Abstract: The creative class theory suggests that society is composed of three social classes: the creative class, the service class, the working class, a different view or classification of the workforce. The boundaries separating the creative class from the upper ruling class and the lower working class rest on occupational premises. This paper examines the construction and tools of the creative class, its human composition as a social class, attending discourses, as well as the shifting foundations of the theory. It underlines the important role of education and research to improve economic development at city or regional level. Unlike economy, or politics, and governance and sustainable development, creativity is among the least regulated human activities.
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1. Introduction

There are more ways than one to approach the Creative Class Theory, an expression coined by Richard Florida. In light of recent debates and except for scope, it may be near impossible to summarize the issues involved: according to Florida, the creative class includes 38 million Americans or 30% of the workforce in the U.S., which is reason enough to wonder whether a new social class has emerged in America in the 1990s.

A review of the creative class discourse examines how the progressive ideas therein conveyed have struck a chord in society, especially with policymakers. In view of the papers, comments and public exposure involved (with more than one million Google Scholar hits in early 2011, Richard Florida appears to be more influential than Karl Marx at half a million Google Scholar hits), it is impossible to enclose the science that push the scholarly assumptions attached to this object. The questions raised and discussed cover social concerns addressed by economics, education, research, and governance. The theory is constructed upon many geographic subthemes. This short paper samples as many expressive comments as possible. Mostly limited to the Canadian experience, it identifies actual inputs of the theory as they are understood and begin to apply to public life. We examine the human composition of the ‘creatives’ as a social class, then we address the shifting foundations of the theory and categorize the two pillars of the social class theory. The creative class discourse was originally designed for the American mindset, and an overview is provided in order to locate and understand the many sided yet profound
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influence of the creative approach in public affairs. Basically, the creative class concept has propelled research in often uncharted areas of urban and regional studies, business and politics, communication (or networking). The call to mind of a class vision of society is politically potent and apparently without an ideology but most critics definitely see the ‘creative class theory’ as a screen of power behind which one can read the secession of the affluent (Levine 1999) or the flavour of the month in economic development circles (Levine 2004:30). Further, the “creative class” concept is flexible enough to include other notions such as the creative economy or creative cities, or creative regions. Unlike economy, however, or politics, and governance and sustainable development, creativity is among the least regulated human activities.

Although basically unfocused, and for that matter conditional to the existence in society of a weighty creative class, the creative class discourse is activated to wrap urban gentrification processes or urban ‘revitalization’ (Granzow and Dean 2008), or, as Rantisi and Leslie (2006) put it, for the purpose of city branding, a form of fast policy “for promoting design as a form of urban regeneration in a neo-liberal context”.

2. Construction and tools of the creative class theory

In Richard Florida’s own words, the creative class theory builds upon the classics of economic, social, and political theory. At the outset of his career, the interest of the author was technological innovation and regional development; the concern then shifted to creativity, diversity, and economic growth. The latter discourse was released in 2001 (The rise of the creative class), but the background material was published in 2005 (Cities and the creative class). The common thread between both books is the economy, that is, a form of creative economy whereby urban competition consists not in attracting firms or investments but highly mobile talent or human resources in order to secure or reinforce regional advantages and boost development. In its final form, the theory was based on Talent, Tolerance and Technology, to which Territory Assets was added last, in a 2005 study concerning Montréal.

For all intents and purposes, Florida’s creative class theory avails itself of territory assets and quality of place, amenities and resources, attraction and retention, individuals and organizations, creative people and holders of creative capital:

"Territory Assets, sometimes called Quality of Place, include the amenities and other resources of a region that can affect the attraction and retention of both individuals and organizations. The emerging geography of the creative sector is dramatically affecting the competitive advantage of regions around the world. Regional economic growth is driven by the location choices of creative people – the holders of creative capital." (Stolarick, Florida and Musante 2005:10).

In that study of Montréal’s urban characteristics, Florida’s benchmarks for a region’s Territory Assets are: Housing Cost to Income, Rent Cost to Income, Owner Cost to Income, Population Density, Arts Workers per 100,000, Arts Establishments per 100,000, Park Workers per 100,000, Parks per 100,000, Homicides per 100,000. In this list, only the Parks item is territorial and other items actually belong to economics and demographics.
Finally, the theory and its application are intended for a specific clientele and are promoted and disseminated using such tools as (i) corporate training toward building regional prosperity, and (ii) exclusive access to reports and case studies.

3. The science of the Creative Class

New measures were designed and compiled to gauge the potential of cities which are ranked in a Creativity Index composed of (i) the Creative Class share of the workforce, or creative workers, with Bohemian ethics as an ideological corresponding item, (ii) high-tech industry and patents per capita that measure innovation\(^1\), and (iii) diversity. Both the creative and the diversity indicators are fraught with controversial issues as they identify groups featured by age, ethnic, gender or other personal conditions.

