teacher.

17) Moe is a naval architect (NOC classification CO) in his early twenties who moved from Mombassa, Kenya to attend the Naval architecture program at Memorial University after which he landed a job at C-Core, an engineering company based in St. John’s. He lives by himself in a rental unit in a row house downtown St. John’s.

18) Jane is a Caucasian female public relations consultant (NOC classification A1) in her thirties to early forties living in downtown St. John’s in a row house with her husband who is a music producer. She was born in St. John’s and has lived in other cities in Canada but returned to St. John’s to start her consulting business.

19) Dick is a 53-year-old banker (NOC classification B0) born in St. John’s. He lived in Halifax, NS for many years and recently moved to St. John’s for work.

20) Avert is a 55-year-old Caucasian male business manager (NOC classification A1) for an engineering company based in Aberdeen, Scotland. He lives here part time (one or two weeks each month) but is based in his hometown of Aberdeen where his wife and two children, ages 21 and 25, are located. He lives in a hotel in downtown St. John’s. His employer gave him the option of keeping a house or apartment in St. John’s but Avert opted to stay in a hotel because of the ease of living and company.

21) Harry is a middle-aged Caucasian male manager of a technology consultancy firm (NOC classification A1) living in St. John’s. Born and raised in St. John’s he attended university in Ontario and lived and worked there for many years.

22) Dale is a 50-year-old Caucasian male provincial employee (NOC classification E1) in a Director’s position (to protect his privacy the name of the department he works in is not used). He lives in St. John’s with his partner and was born in Ontario. He has changed professions a number of times and has lived in rural Newfoundland for a number of years, working in the hospitality industry. He later moved to St. John’s for a change of scenery and better career opportunities.

23) Leah is a middle-aged provincial employee (NOC classification E0) working at a Director level (to protect her privacy the name of the department is not given). She lives in St. John’s and was born and raised in the province.

24) Allan is a 48-year-old, Caucasian male consultant for the provincial government (NOC classification E0). He was born and raised in Newfoundland, is married and
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has two adult children. He earned his Bachelor of Commerce and MBA from Memorial University.

25) Herman is a middle-aged, Caucasian consultant (NOC classification CO).

The interview questions I formulated for the study are broad and open-ended. I posed them in a conversational style, following the flow of the conversation rather than the question sheet to allow the participant to set the tone of the conversation through personal narrative. In doing so I hoped to avoid influencing responses, allowing the participant to steer the conversation and be comfortable with the subject matter. The ISRN study uses structured interview questions designed to address economic as well as social aspects of place. Both types of interviews cover a range of ideas and provide different approaches to asking questions. Combining data from both types of interviews has the benefit of giving a broader range of material that is relevant to this topic. Although the two sets of interview questions differ substantially in format, they are quite compatible when it comes to content. In particular, one section of the ISRN interview question set focuses on the attractiveness of the city of St. John’s. These questions delve into individual values, and open the discussion into the particularities of living in this area that makes it attractive or unattractive – identical to the focus of my interview questions.

I also added a focus group component to this study. Focus groups complement the interview process (Brod et al. 2009) because they generate a particular type of data through ‘natural discussion’ (Smithon 2000) that differs from – and can add value to – the one-on-one interviews that are the largest component of this part of the study. The interactive way in which topics are discussed by participants and moderator during focus groups help to draw out issues and concerns “that may not have materialized in a series of
one-to-one interviews” (Drahota and Dewey 2008, 293). However, group dynamics can create issues such as conversation dominance by one or more participants, “problems of constructing the other, and the likelihood of group dynamics obscuring some of the more controversial perspectives, for example the tendency for participants to reproduce normative discourses” (Smithson 2000, 103-4). I attempted to mitigate these problems through awareness of the group dynamics and participants’ facial expressions and tone of voice.

I transcribed and analyzed all 25 interviews using *Hyper Research* software designed for qualitative research. This program is an organizational tool that allows one to transcribe interviews and arrange them into ‘studies’. Within each study one can create ‘codes’ (labels that represent a topic) and highlight sections or words within the transcribed material to correspond to each code. I created my codes as I recognized topics arising during the interview analysis process, breaking down each interview into codes as I recognized them, creating new ones as necessary. I organized the codes as topics and subtopics that fit within major categories as listed below.

1. Creative class values
   a. Anonymity
   b. Individuality
   c. Tolerance
   d. Diversity, Amenities
   e. Diversity, Social
2. Social and Structural Changes
   a. Positively viewed
   b. Negatively viewed
3. Geographical context
   a. Cultural
   b. Historical
4. Identity
   a. Connection to place
   b. Globally constructed
   c. Locally constructed
d. Relative urbanity

5. Valuation of Place
   a. Childcare
   b. Safety
   c. Trust
   d. Bedroom Communities
   e. Family amenities
   f. Rural as a way of life

6. Mobility
   a. Employment opportunities

7. St. John’s attractiveness
   a. University
   b. Arts
   c. Music
   d. Tight-knit community
   e. Intimacy (small population)
   f. Proximity (walking distance)
   g. Cost of living
   h. Growing economy

8. St. John’s unattractiveness
   a. Isolated (socially)
   b. Isolated (physically)
   c. Weather

Other codes used for identification include: female, male, age, and place of birth.

By coding all the material in the transcribed interviews, material can easily be recalled and organized based on common themes and subjects for easier analysis.

3.7 Photographs as an analytical tool

I also incorporate photos into this thesis to illustrate to readers the built environment within downtown St. John’s and along the periphery of the CMA, particularly for those not familiar with the study area. Because photos are active materials of representation, not simply static reflections of landscapes, it is necessary to discuss the use of them here. Though many geographers use photos to provide a window into their study sites, it is often done without reflection as to what ways it represents the subject
matter and what discourses they reinforce (Rose 2008). However, from them we can derive the purpose of their composition and the relationship between photographer/researcher and subject, and through them we either reproduce existing concepts of certain spaces, or create new ones as long as they are purposefully used as method rather than ornament. Crang (1997) demonstrates how postcard photos are active participants in reproducing images and expectations for travelers. It is through this type of publicly circulated photo that I enhance my analysis of the streetscapes in downtown St. John’s, as representative of the image of the city. I use photos of St. John’s provided by the city’s own Department of Tourism to serve two purposes. To allow those unfamiliar with the region a glimpse of the physical characteristics of downtown, and to examine how the city is being portrayed to those outside. The use of these photos adds analytical value to this study because they illustrate a mechanism used by the municipality to promote the lifestyle and amenities of St. John’s in a specific way that contributes to outside perceptions of the city-region, that in turn helps determine the type of creative worker who might be attracted to the lifestyle connotations attached to such images. I also use photos that I have taken with the purpose of illustrating to readers the variety of housing and street layouts that exist within the five census tracts that I focus my analysis upon.

Combining quantitative and qualitative data helps give perspective to what is occurring, since census data cannot necessarily capture culturally influenced lifestyle aspirations, while selective interviews cannot capture broad demographic trends. With this in mind, in the following chapters I critically assess the applicability of creative class theory, using the empirical findings from census and interview data to analyze how
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creative class theory imagines the geography of 'creative cities', and where it diverges from the spatial patterns that are present in St. John’s.
4. **St. John’s and creative class theory**

In this chapter I focus on the findings that emerge from the census data. I begin with an interpretation of the LQ calculations and an examination of census tracts with the highest LQ values. Using this information I then compare the spatial pattern of the creative class in the St. John’s CMA to what creative class theory postulates – that creative workers value the amenity rich and active/participatory lifestyle available primarily in dense urban settings.

Using the definitions of the creative class provided by Spencer and Vinodrai (2006), the location quotient shows that the largest proportion of the creative class is distributed within a few census tracts downtown, a finding in keeping with the propositions of creative class theory. However, a substantial proportion also exists in parts of the rural fringe (see Figure 4.1.1). To examine these different areas closer, I grouped the census tracts with the highest location quotients by area (urban core and rural fringe), labeling these as Area A and Area B for ease of reference. I then explore each area in detail using census data from the 2006 Census of Canada and photos of each area to illustrate the built environments. The location quotient calculations expose a variety of residential landscapes, possibly reflecting the heterogeneity of lifestyles inherent in the creative class, a grouping based on such a wide variety of occupations that the idea of a shared lifestyle bond is difficult to establish. The subsequent lack of comparability of the ‘creative class landscapes’ explored here to the urban spaces detailed in much creative class discourse may be further evidence of this heterogeneity, which critics such as
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Markusen (2006) argue is often made invisible by creative class theory’s ‘conceptual fuzziness’.

4.1 Location of creative workers in the St. John’s CMA

A visual interpretation of the location quotient calculated at the census tract level illustrates the areas with the highest concentrations of creative workers (see Figure 4.1.1). The highest concentrations are in two adjacent census tracts within the urban core, 10 and 13; they are designated as Area A for ease of reference and have location quotient values of 1.76 and 1.74, respectively. There are also a number of census tracts surrounding the core that also have location quotient values > 1.00. However, these are not examined here as I wish to focus on comparing and contrasting the two areas with the highest concentrations of the creative class, Area A and Area B. What makes the comparison between Area A and Area B interesting is that one (Area A) is part of the urban core – a type of landscape most associated with the creative class in the literature – while the other (Area B) is part of the rural fringe. The association between the creative class and rurality has received much less attention in the literature (though see McGranahan and Wojan 2007). More importantly, the different locational preferences of the creative class that Area A and Area B suggest offer a useful way of examining key propositions of the theory of the creative class such as the notion that members of the creative class share locational preferences and value systems.
Figure 4.1.1 Location quotient results determining the spatial distribution of creative workers in St John's. Area A indicates urban core census tracts with the highest proportion of creative workers, and Area B (B1 and B2) indicates rural fringe census tracts with the highest proportions of creative workers (See Figure 4.1.2 – 4.1.6 for detailed maps of the census tracts in Area A and Area B)
Figure 4.1.2 Map of census tract 13 (Area A) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006b)

Figure 4.1.3 Map of census tract 10 (Area A) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006c)
Figure 4.1.4 Map of census tract 17 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006d)
Figure 4.1.5 Map of census tract 202.01 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006e)
Figure 4.1.6 Map of census tract 202.02 (Area B) (Source: Statistics Canada 2006f)
In both Areas A and B the creative workforce has increased between 2001 and 2006 (see Table 4.1.5), however, in Area A (in the urban core), total population is declining, while the total population in Area B (in the rural fringe) has increased dramatically during this same short time period. The loss of residents in Area A may be related to the movement of retired residents from the urban core into the outskirts of town, a relationship between life-stage and neighbourhood preference that is well documented in the literature (see Fincher 1998, Rogerson 1999, Saint Onge et al. 2007, Florida 2008a). In Area B, there is far more land available for development, and its population has risen as new housing is being built.

Table 4.1.5 Rates of change of total population, total labour force, and creative workforce in Areas A and B broken down by census tract for years 2001-2006 (Source: Statistics Canada 2001, Statistics Canada 2006g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract (CT)</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT10</td>
<td>CT13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 2006</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change 2001-2006 – Total Population (%)</td>
<td>-6.40</td>
<td>-11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population employed in creative occupations as a percent of total labour force</td>
<td>65.75</td>
<td>65.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force Change 2001-2006 (%)</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Labour Force Change 2001-2006 (%)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One way to measure social diversity is through identifying the foreign-born presence. Table 4.1.6 illustrates how — relative to the CMA — Area A has a greater proportion of Canadian residents born outside of Canada. According to creative class theory, tolerance is an important factor in city attractiveness and is measured, in part, by ethnic diversity. Area A also has a higher proportion of Canadian-born residents born outside of Newfoundland compared to the CMA as a whole, 13.9% and 7.1%, respectively. In Area B, this segment makes up 6.8% of the population (Statistics Canada 2006g).