A creative class may be under construction especially in the wake of globalisation, but the game actually remains a twosome involving economic forces and institutions: “Economic development is not the result of abstract economic forces, but is shaped and motivated by real institutions. [...] The processes of economic transformation and restructuring are at bottom processes of institutional change and adaptation” (Florida and Kenney 1994:257). In this definition, economic development is the transformative force wielded to restructure changing and adaptive institutions; such a program is clearly asserted in the very title of Richard Florida’s 2001 best-seller *The rise of the creative class: and how it’s transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*.

The theory suggests that society is composed of three social classes: the creative class, the service class, the working class, all of which apply to the labour force.

The science and the geography behind class discourse is thin, the discourse itself is “thick with statistics [and] Florida’s [2002] book is marked by an absence of any empirical investigation into what is, in fact, only very circumstantial evidence” (O’Connor 2007:39). The evidence referred to draws on U.S. urban statistics presented in the form of “city rankings by life-stage, rating the best places for singles, families, and empty-nesters” (Florida 2009). It is only logical therefore that the creative class theory would meet the author’s objective as stated in *Who’s Your City Who’s Your City?: How the Creative Economy Is Making Where to Live the Most Important Decision of Your Life*, i.e., “to write a book that would actually help people choose the best place to live” (ibid., p.301).

It should be noted here that between 2002 and 2009 the ‘creative class’ is replaced by the ‘creative economy’ (Florida 2009), which brings to mind that “the structure of the economy is one basis on which to build a classification” (Sklair 1995).

For that matter, all place ratings are subject to critique, and one of the most successful is the Places Rated Almanac system (Sauvageau and D’Agostino 2000). Such rankings however leave out the construction of coherent place attributes and jump to conclusions on quality of life for which more research is clearly required. The fundamental concept of place almanacs in terms of scale and holism increasingly places them on the margins of contemporary debates over the future of places and the question remains as to whether

---
\(^1\) Other researchers “have found that RD Expenditure is more positively related with Gdp per inhabitant than Patents” (Guisan 2004:29), in other words, research is to be preferred over innovation.
Creative Class rankings have enough depth to become “the standard toolkit of economic developers and community promoters for assessing local, regional and national place quality and competitiveness” (Tremblay, Rogerson and Chicoine 2007).

Beyond the 3 or 4 Ts of economic development and its indicators, the creative class theory proposes a composite Creativity Index applicable to metropolitan regions and American states as well. The creativity index includes four indexes or factors: (i) the Creative Class itself—people, “comprised of the Super-Creative Core and Creative Professionals” and based on official U.S. occupation and wages data; (ii) the High Technology Index designed at the Milken Institute and “based on the Tech-Pole index”; (iii) the Innovation Index, a “measure of patented innovations per capita [...] based on data from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office”; and (iv) the Diversity Index, deemed “a strong predictor of a region’s high-tech industry concentration and the growth of high-tech industry” (Stolarick 2003).

The creative class theory is designed with built-in flexibility and a wealth of data involving occupations. The proportion of employment in arts occupations is strongly associated with the creation of new businesses and hi-tech specialization in metropolitan areas.

4. Deconstructing the theory

With respect to human capital and diversity, there can be no doubt that “the diversity of people, i.e. cultural-ethnic diversity, is correlated with the logarithmic growth of labor force and GDP per labor force” (Wedemeier 2010:10), and indeed “creativity has an impact on growth. Although there can be no “one-size-fits-all-regions-approach” to increasing the number of creative professionals in an area, it is generally important for cities, and regions, to attract human capital, particularly if the presence of such professionals has been lacking” (ibid., p.11).

In response to an approach based on shifting terminology that draws on social tension (class), accelerated technological development (innovation), unequal human endowment (art, higher education) and the uniqueness of geographic location (or quality of place, or territory assets), a number of scholars from different disciplines and horizons including economic sciences, have examined the creative class concept. Their appreciation follows and may be seen as an insightful deconstruction of the creative class.

Few authors have approached the creative class theory from the standpoint of a ‘social class’ per se; this is quite understandable given the overt economic intention of Florida’s discourse. But the use of countless geographical representations has drawn the attention of geographers concerned with the theory’s ideological background, among them Jamie Peck for whom “the creativity script represents a culturally inflected reinscription of [capitalist] competitive relations” (Peck 2005:767). Houston et al. (2008) argue that the success of talent attraction programs would best be “based on economic realities rather than the marketing of ethereal conceptions of place attractiveness”. A case study conducted by Barnes et al. (2006) “demonstrates that marginalisation and exclusions are products of creative city strategies and wider, more oppressive urban discourses”. Eugene McCann’s analysis (2007:196) suggests that the creative discourse is potent in its “‘creative city’ manifestation — [and] in reshaping urban policy discussion and legitimating certain sets of policy prescriptions”. Gibson and Klocker (2005) underline
the role of the creativity index “in subsuming creativity within a neoliberal regional economic development discourse [whereby] creativity is linked to the primacy of global markets, and is a factor in place competition”. Even more plainly, as Andrew Ross (2009:41) puts it, “Florida’s nostrum, that creativity is everyone’s natural asset to exploit, is difficult to distinguish from any other warmed-over version of American bootstrap ideology”.