Table 4.1.6 Immigrant population by period of immigration in Area A, B, and the St. John’s CMA (Source: Statistics Canada 2006g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>St. John’s CMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 2006</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>5,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population that immigrated from outside of Canada 2006</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated before 1961</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 1961-1970</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 1971-1980</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 1981-1990</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 1991-1995</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 1996-2000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% That migrated between 2001-2006</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, most new immigrants remain close to urban centres for access to services and employment (Thomas and Darnton 2006). This may be the case for immigrants to St. John’s, though in comparison to larger CMAs in Canada, St. John’s is much less diverse both in terms of its immigrant population, and its population of Canadians born outside of Newfoundland and Labrador. The higher diversity in Area A may be linked to the proximity of Memorial University, though the role of educational
institutions in attracting and retaining a diverse population is disputed in the literature (see Florida et al. forthcoming). In the case of Area B in the rural fringe, lack of diversity is more pronounced. In CT 202.01 for instance, the population is over 97% local (born within Newfoundland and Labrador) and the other 3% from other parts of Canada. The pronounced lack of ethnic diversity in the CMA raises questions about the proposition that social diversity attracts creative workers because of its indication of tolerance. This is not to say that St. John’s is intolerant or insular, but it does speak to the potential inability of creative class theory to account for cities with different social and cultural contexts.

In the remainder of this chapter, I examine the landscapes in Area A and Area B separately, exposing some of the contrasts that exist within the CMA. Doing so draws attention to the potential particularities of the St. John’s CMA, such as the close proximity of divergent landscapes and lifestyles. Not examining the landscape variations within the CMA may lead to inappropriate assumptions about lifestyle preferences of creative workers. This is especially important since current assumptions about creative workers hinge on the purported commonalities of their occupations (as defined by creative class theory), a link that is under scrutiny here.

4.2 Area A

Area A is in the urban core of the City of St. John’s and is primarily residential. However it is in close proximity to Duckworth Street (Figure 3.2.2) and Water Street, the two main commercial streets in St. John’s where there is an abundance of boutiques, restaurants, bars, and specialty shops, and George Street, which is the primary nightlife
destination for the city’s population. As discussed in Chapter 3, the terminology applied in this discussion (e.g. ‘urban core’ and ‘rural fringe’) can conjure particular images of landscapes that rely on distinct contrasts between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’. However, the census tracts examined here may not fit the concept of urban that is expressed in creative class discourse, particularly in comparison to the ‘urban cores’ of much larger city-regions that have higher population densities, such as Vancouver or Montréal. This difference is illustrated in the photos below (Figure 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.2.4) of streets in Area A.

Figure 4.2.1 Monkstown Road (Area A, census tract 10)
These first three photos demonstrate the residential nature and particular architectural style predominant in this small census tract. Most of the houses here were constructed
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before 1946, with only 70 private dwellings constructed since 1996. The Municipality has made some effort to control the heritage ‘feel’ of the downtown areas since it designated a 65-acre area of the city as a Heritage Conservation Area in 1977. In addition, the City’s Municipal Plan, adopted in 1984 and revised in 1993, expressed the need to maintain the architectural scale and protect the Heritage Conservation Area, as well as provide affordable public housing. Despite some public and private efforts in rehabilitating the existing housing stock, such efforts remain fragile due to costs borne onto private owners and changes in the Municipal Plan that weaken its protective regulations (Sharpe 1995).

Many of the streets in census tract 10 are lined with row houses that front the street such as those on Mullock Street (Figure 4.2.3). Larger detached properties that have green space on the property are mainly designated heritage houses, home to the more affluent downtown residents (Figure 4.2.2). The average and median household incomes of residents in census tract 10 (82,998 and 55,006, respectively) are considerably higher than that of the CMA overall (53,207 and 45,222 respectively). The wider range of incomes reflects the equally wide range of housing stock in the area in terms of housing quality. The area is absent of apartment complexes higher than five storeys, though rental units in the area have increased since the 1980s (Sharpe 1995). Monkstown Road (Figures 4.2.1 and 4.2.2) and Mullock Street (Figure 4.2.3) are perpendicular to each other. I use them specifically to show the different qualities of housing available within this small census tract that is home to a mix of affluent professionals, students, and lower-income households.
In terms of housing style and development ideology, census tract 13 adds another dimension to the diversity of the built landscape that can be found within a city, even in the small confines of Area A that I explore here. Census tract 13 is adjacent to census tract 10 and also within the statistically defined urban core. However, its physical form differs substantially, reflecting a distinct planning ideology that has shaped much of how St. John’s has developed. Its streetscape reveals the style and history of its construction, and reflects the changes in planning and housing ideology of city officials during the mid 1900s. While the older inner city streets of St. John’s are irregular and unplanned with row houses of different styles, Census tract 13 is part of the Churchill Park garden suburb. This is a planned development conceptualized in the 1940s under the leadership of Brian Dunfield, Justice of the Newfoundland Supreme Court and head of the Government’s Commission of Enquiry into Housing and Town Planning (Sharpe 2005). In this census tract, 62% of the houses were constructed between 1946 and 1960 during the period that the Churchill Park suburb began development and only 23.2% of the houses have been constructed between 1961-2006. This census tract displays characteristics that are typical of many garden suburbs constructed across North America at this time, with green space surrounding each lot, houses set back from the property line, and streets made more private by the use of cul-de-sacs – developments drawn from the aesthetic component of Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City model (Ward 2003). Figure 4.2.4 is a photo taken of one of the cul-de-sacs in this area. Its disconnection from other roads via the cul-de-sac gives it much more privacy, eliminating much of the passing vehicle traffic that the streets in census tract 10 have due to its connection to other streets in town. The addition of planned frontage on each property creates the visual of a connected park space throughout
the neighbourhood, another characteristic of the garden suburb. Rather than the range of quality in housing stock that exists in census tract 10, here there is more conformity: only 12.6% of occupied dwellings are in the form of row houses or apartment duplexes with the majority being single detached houses. The income range is much higher than in census tract 10, with a median of 86,985 and an average of 120,774. This higher income group is not surprising, since the City planned this development, in part, for the middle classes of the inner city to upgrade housing (Sharpe 2005).

Figure 4.2.4 Pine Bud Place (Area A, census tract 13)
The garden suburb plan that census tract 13 sits within demonstrates a significant turning point in the urban development of St. John's, pulling away from the style of row houses and moving towards suburban style housing.

In these two small census tracts we find great diversity in housing stock and planning style, highlighting the unique qualities of place and shaking any preconceived image of an 'urban core' that may arise within creative class discourse. Examining the creative class at this level also reinforces the notion that analyzing the creative class on a larger geographic scale, such as the CMA level, can cloak the potential variations in landscape and lifestyle that exist within. To emphasize this point further, Area B exhibits another variation of lifestyle within the CMA, one that reflects a difference that may be common to other CMAs with smaller populations with more rural-to-urban links than urban-to-urban ones.

4.3 Area B

Area A's range of housing styles and quality bespeak its relatively long development history. Area B (census tracts 17, 202.01, and 202.02) on the other hand, is fairly new to development, where 60% of the total occupied dwellings in the area have been constructed between 1996-2006. Growth in Area B is developing in a manner distinct from the New Urbanism style of growth that many creative city strategies espouse. In many ways its development is comparable to the notion of amenity migration, discussed in Chapter 2. The region is rich in natural amenities, privacy, low-density housing, and lacks urban lifestyle amenities such as diverse consumer amenities. Census tracts 17 and 202.01 are a part of the City of St. John's and census tract 202.02 sits within
the municipal boundary of Portugal Cove-St. Philip's, a town situated in the CMA of St. John's (see Figure 3.2.1 and 3.3.1). Because of its different development goals and philosophies, I will examine this census tract separately.

Portugal Cove-St. Philip's is a town with a population of 6,575 according to the 2006 Census of Canada (Statistics Canada 2006h). It has grown since the 2001 census by 12.1%, and is projected to grow at similar rates in the next 14 years. Partially because of its low-density population, the majority of dwellings are set back on large open tracts of land that must be reached via small roads and paths. These dwellings, for the most part, are owner occupied by single families, though the town recognizes an increase in retired residents that must be accommodated in future development plans. The main sources of employment here are agriculture and some light industry; otherwise, residents are commuting to St. John’s for work (MacDonald 2009).

While the City of St. John’s is the ‘urban’ centre for the CMA (and the province), as it provides a diverse array of amenities such as restaurants, art galleries, and night life activities, the town of Portugal Cove-St. Philip’s focuses more on its ‘rural’ appeal. Certain lifestyle values associated with ‘rural’ are embedded in the town’s draft Municipal Plan 2009-2019, which states within its goals to “maintain the rural community character of Portugal Cove-St. Philip’s” (Macdonald 2009, 11). How this is defined is not explicit, but the proposals in the draft plan suggest a focus on the natural environment and low-density building of the town. The goals in the draft plan include: ensuring that new houses correspond with the existing layouts, size, and physical form, protecting natural amenities (ponds, open spaces, coastal features) for recreation and conservation, valuing the leisurely quality of scenic roads over traffic considerations such as speed and...
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efficiency, and promoting the town as a place to live through emphasizing its scenic and rural characteristics. All of these goals indicate a vision that is neither urban nor rich in diversity of amenities, but distinctly 'rural'.

Census tract 202.02 has a high proportion of creative workers, though as a part of the Town of Portugal Cove-St. Philip's, it has a lifestyle function that differs substantially to what might be expected in a 'creative city'. In the following example of Country Gardens, a development site in this census tract, a certain image and value system is protected, (through lot size, housing type, and covenants). 11

Country Gardens (see Figures 4.3.1, 4.3.3, and 4.3.4) illustrates the type of residential landscape being constructed across the CMA, large-scale development projects that represent the pastoral lifestyle in a modern suburban form, a contrast to the New Urban planning styles espoused by creative city strategies. Developers are not exclusively responsible for the image of lifestyle being projected here but they are responding to (and reinforcing) the culture of suburbs that emphasize green space and privacy (see Archer 2005, Fishman 1987, Ward 2003). While attempts to contact developers for this study were unsuccessful, the motivations and ideologies behind each development can be extracted from the advertisements, deeds and physical design of the developments available to the public. Country Gardens reinforces a particular vision of rural, particularly through its advertisement on a real estate webpage:

11 I use the example of a development, rather than individual houses, because of their prevalence across North America and in St. John’s, as private developers are taking on the task of creating entire ‘neighbourhoods’. This is particularly the case in areas such as this where land availability allows for housing development to occur at larger scales than in the inner city, where new housing is often in the form of infill or renovation due to lack of space and/or high land costs.
Country Gardens - An Idyllic, Self-Contained Residential Community

The Country Gardens Residential Community is situated overlooking the ocean at St. Philip’s, only a ten-minute drive from St. John’s.

Nestled in the natural forested hillside, Country Gardens offers you a magnificent view of the islands and Conception Bay. This strategic location is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create your own, perfect, seaside "Country Home."

Inside Country Gardens two gateways are eighty-two lovely Home sites, each site being an acre or more in area. The design of the roadways has been meticulously planned, with landscaped shoulders and driveway entrances. To optimize the panoramic view, all power, phone, and cable lines are routed along rear boundaries, and power lines to streetlights will be underground. Country Gardens will be recognized as an exclusive upscale residential community, in a self-contained private setting. It is deliberately limited to its current ninety Home sites; never to be expanded. Taking advantage of the scenic views throughout Country Gardens should be the central focus of each homeowner’s site development. For the common good of all homeowners, special Home site Covenants apply... These Covenants guarantee that all homes and landscaping will be designed, constructed, and maintained to exceptional and sensible standards. The neighbourhood’s overall appeal will ensure an unsurpassed pride and satisfaction for all of its residents. (Fowler 2006)

Country Gardens’ mandate prioritizes the scenic qualities of the area, an aesthetic enjoyed exclusively by its residents. An exemplar of landscapes of privilege, Country Gardens invokes early suburban developments that promoted stark segregation of urban and suburban landscapes. But despite the imagery that Country Gardens’ exists separate from the outside world, at the same time its advertisement highlights its proximity to the urban core. As an ocean-side community that is a mere “10-minute drive from St. John’s”, Country Gardens demonstrates how different ‘worlds’ exist adjacent to each other, a reflection of the small size of the CMA. The proximity of contrasting landscapes at this scale is unlikely to exist in prototypical creative cities where urban areas are densely populated and spatially extensive.
The master plan for Country Gardens (Figure 4.3.2) shows the scale of development, with each lot at least an acre in size to maximize privacy.

Figure 4.3.1 Entrance to Country Gardens development site, Country Gardens Rd, Area B (census tract 202.02)
Figure 4.3.2 Master plan for Country Gardens Estate residential development in the St. John’s CMA (Source: Fowler 2006)

Large lots are common in the town of Portugal Cove-St. Philip’s. The draft Municipal plan supports the idea that, in order to maintain its rural character, lots be of a certain size. Controls such as this have not gone uncontested, as some residents have objected to this regulation during a public consultation of the draft plan. Many in attendance proposed that smaller lots be allowed, and strongly objecting to a proposal that restricts parking large trucks, buses, and heavy equipment on lots (Portugal Cove-St. Philip’s 2009). In protecting the scenic and leisurely qualities of place, the town attempts to limit visual interruptions of an industrial or work related nature. This same protection of the scenic qualities of place is reinforced by the Country Garden’s development, as demonstrated by the approval of particular leisure activities over those associated with labour in covenants nine and thirteen:
9. The Owner of the Building Lot may erect thereon and use internally-lighted tennis courts and lighted swimming pools provided that they are first approved by the Developer, and they shall be maintained by the Owner in accordance with the requirements of any statute, regulation or by-law promulgated by any governmental authority having jurisdiction in that regard and the Owner shall hold the Developer harmless from any action or causes of action which may arise by reason of any such tennis courts or swimming pools being located on the Building Lot.

13. No repairs to any motor vehicle shall be effected on the Building Lot save within a wholly enclosed Garage. (Fowler 2006)

The values of a landscape such as this hinge on private leisure activities (as demonstrated by covenants dedicated to the discussion of tennis courts and swimming pools) rather than the social activities associated with dense urban livability.

Figure 4.3.3 Property on Country Gardens Road (Area B, census tract 202.02)
Figures 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 illustrate how the style and layout of the houses in the community enhance the rural ideal, although adapted for the modern suburban family through large houses and two-car garages. Although Area B had the highest growth of creative worker residency between 2001 and 2006 (see Table 4.1.5) for the CMA, the landscape lacks the diverse amenities, and opportunities for social gathering that are often visualized as ‘creative class landscapes’ and linked to the dense urban settings of larger city-regions. Rather, the landscape in Area B points to a more family-oriented lifestyle.

While the Town of Portugal Cove- St. Philip’s attempts to preserve its rural character in part through developing residential houses on large lots, properties in the rural fringe of the City of St. John’s must comply with general site requirements, such as minimum frontage (20 metres) and size restrictions on accessory buildings. In terms of a
'vision' for development, the Municipal Plan of St. John’s focuses mainly on the
downtown area. As such, the streetscapes in these areas differ substantially from census
tract 202.01. Figures 4.3.5 and 4.3.6 show how houses are being developed upon much
smaller lots than in Portugal-Cove-St. Philip’s, but in a similar style.

Figure 4.3.5 Almond Crescent (Area B, census tract 17)
Development along the rural fringe of the City of St. John’s has increased in tandem with its population growth. While Area A in downtown has seen a loss of residents, population growth has increased substantially in census tracts 17 and 202.01, which lie at the fringe of the city. Between 2001-2006, population has increased 134.80% in census tract 17, and 89.60% in census tract 202.01. Despite this high population growth, these areas are still relatively unpopulated. Almond Crescent, which is used as an example of the main style of housing development in this area, is concentrated along with a few other residential streets in close proximity to the City of Mount Pearl. Development further from the urban core in this census tract is limited.

It is likely that the housing developments being constructed in Area B represents a growing trend for St. John’s, as most development in the area is occurring along the
periphery of the urban core in the same style. The close proximity to the urban core may be attractive to creative workers who not only value the open space and privacy of rural areas, but also require access to the job market. Therefore, the lifestyle draw for creative workers who live in the St. John’s CMA, may be a combination of access to a private, bucolic setting that is within commuting distance to work.

While the creative class ethos merges work and personal life, the lifestyle exemplified by the new developments in the rural fringe of St. John’s demonstrate the opposite – the separation of work and life – the ideology behind traditional suburban developments (Archer 2005). Creative class theory focuses on urban lifestyles and largely ignores ways of living distinguished by rural or suburban amenities. However, like many smaller Canadian CMAs, St. John’s is characterized more by rural and suburban traits than urban ones, making it difficult to analyze the lifestyle represented here within the current discourse of creative class theory. Therefore, despite the high proportion of creative workers in the St. John’s CMA, if creative class strategies were employed here without at least some modification, they would face the difficulties of: a) the existence of lifestyle preferences different from those proposed in creative class theory, and b) the structural limitations of fostering a dense urban-focused creative city when the trend of development is low density sprawl and protection of the current scale of downtown development.

This chapter has explored some of the census tracts in the St. John’s CMA that have the highest proportions of creative workers residing in them, in the ‘urban core’ and the ‘rural fringe’. Examining the location of creative workers at the census tract level allows us to explore the different landscapes and the lifestyles associated with them,
exposing the diversity and particularities of place that influence the development of these areas. The visual comparison of Area A and Area B show that the assumptions about the creative class landscape, particularly notions of ‘urban’ that are often attached to creative class discourse, may be misplaced. It is difficult to see how Area B matches Florida’s claim that members of the creative class seek out “street-level culture – a teeming blend of cafes, sidewalk musicians, and small galleries and bistros, where it is hard to draw the line between participant and observer, or between creativity and its creators” Florida 2002b, 166). Adding to this analysis, the next chapter explores this issue in more depth using evidence from the interviews conducted for this thesis.
5 Talking with the creative class in St. John’s, NL

The previous chapter exposed the different types of landscapes that the 'creative class' of St. John's lives in, exposing the potential lifestyle differences within this large group. The complexity and impact of such variance is minimized in creative class theory, but stressed by critics who object to the idea that a group composed of such a wide range of occupations can be said to share a class identity in terms of socio-political attitudes or desired lifestyles (see Banks 2009, Markusen 2006). These critics expect discrepancies to surface when attempting to analyze the values and lifestyles of a group that accounts for over 30% of the workforce, whose occupational grouping may be the only characteristic that links them to one another. The purpose of this chapter is to examine this issue by interviewing a group of people chosen by their membership in the creative class. My findings from the interviews further highlight the potential inappropriateness of linking the creative class, as defined by occupation, to the idea of a creative class as defined by shared socio-economic characteristics, lifestyles, beliefs, or values.

The interview component of this study elaborates on the previous chapter by adding an important qualitative dimension. In particular, interviews exposed the significance of social origin – where the creative worker was born and raised. The creative class is purported to be footloose; however, the responses of interview participants indicate that social ties and attachment to place inhibit this mobility. An evaluation of social origin is especially crucial in city-regions that are not ethnically
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diverse, such as St. John’s, where it is likely that over time social and cultural norms have
developed in a unique manner. Without a significant flow of immigrants, strong social
capital is likely to exist and exert a shaping force on the experiences and attachments that
residents have to the area. Creative class theory largely disregards the impact of social
origin on lifestyle values and migration decisions of creative workers because of its focus
on diverse urban centres and the assumption of a relatively transient creative workforce.
St. John’s is not socially diverse in terms of immigrant population or residents from
outside of the province; most of the CMA’s residents were born in the province, as are the
majority of creative workers interviewed for this study. The interview responses suggest
that this background has a significant impact on how many participants formed their
lifestyle preferences. The central themes that emerge from the interviews reiterate the
importance of social origin by demonstrating the differences in lifestyle concerns between
local (those born and raised within Newfoundland) and non-local (those born and raised
outside of Newfoundland) creative workers. Local workers raised issues of community
and/or place attachment, concerns that diverge with the creative class ethos as proposed in
creative class theory, which places individualism above all else. A few non-local
participants on the other hand expressed lifestyle values consistent with creative class
theory, focusing on comparing St. John’s to other cities in terms of services and consumer
amenities. This split strengthens the evidence that there is no single creative class
lifestyle that can be generalized across social contexts. In the case of St. John’s, the
existence of a ‘rural’ creative class lifestyle is influenced by the social, cultural, and
environmental contingencies of place, rather than the global cultural influence present in
the metropolitan areas deemed ‘creative’ in creative class discourse.
Most conversations contained elements of both creative class and non-creative class values, sometimes even within the same phrases, demonstrating how lifestyle values are more complex than either-or categories. For instance, some interviewees spoke about the urban amenities available in St. John’s that made living in the urban core attractive; yet they did so by comparing the city to their home towns, often small rural communities within the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Others from larger cities spoke about St. John’s small-town amenities that made it attractive, comparing it to larger cities. What surfaces from these accounts are the influences of social origin, geographic location, size, culture, and the impact that these issues have on social diversity and lifestyle values.

5.1 Community values and place attachment

For local creative workers interviewed in this study, the most attractive attributes of St. John’s stem from the social realm. This includes family and community – all markers of strong social capital and community attachment. This stands in contrast to creative class theory’s findings, which at the regional level show how strong social capital is negatively correlated with creative capital, and at the individual level, finds that creative workers are largely unconnected, and enjoy the anonymity that dense urban living affords. Community attachment and a sense of place are sentiments local creative workers discuss in the interviews that reveal an important dimension to the question of the potential relevancy of creative class theory as a development tool in St. John’s, particularly since the majority of residents are local. Whether it is seen as a negative or
positive quality, strong social capital highlights the unique characteristics present in society in the St. John’s CMA.

Creative workers are purported to be extremely mobile, in part because their identities are formed less by place or community, and more by their occupations and individual character. However, for local creative workers in this study, strong social capital plays a greater role than diverse amenities. This has negative implications for the applicability of creative city strategies, which bank on the notion that creative workers evaluate their residential choices based on amenities and social diversity. Demonstrating the influence of community attachment on mobility, Eli, a musician in his twenties, describes the reason for remaining based in St. John’s as a decision made between him and his band members:

So we've all sort of, I think, agree[d] that we're going to live here. Our bass player refuses to even discuss the option of not living here... He's like pretty tied to the place. And, you know, I don't know, it seems like the older I get the more I feel the same way.

Rather than economic or amenity features of place, Eli alludes to the significant emotional attachment one can have to place constructed through personal history and social bonds. Such bonds strengthen over time and therefore make community attachment strong for locals (Trentelman 2009). In contrast, creative workers who are recent immigrants may lack the time and social links required to build this type of strong attachment, and may not express the same type of attachments. Creative class discourse describes the creative class as 'footloose', having the ability to choose 'place' before finding a job, making the decision based on whether the city-region exudes an air of tolerance, or on the diversity of amenities. What is generally left out of this discussion is
the idea that some creative workers may choose ‘place’ based on personal connections and a strong sense of community, and therefore make the choice (which may or may not be beneficial to the development of their careers) to remain in or close to the places they were born and raised.

Sense of place/place attachment is another value that emerged in interviews with local creative workers. It is closely related to social capital and community attachment because it involves the same emotional connections; the distinction however, is that sense of place combines such connections with the cultural and sensory memories that people attach to place (Trentelman 2009). For all local interviewees (18 of 25), these two concepts are intertwined, though sense of place stood out during interviewee accounts of lifestyle preferences. For instance, Lenny, a 28 year-old teacher originally from Norman’s Cove, Newfoundland (population 795 in 2006), observes:

If you come from a small town, you feel a deep-seated connection to it. I know some people I grew up with [who] lived where I grew up and always talked about the fact that they couldn't wait to leave. And then they were happy cause they were finally gone. They didn't enjoy living in small town Newfoundland. But me, it depends on your personality and what you choose to do with your spare time. If you're someone who enjoys hunting and fishing and gardening and playing golf and stuff like that, then you're ok...I've reserved myself with the belief that at some point I'm going to actually have to leave Newfoundland but...it won't be a happy leaving Newfoundland kind of thing.