Further, in *The Class of the New*, Richard Barbrook (2006) lists and quotes more than 70 authors from the 19th and 20th centuries who have invented or commented on new social classes and among them the New Middle Class and the Intellectual Proletariat (William Morris), the Aristocracy of the Working Class (Friedrich Engels), the Educated Working Man (Thomas Wright), the Proletarianised Professionals (Stanley Aronowitz), the Knowledge Class (Daniel Bell), the Scientific Intellectual Labourers (Ernest Mandel), the Knowledge Workers (Peter Drucker), the Educational and Scientific Estate (John Kenneth Galbraith), the Power Elite (C. Wright Mills), the Managerial Class (James Burnham), the Scientific Managers (Frederick Winslow Taylor), and the Professional-Managerial Class by Barbara & John Ehrenreich (1979) who described how the professional managerial class “includes people with a wide range of occupations, skills, income levels, power and prestige. The boundaries separating it from the ruling class above and the working class below are fuzzy. […] occupation is not the sole determinant of class (nor even the sole determinant of the relation to the means of production)” (Barbrook 2006:80).

Robert Lang does not believe “that cities foster an innovative creative class – [the hypothesis] is largely atheoretical and relies instead on such weak props as correlations and vague empirical generalizations” (Lang 2006:318). And further, regarding the endowment or talent of the creative class, especially in Canada, Richard Shearmur adds that Florida’s theories are not empirically verified when analysed against regional growth theories. The initial allocation in human capital or in ‘talents’, writes Shearmur, does not predict the growth of salaries or of employment; the existence of a developed cultural environment is not a growth factor in Canadian agglomerations, and further, empirical results show that in Canada no generalisable rule actually correlates talent with urban growth or talent attraction with cultural substrate (2010:131).

4.1 The discourse behind the Creative Class label (content analysis)

The very designation of this theory—Creative Class—is more evocative than descriptive, and it is in the author’s discourse that one may find its actual scope and domains. A statistical analysis of Florida’s discourse was conducted over 2009—all the texts in the media section of creativeclass.com/article_library/ website were gathered and English texts readable with TextStat (version 1.52, by Matthias Hüning) were compiled, that is, 237 entries (texts), i.e., 253,790 words or 900 pages, including, separately, seven formal studies accounting for 26% of the above material under the heading *Ontario in the Creative Age: Assessing Ontario with the 3 Ts of Economic Development*, Ontario Working Paper Series. The latter documents can be found on the Martin Prosperity Institute website (MPI), University of Toronto.
In seven of the twenty (7/20) studies published in 2009, the main issues of Florida’s scholarly discourse are economy (505 occurrences), technology (372 occ.), capital (353 occ.) and human (essentially human capital — 337 occ.).

Yet during the same year, the overall Web and media discourse by Florida, collaborators and commentators addressed mainly economy (2208 occurrences), region (1169 occ.), class (669 occ.) and community (554 occ.).

In both cases, the front stage expressions definitely draw attention to economic development, both in the scholarly and the media discourse. Geography, territory, and place are represented by the term ‘region’ as the second discourse driver after ‘economy’ but ahead of ‘class’ and ‘community’. Technology, talent and tolerance (the 3 Ts) are among the visible discourse drivers as well.

4.2 The four or five columns of the temple (investment, the missing link?)

Whether the object of the theory is economic performance or regional development, it is believed that the potential of a metropolitan agglomeration can be assessed with city rankings based on comparative statistics pertaining to talent, technology and tolerance (3 Ts; the fourth T, Territory Assets, was introduced 2005). In short, the creative class theory is deployed toward economic development and it refers to creative or innovative urban development and draws on human and geographic potential.