For Lenny, the lifestyle amenities available in rural Newfoundland suit his proclivities and are part of his ‘deep-seated connection’ to the place. This connection between lifestyle and place is significant in the context of St. John's and 'rural' activities because these activities are literally linked with the physical landscape in a manner that cannot be replicated in different contexts. Unlike amenities like cafés and music venues, which can
be built in all urban areas, hunting grounds are specific to certain areas that are undeveloped and have particular species residing in the area.

Harold, a 39-year-old married father of two young girls (ages 6 and 2) expresses a similar sentiment about the ‘rural lifestyle’. Originally from Gaultois, a small coastal community in rural Newfoundland with a population of 265 in 2006 (Statistics Canada 2006), Harold spent his early childhood and teenage years living in Bay D’Espoir, North of Gaultois, encompassing a number of smaller communities with a total population of 3,460 (Statistics Canada 2006), before returning to Gaultois. His current location in St. John’s is due to a job opportunity, working at Memorial University as a researcher. However, his proclivity for small towns and the ‘rural lifestyle’ led him to purchase an old 3-bedroom house (that requires extensive renovation) in York Harbour, NL a coastal community of 360 residents (Statistics Canada 2006), which he currently only uses as a summer vacation home, but would like to eventually move to full time.

I am a great fan of the rural lifestyle, but I have lived in larger cities and urban centers over the years and enjoyed that lifestyle as well. I think, overall, that my opinion of the rural lifestyle is one where the focus and the speed of life tends to slow down. When you are younger and without [a] family, living that sort of lifestyle can be a bummer. As one gets older, and has kids, you can see the inherent appeal to it. I have many friends with children who live in large cities throughout North America, and their lifestyles are hectic, fast-paced and often devoid of quality time with their children. They have high quality activities for their children to participate in, but not one-on-one family time.

Harold’s main concern here is the quality of life he deems most appropriate for raising his children. He believes that a small population means that he “can send [his] children out in the yard to play, have kids next door come to play, go to the beach to beach comb and make sandcastles, or build a beach fire after dark.” The attributes of living in a smaller community, like those he grew up in, include safety and tranquility.
"[In York Harbour] I have no inherent fear about crime, pollution (noise, air or ground), or the hectic pace of life. It is not about living a lifestyle that is backwards, rather, more self-centered and introspective and family-oriented. I know everyone in my community...by name, and will wave and say hello to any and all as I walk up and down the roads of town, or see them at town functions." Harold's account highlights the importance of life stage in informing migration decisions. In a study of creative worker migration in Sweden, Hansen and Niedomysl (2009) found patterns of migration that similarly point to the importance of life stage. They contend that before becoming members of the creative class, younger people are more likely to move to regions that have highly ranked 'people climates' (regions with high levels of tolerance and diversity), often to attend University. According to creative class theory, these regions should be the most attractive to creative workers. Yet they found that after becoming members of the creative class, these individuals moved to lower ranked regions, with employment opportunities being a major factor. Hansen and Niedomysl's (2009) study highlights the fact that migrating is a major decision requiring the consideration of a number of factors, including life stage factors, which Harold's account illustrates.

The ability to know all your neighbours, and have a sense of safety through strong social capital is not always viewed as a positive attribute. Amber, a 25-year-old provincial employee who has lived in Mount Pearl her entire life, expressed the double-edged nature of strong social capital -- as it creates safe environments for families and a
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12 The authors rank regions in Sweden according to their 'people climate' using: Florida's (2002b) Bohemian Index, measuring ethnic diversity, and measuring the share of non-Swedes participating in the labour market.
sense of belonging, but at the cost of personal privacy. Having lived in Winnipeg and Paris for short periods, Amber noticed in those cities that:

Nobody was ever in your business... You were pretty much heading for yourself, they didn't care, you know, in fact, they don't want to associate with you, they didn't want to talk to you, but here...everyone knows everyone. We go to each other's house for supper or we go in the summer to each other's house for barbeques. And like even my friend lives on my street it's more like older people and really, really young families, where as, my friend, she lives in a really family oriented neighborhood, and over there they have block parties. So everyone on this huge street gets together and has a huge party in the summer with music and barbeque, and little things like that. So...like, you just don't see those things in other cities. Like, granted, there are other parties, but it's not organized by a street, you know? Families don't get together and say "ok, let's plan a big block party tonight' you know?

Amber emphasizes the family-oriented aspect of the community she grew up in. This aspect of a city-region is not generally the focus of creative city strategies, particularly neighbourhood-level social events such as a ‘block party’, even though it is an example of “authentic participatory experiences” (Florida 2002b, 167) that creative class theory espouses. Yet these types of participatory experiences are difficult to engineer, from a creative city strategy standpoint. The experiences illustrated by Harold and Amber expose one of the potential pitfalls of creative class theory’s occupational categorization framework. Ascribing a narrow notion of lifestyle and location preferences to such a wide range of people may ultimately result in the undervaluing of other lifestyles and important migration factors.

Similarly, Dale, a non-local who moved to Newfoundland in the mid 1980s for an employment opportunity, sees how the size of the community in St. John’s can create a social atmosphere that might repel some:
I could see some people might feel too constrained by the smallness of the place. You know, like everybody knows... almost everybody knows your business, all that kind of thing. So I could see for some people – probably a lot of people, probably a lot of creative types – this might have been a place that you had just had to get the hell out of.

While he enjoys the diversity of amenities available in larger city-regions, he values the sense of community in St. John’s, which he contends is unique to small communities:

What probably would be less easy to achieve would be sort of that sense of community, which I think is more easy to achieve in a small community, and I think that’s often what strikes people when they come and visit here is... you know, they get that sense of community pretty quickly.

In another account, community and place attachment are demonstrated as conflicting factors in the migration decisions of Hilary, a computer science worker-cum-musician now in her mid 40s. Currently living in St. John’s, her plan is to return to her hometown of Woody Point, a small community in Newfoundland situated within a National Park. Despite the lack of employment opportunities and the unwelcoming winters, she felt motivated by her emotional connection and a wish to pursue a different lifestyle:

It’s a beautiful place and it’s a place that’s close to my heart because I’ve been going there since I was a child; and I think in terms of helping contribute to a community, I’m more interested in contributing to that community than, let’s say, to the community of St. John’s. And because I’ve spent a great deal of time out there in the last four or five years, I guess there’s a lot of things about the city now I’m finding less and less appealing or more and more offensive...things like noise and pollution in the city and the politics perhaps. I guess there’s politics everywhere. (laughs) Can’t avoid that, yeah.

Hilary demonstrates how growing up in Woody Point has contributed to a strong sense of place for her that has sustained her many years living in a different city. She compares this with the attributes of city living, drawing attention to the conditions of the urban
environment that are unappealing to her. As a musician she finds it difficult to earn a living, already dipping into her retirement savings to purchase land in Woody Point where she is slowly building a modest home. She admits that job opportunities are limited compared to St. John’s but her emotional attachment and lifestyle preferences are paramount:

I’d like to move there because I have historical ties to the community. It’s a very beautiful community. It’s an internal emotion for me to go back to a more simple way of life – like probably working more directly in my garden, working on building things and probably, if I can get some land, maybe crop some hay.

The type of lifestyle she alludes to here is a far cry from the café-culture lifestyle that creative city strategies often focus on. Instead, Hilary finds the negative features of the urban environment in St. John’s outweigh the benefit of economic opportunities and diversity of amenities. Sentiments that speak to values like place attachment such as those expressed by Lenny and Hilary contradict the idea that creative workers are “itinerant hedonists” (Peck 2005, 766) a term Richard Florida used when advising city officials of why diverse amenities are so crucial to attracting the creative class. However, Hilary may be atypical in her decision-making as a musician. It is well documented that bohemians, especially musicians and visual artists tend to live in or at the edges of the downtown cores of densely populated city-regions (Bain 2004, Kelly and O’Hagan 2007, Strom 2002). Markusen (2006) points out how certain artists like performing artists and screen writers need to live in areas that are in proximity to their markets and social/business networks in order to be successful. This is something that Hilary implicitly recognizes as she speaks to the social and creative benefits of urban density.
These positive characteristics include the cultural value of the city and the opportunities—incidental and coordinated—to gather with fellow musicians, have a good time, and create new forms of music.

Certainly, the things of St. John’s that I will miss is the cultural things like The Rooms [the provincial art gallery] or just being able to go to a bookstore the size of Chapters; to be able to go downtown—just the number of people that you run into. So this is where St. John’s has got its strength... Like Tuesday, lunch time, at Auntie Crae’s, you can go and sit down and have your lunch and a coffee and there’s, you know, a little band is playing there every Tuesday lunch; and there’s different places that there’s... regularly, musicians are gathering for a session. And, of course, if you, you know, when you want to have—generate ideas, they’re going to percolate more when you’re sitting in a group—like what will we do now. For example, you just run into somebody... You know, the downside of it, I think, is that like there’s so much going on, really, in a larger city that sometimes life can just get fragmented when you try to take it all in.

In this statement, Hilary gives an example of how the creative milieu operates in the music community of St. John’s; the social dynamics she believes gives the city its strength. Although she values the social and cultural characteristics of the city, place attachment is a stronger sentiment for her, and is the overriding factor in the decision to leave the city and move back to Woody Point. Her decision is not an economic one, but is one based on place attachment and lifestyle. Creative class theory contends that lifestyle decisions are often paramount to economic ones for creative workers, however it does not account for the notion of place attachment, and how this can shape lifestyle preferences and migration decisions. This nuance indicates creative class theory’s need to broaden its understanding of the creative class value system.

Currently, the creative class is often understood as a one-dimensional social group that lives according to a specific set of values and lifestyle preferences including individualism and hedonism. Yet, as we see in the case of St. John’s, community...
attachment and sense of place may play a major role in shaping the values and lifestyles of these creative workers.

One of the central characteristics of both community attachment and place attachment is a sense of belonging. When discussing community and place attachment, Hugo, a young filmmaker born and raised in St. John’s recognizes how the size and density of the artistic community facilitate a sense of belonging:

"The downtown core – everything is fairly compact, I think, which is great, I mean, because...if you're artsy-fartsy, chances are you're probably living within five miles of all the other artsy-fartsies in town. You know, you can see these people over and over again, which is great. You know, it just reiterates that... there's a place where you belong, I think, for a lot of people."

Hugo describes how the social density of the urban core facilitates this sense of belonging for the creative community. Researchers of social capital show how such individual attachments can deter the desire to relocate (Greif 2009) and may partially account for the CMA’s ability to retain such a large proportion of local creative workers. Yet, when society is less socially diverse, as in the case of St. John’s, it can signify that a sense of belonging is only experienced by the select few who fit into the social groups present in St. John’s (e.g. bohemians, local residents, and those with similar backgrounds such as migrants from other Maritime provinces). As creative class theory contends, this lack of diversity can deter potential migrants or new migrants who have difficulty fitting in. Harry, manager of a private technology-related consultancy firm and local resident commented on the inability of St. John’s to retain new immigrants as a social issue, rather than a matter of policy or economics: "I really don’t think that in many ways local people know [what] to do with some foreigners, you know, and that’s one of the problems."

While local creative workers observed that community, strong social capital, and sense of
place are the main attributes that they find attractive about St. John’s, for new immigrants these important characteristics may be absent.

Sense of place is something that builds over long periods of time and is not something new immigrants will easily find in most locations. As for community and social capital, Harry acknowledges the inability of a city-region to superficially create a cosmopolitan environment that will attract different types of people: “you can’t grow [social infrastructure]. Even if you attract people, they don’t have what the native Newfoundlanders here have – you know, the family member, the friends network, you know, and so on.” It is the lack of social capital for many newcomers that Harry believes drives new immigrants away. This sentiment is extracted from his own experience of sponsoring a family from Kosovo who ultimately moved away due to a lack of social networks. It is uncertain whether these immigrants were creative workers or not, but it does highlight the point that locals may be living lives that are parallel to the lives of non-local residents. And so the characteristics that local creative workers find attractive might differ from their non-local counterparts.

Cultural homogeneity contributes to the strong social capital in St. John’s, and can be seen as a hindrance to the innovative process. But Hilary’s account suggests otherwise, where, by running into friends and colleagues, and sitting in a group with other musicians can lead to creative collaborations, in this case, actually fostering the innovative process. This seemingly contradictory combination of innovation and strong social capital highlights the need to further explore the nuances of how social capital, innovation, and the cultural contingencies of place, intersect. So far, Hilary’s account referred solely to the innovation that occurs between musicians, and so to broaden the scope of this analysis
the next example moves beyond the arts and culture sector and explores how strong social capital may influence St. John’s unique business climate.

As a person who conducts business within national and international industry circles, Harry recognizes how St. John’s cultural idiosyncrasies have spilled over into business relations, attributing this feature to historical circumstances:

Business in St. John’s is certainly different than it is in a lot of places in Canada. Networks are really important. Even now, in a business it’s who you know...and if you know somebody else or if you can relate to the particular thing, it’s like a comfort level that... it’s a basis for developing a relationship...Now people who haven’t gone to any trouble to develop a network probably are still going to have trouble, okay; but because it’s a small community, it works very well and there’s a history here of doing that. I mean, it goes back to, in my view, the isolation that was here for a long period of time, and the fact that we were a colony of Britain - you kind of stand on your own two feet. So either you got along with your neighbours and figured out how that worked or you didn’t; and if you didn’t, you’d probably starve to death ... but, definitely, if you go to Alberta, it doesn’t matter. It doesn’t matter; and, in fact, in BC I don’t think it matters whatsoever.

In his statement, Harry describes how culturally molded social capital impacts the economic realm in St. John’s. His account highlights the importance of historical contingencies that underlie the cultural character of St. John’s. By noting the absence of this feature in other Canadian provinces, he suggests that St. John’s may be an exceptional case. Many creative cities have global connections that infiltrate the social, economic, and cultural spheres. These similarities allow creative cities that are far apart geographically to share similar cultural experiences (see Bridge 2007). St. John’s however, is relatively isolated from these experiences, partially due to its remote location, and aggravated by the disconnectedness from other urban centers due to transportation limitations. As a result, St. John’s lacks the diversity and cultural heterogeneity that Wessel (2009) argues are markers of the urban experience. Yet as Hilary and Harry note,
the social capital that has developed in this relatively small community has its benefits, and residents have been able to turn it to their advantage for business and creativity in the cultural sector.

Jean, a marine researcher at St. John's Marine Institute originally from Quebec City also notices the culture and society that is unique to Newfoundland, a product of its particular geographic location and social and economic history:

I think St. John's is quite different from the rest of Canada because they were the last province to be integrated in the country, and so they've been living isolated from the rest of Canada most of their existence here, and developed quite a tradition... Compared to Ontario's let's say, I've been to Ontario and it's nothing like this. People [in Newfoundland]... have their accent, first of all. They have their different traditions, their songs. The fishery is a big tradition so, yeah, I think it's pretty different than the rest of Canada.

While Harry speculates that it is the closed culture that prevents people from settling in St. John's, Jean attributes his own preference in part to the difficulties associated with geographic isolation:

Well, it's an island so it's far from everything else...if you want to get out of here or if you want to travel, you have to take the plane. You can't really take the car because it takes forever to get to Nova Scotia... If you're coming here to study it's a good place...I personally wouldn't live here long term. I wouldn't be interested in moving here for a long term.

Up to this point I have explored strong social capital as a predominant theme in the interviews. A family-focused lifestyle also emerges as a feature of urban St. John's and is complimentary to the idea of strong social capital. A discussion of family values is generally absent in the creative class discourse, which instead focuses mainly on the entertainment value of the city, speculating that creative workers tend to remain single longer and have fewer children than non-creative workers. This may be true, but what is unique in the case of St. John's, is how the urban core may appeal to families. St. John's
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has a low population density compared to other Canadian CMAs, especially at the urban core. The landscape of census tract 13 has one of the highest proportions of creative workers in the CMA and exemplifies the garden suburb style of neighbourhood traditionally linked to raising families (see Archer 2005). And as we see in Table 5.1.1, both census tracts in Area A exceed expected proportions of families with children in the home compared to the rest of the CMA, and the nation.

**Table 5.1.1 Location Quotient values for Families with Children living in the home in Area A measured against the CMA and National levels (2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Comparison</th>
<th>Census tract 10</th>
<th>Census tract 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of a creative city’s urban core undoubtedly evokes images of adult-oriented amenities – fine-dining experiences, wine bars, boutiques, and art gallery exhibits – spaces of entertainment that often exclude children. St. John’s however, demonstrates a divergence from these conventions, having attributes that appeal to creative workers with children, such as Beverly, a local 56 year-old environmental technology consultant. Elucidating on the idea that urban St. John’s is an ideal place to raise a family, she moved into downtown St. John’s, in the Georgestown neighbourhood, because of its proximity to her children’s school and after-school activities: “It's not just school; it's the dance classes, then the violin classes and hockey, soccer etcetera, etcetera. I think I would have just spent days in the car if we had still lived outside the city.” As a creative worker who migrated to the urban core of St. John’s from a community in the periphery of the CMA,
amenities were the main attraction for her. But these amenities revolved around her children, not a hedonistic lifestyle that is theorized as a hallmark of the creative class.

As an environment for raising children, Beverly saw little difference in St. John’s from rural areas. To her, the smaller communities adjacent to the City of St. John’s are similar in terms of quality of life and community:

I don't think it's too much different [in Logy-Bay]. I think you have to go a little bit... further away from the city before there's a real difference in community, but maybe only as far as Torbay [since] there are a lot more families who have been there for forever. So there are a lot more...family relationships and family networks in the community. And I think because there's been so much growth in the newer one's, like Logy Bay and Middle Cove, that those family networks that to me, are often related to you know, great granddad had this huge piece of land and so...it's just the family ends up being just physically still connected, but I think with so many newcomers to the areas just outside the city, that those links probably aren't there to the same extent.

Beverly touches on the strength of social capital in the areas surrounding the city, but also the subtle differences in community. The lifestyle differences within the CMA are nuanced, rather than well defined and dramatically different. Urban-centric approaches to development drawing on creative class theory have often spurred criticisms for aggravating socio-spatial segregation in city-regions and creating visions of what the urban landscape should be, and limiting that vision to meet the perceived needs of the middle-class (see McCann 2007, Zimmerman 2008). In the case of the St. John’s CMA, the social and economic spaces of the entire region (including 'rural' and 'urban' spaces) are tightly interconnected and despite its small size and relative ethnic and cultural homogeneity, still encompasses a population base with a wide range of desires.

Overall, the sentiments highlighted here create a contrasting picture to the creative class as understood in creative class theory that has guided the direction of urban development
for many city officials across North America (see Peck 2005). This chapter has so far expanded on the notion that social complexities create barriers to understanding the creative class as a group that shares singular lifestyle preferences and personal values. Adding another dimension, the next section explores the complications that transpire when relative location and different concepts of urbanity are considered.

5.2 The matters of size and location

The variable sizes and population densities of city-regions reflect the needs and capabilities of each urban system. In comparison to cities categorized as ‘creative’ in the creative class discourse such as Boston, San Francisco, Vancouver and Toronto, St. John’s is small, but at the same time it is the largest urban area in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The “combined outcomes of land value, land use, public and private transportation systems, and planning policies” (Millward 2008, 618) allow creative city-regions to support dense populations, many of which, like San Francisco, have taken on urban densification strategies. In comparison, due to its small area and population, the pressure for large-scale densification planning is absent, and St. John’s city officials have actively sought to restrict development within the downtown core, to help the city retain its low density and heritage aesthetic. Revised in 1993, the city’s 1984 Municipal Plan employed zoning by-laws to restrict the height and style of residential buildings in an attempt to create a uniform streetscape (Sharpe 1995), a move that relegated growth to the periphery and stunted any future efforts at urban densification.
Yet as the centre of economic and administrative activity for the province, St. John’s is also the most densely populated and urbanized landscape in Newfoundland and Labrador. The multiple functions St. John’s has at the provincial and national level as both a central and peripheral city-region, respectively, is similarly expressed by interviewees, who articulated their perspectives in either ‘urban’ or ‘small town’ terms. The previous section discussed the lifestyle nuances of the city-region in terms of amenities, showing how St. John’s may serve dual lifestyle functions due to the fact that it is the center of economic activities, downtown being the base for the major financial institutions, restaurants, bars, and boutiques, and at the same time being relatively small and low-density, appealing to those who wish to be close to the core to access schools and activities for their children. Expanding on this dual nature, I examine lifestyle preferences based on the perceptions of St. John’s relative size and location as expressed by interviewees. The complexity of St. John’s identity may be impaired if creative city strategies are employed without paying attention to the local context due to the single lifestyle dimension that many proponents of creative city strategies espouse.

To examine the multifaceted ways space is conceptualized by members of the creative class, the following example shows how two creative workers in St. John’s use the same attributes to describe the city in contrasting ways. Bobby, a 30-year-old computer software engineer was born and raised in a small town in Newfoundland. He admits that living in St. John’s is necessary for work but if economic opportunities in his hometown were to arise, he would return there. Comparing the freedom afforded in small towns to the rules and by-laws in larger cities, he laments the restrictive and overwhelming nature of city living:
[In smaller towns, you can] go in [a] quad [an off-road vehicle] and just you know, take your ski-do in the wintertime. [But in] St. John's, you're in a city and you gotta follow rules, you gotta cover your garbage, there's a lot of traffic, and there's a lot of advertisements and signs and businesses. Its' just really cumbersome I find. I'm just used to the smaller towns.

Bobby compares living in St. John's to his experience growing up in a small town and he emphasizes the freedom, recreational activities and more peaceful environment of living in a smaller town compared to what he sees as the busy and restricted urban lifestyle. In the next account, Aaron, a musician/music teacher who has also lived in the greater Vancouver region uses Toronto as a reference to compare the differences between living in a small city versus a large one:

TV is everywhere...[in Toronto], but I just feel like...[in St. John's] there's (sic) no big neon billboards hanging over our heads and stuff like that. You know, you can walk downtown and it's just... it's an old downtown street and it's just nice and there's mom and pop businesses everywhere...

Bobby and Aaron use advertisements and billboards to illustrate two different perceptions of St. John's. Bobby views St. John's as an unattractive place to live because of its urban attributes, preferring the lifestyle freedom and tranquility of smaller towns such as his hometown Clarenville. Although Aaron has a similar view of small towns, he finds that St. John's possesses the amiable small town characteristics that set it apart from larger urban centres like Toronto and Vancouver. By using different places of reference, these two accounts demonstrate how individuals with similar backgrounds can experience the same city in divergent ways, illuminating a complexity in applying creative city strategies in regions that play different roles for its residents. Creative city strategies rely on the notion that certain city-regions attract and retain creative workers due to specific
and known lifestyle factors. The case of St. John’s reveals that the attractive qualities of place for creative workers may be complicated by the different ways people experience and perceive the city-region they live in. These differences highlight the notion argued by Markusen (2006) that the term ‘creative class’ encompasses such a wide range of occupations, that there may no be common preferences that bind them as a social group. The complexity that Markusen highlights is compounded in the example of Bobby and Aaron by adding the dimension of perception to the mix. How an individual perceives the city-region (as a creative worker or not) may be influenced by a number of factors including personal experience, for which occupation type may not override.

The different ways St. John’s is perceived by interviewees is evident between local creative workers and non-locals as well. For instance, Gertrude, a native of Montréal, believes it is the geographical isolation and small size of St. John’s that contributes to its lack of urban amenities:

I find it has its limitations because it’s smaller than where I’m coming from...I feel the effects of it being sort of an island that’s not very good for agriculture and that sort of thing...There’s not as much [sic] options or choices you get in a bigger city, or probably a city of similar size on the mainland, just because St. John’s is far away.

Gertrude observes how size and isolation hinder St. John’s capacity to provide the amenities that other city-regions across Canada are able to provide. Her expectations stem from her experiences growing up in a larger city-region. Likewise, Barbara, a provincial employee from Vancouver who stayed in St. John’s after graduate school to gain work experience recognizes the limitations that size and location have on social diversity and public services, features that are generally advanced in larger urban centres. She contends St. John’s lacks “cultural diversity...and environmental programs – that’s a
big thing. It…kills people to recycle here…it’s darn near impossible to recycle.” The limitations of the size and location of St. John’s may deter migrants who appreciate the services and diversity available only in larger city-regions.

For others, St. John’s does provide the features of large urban centres. Lenny, coming from a small town in rural Newfoundland, finds the social diversity and cultural scene, especially the ethnic restaurants and boutiques set the city of St. John’s apart from other communities in Newfoundland. From his experience, a community having any retail amenity or fast-food chain, marks the difference between the small communities and the larger ones:

If you have a McDonalds…It’s the McDonald’s test. If you have a McDonalds in your town, you’re large enough to not be considered out around the bay\textsuperscript{13}, even if it’s on the water and it’s surrounded by little small communities. I would not actually call it out around the bay so…But if you grow up, I guess, in a community of 800 or 1000 people and all the communities around you are anywhere from 200-1000 people, it’s a little bit different than if you happen to live in a place where there’s…10-15 000 people.

In this statement, Lenny demonstrates how the concept of city size is constructed through social and geographical contingencies. By comparing St. John’s to surrounding communities, he reiterates its isolation from other urban centres. Furthermore, the different expectations for what an urban centre should provide illuminates the social and cultural specificity of creative class theory that may speak to the creative class of large metropolitan centres, but not necessarily all cities. Applying creative class theory’s concept of urban livability in St. John’s to attract creative workers may have a negative impact for some, particularly those with ‘rural’ proclivities who already dislike the urban

\textsuperscript{13} The ‘bay’ Lenny refers to is Conception Bay, and is a term often used to refer generally to small rural communities within Newfoundland.
qualities of St. John’s and larger cities. Focusing on increasing ‘urban’ amenities may also compromise the ‘small town feel’ of St. John’s, that creative workers like Aaron, Moe, and Gertrude see as a major attribute of the city-region.

The small size of the St. John’s city-region has had negative economic impacts on creative workers employed in specialized industries who find that the lack of resources and employment opportunities lead them away from St. John’s. For instance, Jill, a filmmaker in her late 20s who was born and raised in St. John’s, speaks about the dilemma of dealing with her emotional attachment to St. John’s and her career goals and lifestyle that take her away from the city:

Ideally, I would love to kind of live in St. John’s half of the time. I really like St. John’s and I think I like St. John’s more now than I ever have. I feel like connected to the community here... I don’t want to abandon St. John’s, by any means; but, you know, I don’t see myself making all my work here for many reasons. Like some of the more simple reasons being like...there’s a really small pool of actors here. There’s a really small pool of places here where you can shoot that don’t [look] like Newfoundland...also, I really like big cities. I like Montreal and I like Toronto and so just, personally, I see myself... needing to leave this place for a while, even just to kind of get more creative inspiration like. You know, I want to meet more people and hear more stories...you need to work with different people to get better...and you need to see different places; and so just for the sheer fact that this place isn’t that big, this place doesn’t have a lot of people...I can’t imagine myself staying here permanently from here until the end of my life. (chuckles) I’m going to go for awhile, which doesn’t mean I won’t come back, which doesn’t mean I don’t want to come back. You know, you get stuck here and nobody wants to get stuck.

In terms of the film industry, Jill sees the negative attributes of St. John’s related more to the small size of the industry – limited expertise, little investment, lack of specialized equipment, lack of diversity of film genres and a difficulty of finding diverse landscapes in which to film. Thus, while she has a strong connection to place, which she claims will
ultimately bring her back to St. John’s, she also finds it too small to support a diverse cultural industry.

Jane, a local middle-aged public relations consultant living on Garrison Hill, in downtown St. John’s (see Figure 3.2.3) has also lived outside of St. John’s, but finds that its social and geographic characteristics beneficial in her industry:

The cost of living is much more affordable; and, because I lived away, I found it a little easier... to get access to the marketplace. I mean, the close proximity to everything makes it really quite easy to run an operation, unlike when we lived in Ontario. If we had a meeting, it could be across town, so it makes for time management much more easier...I always found that, you know, the closeness of the marketplace means for good word-of-mouth connections there. This town really operates on a word-of-mouth type basis. So if you have a good reputation with one client, I find that can spread through the community pretty quickly, which is really quite helpful, unlike if you’re in a larger environment.

For Jane, living downtown has the benefit of being close to her clients. Yet, although her business has benefitted from the small size of the community, she also observes that it can go both ways:

If you make any mistakes, it can spread through the community pretty fast...that lobster pot mentality does operate here. I mean, it’s up to you whether you want to let it get to you or not. You know, I find that the more you go up through the ranks, I guess, in society here, there are more negative people against you, but I mean that’s just a matter of you letting it get to you or not, I mean. Generally, I find the community really a friendly community to operate in and...I find the community pretty supportive. I know that, you know, when times get tough I have found a community that’s been really supportive and helped me get through the tough times.

As we have seen in this chapter so far, the small population in the St. John’s CMA and its isolated geographic location limit its ability to provide the diverse services and amenities
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14 By ‘lobster pot’, Jane refers to a joke in Newfoundland that pertains to the idea that the community can stunt personal success.
that are present in larger CMAs. However, these same limitations have facilitated the
development of a tight-knit community that some find appealing. We have also seen how
the level of urbanity in a city-region is not an essential feature of absolute size. Multiple
perspectives on the amenity value and livability of St. John’s can be found within the
creative class itself, a large occupational group (38.2% of the workforce in St. John’s) but
one that tends to be treated as a monolithic group in creative class theory and in many
creative city strategies. Without sensitivity to the multiple perspectives that exist within
the creative class, creative city strategies run the risk of alienating a large portion of them,
not to mention the 61.8% of the workforce and unemployed population that are not
considered a part of the ‘creative’ workforce.

5.3 Dissecting the purported mobility of the creative class of St. John’s

The final point I address in this thesis is the idea of creative class mobility,
particularly the contention that many creative workers choose the places they wish to live
first, and then search for jobs based on these preferences. McGranahan and Wojan (2007)
raise the issue that certain occupations within Florida’s categorization of the creative class
may not be considered footloose. They contend “education, training, and library
occupations’ and ‘healthcare practitioners and technical occupations’, are involved in
economic reproduction and locate largely to provide essential services to a population”
(198). Counting these types of workers within the creative class definition, they argue,
decreases the purported mobility of the creative class. The issue of mobility arose in this
study as well. Eleven of the interviewees regarded mobility as dependent upon economic
opportunity, rather than personal preference; nine of those individuals are in their twenties. Those with personal and emotional attachments to the area saw mobility as a necessity, but not necessarily as positive, or within their control. Jimmy, a young registered nurse who was born and raised within the CMA disliked the idea of leaving the Province. He lamented the idea of moving elsewhere, and even found that St. John’s was getting too crowded for his liking:

Where I’m from in Conception Bay South, when I grew up there, it was very, very small. But recently, it's just developing into suburbia, and that's why I say I'd rather move beyond CBS to a place like Holyrood that's...at the bottom of Conception Bay, somewhere much more quiet, a better place to raise kids and have a family.

He believes many Newfoundlander people are forced to move out of small rural communities or out of the Province in order to make a living. In terms of the economic opportunities within Newfoundland he added that:

It’s just...not an option in Newfoundland. You’re in St. John's or you might be lucky enough, [to find employment] in Grand Falls or Cornerbrook, but with those exceptions, there's nothing. You can work in small retail stores, but you can't make a life out of that so you're forced to come to the big centres.

Similar to Bobby and Lenny, Jimmy prefers the ‘rural lifestyle’ over the ‘urban lifestyle’ due to the freedom of activities and the privacy afforded by large properties and like Harold, would prefer to raise his family in a small rural community.

For some creative workers, mobility is a function of economic necessity rather than personal preference. For Moe, a young naval architect from Kenya, the focus on amenities is a secondary concern at this early stage in his career. St. John’s may not have the amenities that he ideally wants in a place to live, but at this point, economic considerations are paramount. Moe came to St. John’s because of Memorial University’s Naval Architecture program, and stayed because of a job opportunity. Difficulties
obtaining travel visas for the U.S. meant a loss of a job interview in Houston, Texas and general difficulty in terms of mobility across North America. Ideally he wants to live in Vancouver, mainly because it has a more temperate climate compared to St. John’s. He enjoyed living in downtown Vancouver briefly during a co-op work term but acknowledges that St. John’s is more affordable. Although he sees better job opportunities in Vancouver for his field overall, he is discouraged by the costs of living:

Housing is a big problem; it's the only discouraging thing. I wonder what the prices in North Van are right now? I mean, for $400,000 here, you can buy a mansion if you want. Or you can live in big, beautiful B.C. in a junk of a house for the same price.

On the other hand, Moe observes that in Vancouver:

[There is] more to do. There are beaches, like Kits beach, and the whole Stanley Park thing. So many people use it, for jogging, just having a good time...And spring starts earlier there. I was there for three seasons, fall, winter, and spring, so I got to see all the changes.

His views are tied in weather and monetary considerations. Moe says all this, though, with the knowledge that his mobility is ultimately tied up in government immigration laws.

Like Moe, Barbara is at the early stages in her career and sees a good opportunity to save money by living in St. John’s. Despite having more potential cross-country mobility than Moe as a Canadian citizen, she recognizes that her lack of experience in the workforce stunts this mobility. She ultimately wants to work in Victoria, B.C:

But being a recent graduate that’s just starting up in the workforce I have to go where work is. And right now that happens to be St. John’s. But if that changes, that will change.
Barbara’s account underscores Hansen and Niedomysl’s (2009) finding that once people enter the workforce as creative workers, they tend to migrate based on employment opportunities. Lepawsky et al. (Forthcoming) observe that:

While creative class theory does not argue that amenities are a perfect substitute for wages and employment, it does claim that a key shift has occurred: people are ‘not slavishly following jobs to places’ (Florida 2002a, 223), rather firms and jobs are locating, relocating, or being created where the talent is (7).

Barbara’s account contradicts the notion that creative workers have more mobility than other workers. By adding the dimension of life stage, her account also highlights the multifaceted decision-making process involved in migration as already observed by others (see Clark and Cosgrove 1991, Hansen and Niedomysl, 2009, Whisler et al. 2008).

Job opportunities are also paramount for Parvinder, a 48-year-old civil engineer from India, though, in contrast to Moe and Barbara he finds that St. John’s lacks the opportunities for highly skilled professionals like him. A few years ago, Parvinder wrote a letter to the editor of a local newspaper that expressed his lament for the lack of job opportunities. Having lived in four countries before he came to Newfoundland, he finds the community itself friendly to newcomers, though does not feel the same way about employers. In his letter he argued, “employers in smaller towns tend to have hostile attitude towards an immigrant’s overseas experience and educational qualifications”.

Combined with the lack of diverse employment opportunities, Parvinder believes that these factors contribute to the movement of many immigrants to Canada’s larger CMAs. From correspondence with Parvinder since the interviews took place, I have learned that he has since moved to the U.S. for a job opportunity.
Many younger creative workers interviewed for this study talked about the economic opportunities that govern their mobility decisions. A few older creative workers on the other hand, did not mention economic insecurities. Rather, their focus was on developing their current careers or future retirement plans. Dick, a 53-year-old banker working in downtown St. John’s is settled in his career, and speaks about his mobility in terms of accommodating the life stage change of retirement:

Well, the only reason I would move now is on account of retirement, and I have no desire to move to any other city. Now I might move to some rural setting, but I have no desire to move back down to Halifax; and there are no other cities that attract me from a retirement perspective.

Outside of creative class discourse, earlier research has shown that quality of life factors can influence the out-migration of middle-class professionals from cities to more rural, small town areas (Keeble 1990), and that quality of life factors, rather than economic opportunities, may be the driving factor for this movement, although the issue remains contentious (Rogerson 1999). With the addition of life stage, such inquiries become more complex. Creative class discourse often focuses on the diversity and amenity value of the city as a means of attracting and retaining mobile creative workers, but rarely are the impacts of economic opportunities or life stage considered in assessing this purported mobility.

While promoting quality of life factors to attract workers and capital investment is not new, creative class theory has reinvigorated these efforts with a focus on the creative class. Despite the popularity of this approach, it has received much criticism for being too narrow and simplistic. These criticisms are illuminated in the discussions with creative workers examined here, as lifestyle values are multi-dimensional, intersecting personal
values and attachments, expectations of place stemming from experience, perceived
economic opportunities, and life stage expectations. Considering the diversity within this
group, city officials who uncritically adopt creative class inspired strategies in their urban
development efforts may exacerbate the social exclusion within city-regions that have
been characteristic outcomes of previous strategies for attracting professional workers.
6 Discussion/Conclusion

Creative class theory's popularity has spread across cultural and geographic contexts. As such, many inspired city officials are attempting to transform their cities into environments that might appeal to creative workers, simultaneously accepting the idea that the creative class is a monolithic group with a shared value system. This oversight could lead to inappropriate and narrowly focused projects and policies. In this thesis I examined the purported link between the creative class (as defined by creative class theory) and shared lifestyle and locational preferences using the St. John's CMA as a case study. I did so at the census tract level in order to draw attention to the heterogeneity of landscapes and lifestyles that exists in city-regions, a detail that can be obscured by regional-level analysis. I used a location quotient method to locate the distribution of the creative class in the St. John's CMA revealing an uneven distribution within a few census tracts, some located in the urban core, close to the downtown core, as creative class theory would predict. Yet, my results also show a higher than expected distribution of members of the creative class in areas of the rural fringe (using Statistics Canada definitions), something overlooked in the propositions of creative class theory. Moreover, it is those census tracts in the rural fringe that experienced the highest percentage increase in the creative class labour force between 2001-2006 (see Table 4.1.5). These findings raise questions about the generalizability of creative class theory. Adding another dimension to this thesis I incorporated an interview component by combining interview material from
two studies, my own and the ISRN project that examines innovation in city-regions across Canada. Through these methods I attempted to compare and contrast the landscape in the CMA and the lifestyle values of the creative workers interviewed in this study with the contentions of creative class theory. What surfaces from this research is that the St. John’s CMA may have a high proportion of the creative workforce because of its ability to retain workers from within the province, rather than its ability to attract workers from other parts of Canada or internationally. Table 4.1.6 shows the low levels of immigrant population in the St. John’s CMA, especially in Area B. While these statistics do not account for the percent of creative workers who were born outside the province, the overall immigrant population, and population born outside of the CMA is relatively low. The majority of creative workers interviewed for this study were born and raised in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and their accounts demonstrate the strong cultural and social bonds that have helped shape their lifestyle values and migration decisions. The interviews add another important dimension to this observation by highlighting the complex and multifaceted ways in which lifestyle values and migration decisions are formed.

Addressing the first question of this thesis “where does the creative class of St. John’s live within the CMA?”, the location quotient calculations exposed the census tracts within the CMA that are over-represented by creative workers. In Chapter 4, I paid particular attention to census tracts in the urban core and rural fringe with high proportions of creative workers, exposing the contrasting landscapes that exist within city-regions, even in this smaller CMA. From closer examination of these areas, we discover even greater place diversity that belies the dichotomous presumptions often associated
with the categorizations of ‘urban core’ and ‘rural fringe’. In the two small census tracts in Area A we see two different styles of development that mark the changes that have occurred in St. John’s since the 1940s. Census tract 10 displays the row style housing typical of downtown St. John’s with little to no frontage on each property and a wide range of housing quality to support an equally wide range of residents. Adjacent to this is census tract 13, a part of the Churchill Park Garden suburb. This planned suburb represents a turning point in the development style of St. John’s towards lower-density family-oriented housing, which has continued in a similar style in the rural fringe of the city in Area B as well. In census tract 202.02 of Area B however, we see development occurring with specific aims to promote a rural aesthetic and lifestyle. The Town of Portugal Cove-St. Phillip’s has a greater population and is more developed than much of the outer fringes of the CMA, however, through its municipal plan’s objectives it attempts to maintain its identity as a rural community. Through this exercise we find that St. John’s may not display the same levels of ‘urbanity’ in terms of services, social and amenity diversity, and high density, that most larger urban centres offer, and thus despite the presence of a large creative class, caution must be taken when making corollary assumptions about why they are located there.

I addressed the second question of this thesis, “do the values of creative workers in St. John’s support creative class theory’s assumption that they share a common value system?” in the interview component of this study in Chapter 5. It revealed many of the important factors in determining values and lifestyles of creative workers in St. John’s that help inform their location preferences. Values that have their roots in social origin, experience, perception, life stage, and lifestyles revolving around a ‘rural’ landscape are
often disregarded in creative class discourse, but come forth in the discussions with
creative workers in this thesis. The influence of strong social capital – as expressed by
community attachment and a sense of place – may be specific to smaller CMAs like St.
John’s. This finding may impact the comparability of lifestyle values amongst creative
workers in different sized urban regions, and also impact the generalizability of creative
class theory. Though considering Newfoundland’s historical and social development
related to its geographic isolation, these characteristics may be more developed here than
in other small city-regions that have stronger links to other urban centres. Nonetheless,
these have played a significant role in the lifestyle preferences and migration decisions of
some of the creative workers interviewed for this study. Creative class theory emphasizes
the importance of amenities, tolerance, and diversity over jobs as the factors that will
attract and retain members of the creative class. Yet, interviewees in my research indicate
that many people are making their migration choices for jobs, rather than amenities,
tolerance, and diversity. The wide spectrum of lifestyle values, and influencing factors
associated with mobility expressed by creative workers in this study support the idea that
treating the ‘creative class’ as a homogenous category may be misleading, and may have
limited value in analyzing the desires of this wide group of workers in the context of small
Canadian CMAs.

St. John’s social composition suggests that it does not attract and retain many
creative workers from outside of the province or internationally. It may be the case that
St. John’s retains creative workers born within the province because it is the economic
centre of the province. Also, because of strong attachments to place and personal ties,
many creative class members may choose to live in the city or in surrounding
communities. For those who wish to stay in the province, St. John’s provides the best economic opportunities. Such an advantage may be the best amenity St. John’s has to offer. If so, this runs counter to creative class theory’s insistence that people are ‘not slavishly following jobs to places’ (Florida 2002b, 223).

Furthermore, many creative workers interviewed here had expectations and preferences linked to their perceptions of life stage. In this regard, we find that mobility may have a different meaning for younger creative workers, whose motivations for mobility may be associated more with perceived economic opportunity than lifestyle preferences, due to their lack of experience in the workforce. However, older creative workers may be thinking of mobility in terms of retirement and lifestyle preferences. While the idea of mobility as linked to life stage is not new, this type of factor is oftentimes not taken into account in creative class discourse.

The results of the first two inquiries of this thesis form the conclusions for the final question “what implications might these findings have on the use of creative class theory as a tool for attracting and retaining the ‘creative class’ in small Canadian CMAs?”

Overall, this study demonstrates how creative class theory’s concept of livability may be too narrow to speak to the diversity within the creative class, exposing the analytical limitations of the creative class concept and the resulting potential limitations for cross-cultural comparison. Considering the many factors contributing to how creative workers in St. John’s balance their lifestyle preferences and location decisions, it is difficult to consider that any existing commonalities between them can be connected to their membership in the creative class, which are, according to Florida, “determined by economic function – by the kind of work they do for a living. All other distinctions
follow from that" (Florida 2002b, 8). The concepts of ‘creativity’, ‘diversity’, and ‘tolerance’ are prevalent in creative class discourse yet, how these ideas manifest in creative city strategies are not clear. They may be useful only at a superficial level for politicians who find the de-politicized jargon of creative class discourse easy to promote. As such, many of these strategies may simply boil down to a revitalized version of older strategies of urban attraction, as suggested by Reese and Sands (2008).

Employing creative class-inspired strategies of attracting and retaining creative workers may come at the cost of under-representing the lifestyle diversity that exists within any city-region, even at the smaller scale of the St. John’s CMA, as demonstrated in this thesis. As a result, policy makers may inadvertently disregard the needs and desires of the majority of the region’s population, while tending to a ‘class’ of people that may be much smaller (in terms of shared values and lifestyle preferences) than is postulated when using the creative class categorization scheme.

The findings of this thesis also bring attention to the complex process of making migration decisions. Such decision-making processes may not be understood through a simple balance of job opportunities and amenities. Factors like place/community attachment, family ties, and life stage, are important factors that arose in this research that may also play a role. As such, city officials must be cautious in how they interpret creative class theory into strategies of talent attraction and retention. Taking a shallow approach towards arts and culture may undermine these important institutions, while overlooking programs and policies that, though they draw less public attention, may be more effective, like decreasing barriers to entry for workers as suggested by Donald and Morrow (2003), and financially supporting new research. If the ultimate goal of creative
city strategies is to improve a city-region's chances of economic growth through innovations, city officials may need to diversify their approach. Attracting and retaining creative workers through catering to a specific set of lifestyle values may not be an effective strategies in places like the St. John's CMA. The importance of such specific quality of life factors may be exaggerated in creative class discourse, thus potentially limiting the contribution of creative class theory in promoting the development of smaller urban centres.
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## APPENDIX 1

### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Workforce 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total Workforce 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A0 Senior Managers (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1 Specialist Managers (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2 Managers in retail, trade, food and accommodation services (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A3 Other managers, n.e.s. (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B0 Professional occupations in business and finance (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B1 Finance and insurance administrative occupations (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C0 Professional occupations in natural and applied sciences (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C1 Technical occupations related to natural and applied sciences (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D0 Professional occupations in health (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D1 Nurse supervisors and registered nurses (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D2 Technical and related occupations in health (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E0 Judges, lawyers, psychologists, social workers, ministers of religion, and policy and program officers (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E1 Teachers and professors (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F0 Professional occupations in art and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F1 Technical occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport (total number of workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Total Creative Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Total Creative Workforce (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Location quotient results at the CT level, using the CMA as the area of comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Location quotient results at the CT level, using the Province as the area of comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Location quotient results at the CT level, using the Nation as the area of comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10001</th>
<th>CT 10002</th>
<th>CT 10003.01</th>
<th>CT 10003.02</th>
<th>CT 10004</th>
<th>CT 10005.01</th>
<th>CT 10005.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2325</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10006</th>
<th>CT 10007</th>
<th>CT 10008</th>
<th>CT 10009</th>
<th>CT 10010</th>
<th>CT 10011</th>
<th>CT 10012</th>
<th>CT 10013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>530</th>
<th>775</th>
<th>365</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>595</th>
<th>465</th>
<th>560</th>
<th>670</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10014</th>
<th>CT 10015.01</th>
<th>CT 10015.02</th>
<th>CT 10015.03</th>
<th>CT 1005.04</th>
<th>CT 10016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>4635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Values:**

- **18:**
  - 840
  - 895
  - 845
  - 1255
  - 1605
  - 2055

- **19:**
  - 0.52
  - 0.40
  - 0.41
  - 0.47
  - 0.50
  - 0.44

- **20:**
  - 1.38
  - 1.07
  - 1.10
  - 1.27
  - 1.35
  - 1.19

- **21:**
  - 1.82
  - 1.45
  - 1.45
  - 1.67
  - 1.78
  - 1.56

- **22:**
  - 1.58
  - 1.23
  - 1.26
  - 1.45
  - 1.54
  - 1.36
2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>CT 10017</th>
<th>CT 10100.01</th>
<th>CT 10100.03</th>
<th>CT 10100.04</th>
<th>CT 10110</th>
<th>CT 10170.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10170.02</th>
<th>CT 10171</th>
<th>CT 10172.02</th>
<th>CT 10172.03</th>
<th>CT 10172.04</th>
<th>CT 10172.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>4050</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>3310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10172.06</th>
<th>CT 10200.01</th>
<th>CT 10206.02</th>
<th>CT 10200.03</th>
<th>CT 10201</th>
<th>CT 10202.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10202.02</th>
<th>CT 10202.04</th>
<th>CT 10202.05</th>
<th>CT 10300</th>
<th>CT 10301.01</th>
<th>CT 10301.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>2655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>735</strong></td>
<td><strong>1550</strong></td>
<td><strong>1330</strong></td>
<td><strong>1550</strong></td>
<td><strong>850</strong></td>
<td><strong>715</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Creative Class Occupations Located by Census Tra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 10302</th>
<th>CMA</th>
<th>Newfoundland</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>97914</td>
<td>248,680</td>
<td>17,146,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>218,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>423,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>475,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2895</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>514,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>427,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>201,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3810</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>603,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3785</td>
<td>8,490</td>
<td>504,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>192,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>279,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>219,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>373,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4725</td>
<td>10,380</td>
<td>667,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>218,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>283,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>36701</td>
<td>70,575</td>
<td>5,604,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Categories of Data retrieved from the 2006 Census of Canada for analysis in census tracts 10, 13, 17, 202.01, and 202.02

1) Population and dwelling counts
   Population percentage change, 2001-2006
   Land area in square kilometres, 2006
2) Family and Households - 20% sample data
   With children at home, married couples, couple families by family structure
   With children at home, common-law couples, couple families by family structure
   Total lone-parent families by sex of parent and number of children
3) Housing
   Total occupied private dwellings by period of construction -20% sample data
   Total number of occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling - 100% data
4) Immigration and citizenship
   Total population by immigrant status and place of birth -20% data
   Born in province of residence, non-immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth
   Born outside province of residence, non-immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth
   Immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth
5) Income and Earnings
   Household income in 2005 of private households -20% sample data
   Median household income $, household income in 2005 of private households
   Average household income $, household income in 2005 of private households
**APPENDIX 3**

Data retrieved from 2006 census, including, population, housing, citizenship, and income (Source: Statistics Canada 2006b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic:</th>
<th>CT 10</th>
<th>CT 13</th>
<th>CT 17</th>
<th>CT 202.01</th>
<th>CT 202.02</th>
<th>St. John’s CMA</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, 2006 - 100% data</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>181,113</td>
<td>31,612,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population percentage change, 2001 to 2006</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land area in square kilometres, 2006</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>151.91</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>804.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children at home, married couples, couple families by family structure</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>22,445</td>
<td>3,443,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children at home, common-law couples, couple families by family structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>618,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lone parent families by sex of parent and number of children</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>1,414,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, before 1946, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,414,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1946 to 1960, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,595,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1961 to 1970, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1971 to 1980, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1981 to 1985, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1986 to 1990, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1991 to 1995, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 1996 to 2000, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of construction, 2001 to 2006, occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached house, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached house, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row house, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, duplex, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, building that has five or more storeys, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, building that has fewer than five storeys, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single-attached house, occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable dwelling, occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in province of residence, non-immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside province of residence, non-immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants, population by immigrant status and place of birth</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income $, household income in 2005 of private households</td>
<td>55,006</td>
<td>86,985</td>
<td>97,487</td>
<td>51,455</td>
<td>73,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income $, household income in 2005 of private households</td>
<td>82,988</td>
<td>120,774</td>
<td>98,410</td>
<td>64,801</td>
<td>96,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ISRN City Regions Study: Interview Guide
Theme II: Social Foundations of Talent Attraction and Retention

Our research proposal noted that competitive success in many sectors of the economy rests increasingly on intangible assets such as knowledge and creativity. If so, this suggests that a critical resource is now pools of highly educated and creative workers who have the potential to attract and embed globally mobile investment, as well as generating innovative growth in situ. The argument here is that such talent is attracted to, and retained by cities, but not just any cities. In particular, those places that offer a richness of employment opportunity, a high quality of life, a critical mass of cultural activity, and social diversity – low barriers to entry for newcomers – are said to exert the strongest pull. The success with which an urban region can generate and retain creative activity also depends on its quality of place and community characteristics that promote strong neighbourhoods and social cohesion. The questions in this guide are intended to explore various dimensions of this hypothesis.

Part A. Questions for Highly Educated/Creative Workers

Background

1. Where were you born?
   a. If outside [city name], when did you first move to [city name]?
   b. Age and family status?

2. How would you describe your ethnic identity?

3. Please describe your educational history and credentials (institution, degree program, location, years)

4. Please describe any other additional training, apprenticeships, or other on-the-job learning that you have engaged in.
   a. Have you completed an apprenticeship?

5. What is your current occupation?
   a. Does your current job fully utilize your skills, training and education?
6. Please describe your employment history (firm/organization, location, sector, position)
   Follow up [probe issues of volition, challenges that workers have faced]:
   
   a. In the case where there was a succession of jobs, why?
   b. Where such changes voluntary or not?
   c. What attributes of the cities help to minimize risk associated with losing one’s job
      (role of social networks, location, policies)?

7. To what extent have you moved between different kinds of sectors or occupations?
   
   a. To what extent does the [city name] economy enable this kind of mobility and the
      kinds of opportunities available?
   b. To what extent do you apply knowledge gained from working in other industries or
      firms in your current work?

8. What are your future career plans/aspirations?
   
   a. What would you like to be doing and where?
   b. What strategies are you undertaking in pursuit of these goals?
   c. Challenges?

Attractiveness of the City Region
9. If from outside [city name]: Why did you move to [city name]?
   
   a. If you worked in your field in another city, how does [city name] compare?

10. What characteristics of the [city name] economy and/or labour market make it an
    attractive place to work in your field? Follow up on the following aspects:
    
    a. Degree to which [city name] is a city characterized by an ‘openness’ to
       experimentation and creativity?
    b. Cutting edge work in field?
    c. Degree to which [city name] is a tolerant/welcoming place (i.e. in terms of
       race/ethnicity/ sexuality/ gender equality in their field)?
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11. What characteristics of the [city name] economy and/or labour market undermine its attractiveness as a place to work in your field?
   a. Have you encountered discrimination in [city name] in your field?


13. Are there particular aspects of [city name] that enhance creativity in the city?
   a. What part of the city do you work in?
   b. In what ways does it facilitate creativity (or not)?
   c. To what extent are [city name]’s strengths unique to the city or are they related to Canadian institutions and values more generally?

14. What characteristics of [city name] reduce its attractiveness as a place in which to live? (Follow up on same issues as in previous question)

The City Region’s Ability to Retain Talent

15. If you were to move to another city, where would you choose to live, and why?

16. How would such (a) location(s) compare to [city name] in terms of:
   • career opportunities?
   • quality of life/quality of place?

17. How likely is it that you will move to another city-region within the next three years, for the reasons just discussed?

18. Are there other people you know who work in the same area as you but are not employed at the moment? Do you think they would be willing to be interviewed?
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Part B. Questions for Employers of Highly Educated/Creative Workers
(could also be adapted for use with Higher Education Institutions, Research-Based Organizations):

Background
1. What are your firm’s primary products or services?

2. Please provide a brief history of the firm (year and location of establishment, founder(s), and changes in ownership since founding).

3. Why did your firm choose to locate in the city? (or: if it has changed locations, why?)
   a. What are this city’s particular strengths (and weaknesses), from your firm’s perspective?

4. How many different sites/locations does this firm operate from, and where are they [if more than one]?
   a. What does your firm do at these different locations, and why?

5. How many employees work in this firm (total, [city name] office(s), elsewhere)?

6. Employment composition by (approximate percentages):

   Occupational category
   • managerial
   • scientific/technical/engineering
   • ‘creatives’
   • sales
   • clerical
   • production
   • other

   Educational attainment
   • less than high school diploma
   • high school graduate
   • community college graduate
   • university graduate (bachelor’s)
   • master’s degree
   • PhD degree
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7. Why are you located in this part of the city? Follow up on: What aspects of this
neighbourhood facilitate the creativity and innovativeness of your organization?
   a. What parts of the city do your employees live in?
   
   b. What specific requirements do you have in terms of location? ‘Buzz’, architecture and
   building characteristics (need for lots of light, open flexible spaces, etc.)

Attractiveness of the City Region
8. What are the primary sources of recruitment for your highly educated/creative workers
   (local and nonlocal)?
   • Educational institutions
   • Competitor or supplier firms
   • Other (specify)
   
   a. Does your firm have special relationships with any local educational institutions?
9. What proportion of your highly educated/creative workers was born outside Canada?
10. Do you recruit talent from outside [city name]/outside Canada? If so, how actively do you
do so, and what mechanisms do you use for this)?
    a. What obstacles have you encountered to doing this – immigration policies,
bureaucracy/red tape?
11. Do you target any particular locations in such recruitment? If so, why?
12. What characteristics of the [city name] economy and/or labour market enhance your firm’s
ability to attract and retain highly educated/creative workers?
13. What characteristics of the [city name] economy and/or labour market undermine its
attractiveness in terms of your recruitment efforts?
14. What characteristics of living in [city name] make it an attractive place for your highly
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15. What characteristics of [city name]'s quality of place/quality of life undermine your ability to attract and retain highly educated/creative workers?

16. To what extent does your firm benefit and learn from other sectors in the city?
   a. Is there a high degree of crossover between these different sectors in terms of innovation and learning? Or employees?
   b. To what extent do your employees work across fields and is this an asset for you?

17. To what extent does being located in a multicultural city help you in terms of developing products/services/etc.? (may not be applicable to all the cases)

The City Region's Ability to Retain Talent

18. What challenges do you currently face with respect to the retention of your highly educated/creative workers?
   a. Where are their potential competing employment opportunities: primarily local or nonlocal?

19. If your highly educated/creative workers were to move to another city for career-related reasons, where do you think they would choose to live, and why? [May need to break this down by specific occupational categories]

20. How would such (a) location(s) compare to [city name] in terms of:
   • career opportunities?
   • quality of life/quality of place?

21. Have you lost any highly educated/creative workers to such locations in the last three years? If so, how many? Why? ISRN City Regions Study: Interview Guide Theme II Page 7
Part C. Questions for Intermediary Organizations:
Organizations to be considered might include: specialized headhunting agencies, local employment centres and immigration boards.

1. Describe the goals and mandate of your organization
2. What specific services does it provide?
3. Describe your organization’s history: how it was formed; how it has evolved over time?
4. What are the principal challenges facing this region, with respect to the attraction of highly educated/creative workers from elsewhere?
5. What are the principal challenges facing this region, with respect to the retention of highly educated/creative workers?
6. What are the principal challenges facing this region, with respect to the integration of highly educated/creative workers into the labour market; into society more generally?
7. In what ways does your organization facilitate the attraction, retention, or integration of highly educated/creative workers in this region?
8. To what extent do you focus your efforts on particular socially disadvantaged groups in this program activity? (And which groups do you target for this work?)
9. What programs or services do you offer to help these groups?
APPENDIX 5

Interview question set designed specifically for this study.

Part A: Background questions
1. Age
2. Place of Origin
3. Current occupation

Part B: Neighbourhood and city evaluation
1. What part of the city do you live in?
   a. What do you like about living there?
   b. What do you dislike about living there?
   c. How does it compare to other places you have lived (if applicable)?
2. What kind of neighbourhood or city is an ideal place for you to live and why?