According to the theoretical discourse and based on city rankings, a number of selected urban features (4 Ts) are efficient factors in attracting talents; this hypothesis is debatable and it remains to be proven that a concentration of ‘creatives’ would generate innovation and economic growth, and set in motion or change the pace of a wheel the size of a large city or that of an entire region. The methodology in support of such hypothesis is questioned by a number of authors (Lang 2006; Vivant 2006; Kotkin 2004). In other words, Richard Florida’s creative class theory proposes a different view of regional development which departs from the belief established in the 1980s and 1990s whereby urban development or reconversion could be successfully sought through “public-private partnerships and innovative milieux to promote hi-tech industry, entrepreneurship and foreign direct investment” (Mitchell-Weaver, Deitrick and Rigopoulou 1999). In today’s equation along with innovation, technology, entrepreneurship (human resources), and the contribution of public institutions, it would seem that creativity—consistent with the creative class theory—has replaced direct or targeted investment, whether private or public in companies “promising future job growth and economic innovation” (Levine et al. 1997) as the inception factor.

4.3 The creative class philosophy (exit cognitive needs)

Since his expatriation to Canada in 2007, Richard Florida published Who’s Your City with “all new Canadian content”; the book even includes a section entitled “The Geography of Happiness”. In another chapter entitled Beyond Maslow’s City, Richard Florida recasts Maslow’s psychological hierarchy of human needs. Maslow’s original theory and wording on human needs are as follows: (i) the aesthetic needs; (ii) the desires to know and to understand (items 1 and 2 refer to basic cognitive needs); (iii) self-actualization needs; (iv) esteem needs; (v) belongingness and love needs; (vi) safety needs (Maslow 1970:18-25). For Richard Florida however “what really matters to people
in the places they live” are, instead: physical and economic security, basic services, leadership, openness, aesthetics (Florida 2009:149). Further, in a short paper published by the Canadian Institute of Planners, Florida adds that “the only way to retain talent is to offer the kind of place that provides emotional attachment” (Florida 2010:15).

4.4 Grafting the creative class discourse

Since the 1930s, through the sixties, the eighties and to this day, the ‘cultural mosaic’ has been the emblem of Canada’s diversity in federal multiculturalism policies. Based on cultural identifiers, this descriptive assumption of the Canadian society had social class —groups enjoying unequal status and power— at the centre of its analysis. Nevertheless, all levels of government—federal, provincial and municipal— “have brought in policies [...] to encourage the active interplay of different groups, proclaiming it not only a moral imperative but also an economic opportunity” (Wood and Landry 2008:57). Meanwhile, the ‘creative class’ notion is an attempt to gel the public mind around the concept of prosperity and it can now be said that the government of Ontario and a number of cultural and municipal agencies use and promote such class discourse as well (Ontario in the Creative Age, Creative Cities Network). Florida’s remake of social class discourse moved along four paths since the mid-90s: (i) the use of institutional, official statistics and data toward preparing a class theory based on geographic representations, (ii) the addition of a media discourse layered over a university, scholarly discourse (scholarly material combined with social media), (iii) the use of self-medias toward the social construction of a class case statement, and (iv) the adoption of the media discourse by municipal authorities and government agencies and hence the institutionalisation of a class discourse by public authorities.

The institutionalisation of the class discourse in Canada began in 2007 when 60 million dollars in founding subsidies were granted to the Rotman School of Management (50M$) and the Martin Prosperity Institute (10M$):

> “The funding for this project has been assembled primarily from external sources including: the Government of Ontario ($ 50M) as announced in the 2007 Budget and a further $10M from other grants to the University; Joseph and Sandra Rotman ($ 2.8M) and U of T ($ 9M) from general revenues. A further $20M is intended to be raised through Advancement prior to commencement of the project.”

Less than two years into its activities, the Martin Prosperity Institute (MPI), lead by Richard Florida as director, had published a series of working papers and research notes under the Creative Ontario header (Ontario in the Creative Age). Many of the studies were designed ‘using the 3Ts of economic development and other borrowed expressions: “The Rise of the Service Class”, Ontario’s competitiveness performance, Toronto’s performance, Ottawa’s performance, Hamilton’s performance, Ontario’s mid-sized regions’ performance, Ontario’s small-sized regions’ performance; and studies entitled

---

“Talent, Technology and Tolerance in Canadian Regional Development”, “Evaluating Higher-Education Excellence Using the 3Ts”, etc., (by a host of authors).

The class issue conveyed by the theory is unresolved even where 38 million U.S. creative workers (or about 30 percent of the workforce) are promoted to dominant class status in society based on education and occupational characteristics. In America, the land of democracy, references to neatly outlined social classes remains uneasy. Nevertheless, researchers at the Survey Research Center (SRC, University of California at Berkeley) have isolated a number of subjective class or social rank identification factors: age, access to property (type of dwelling), and belonging to workers associations. The high level of generalization of the social stratification system proposed in Florida’s four classes theory (creative class, service class, working class and Fishing/Farming/Forestry—FFF) distributes “favorable self-images unequally throughout a population. To the extent that such favorable self-images are requisite to the development of the creative potential inherent in men, to that extent stratification systems function to limit the development of this creative potential” (Tumin 2006:114).

4.5 Class-grafted industrial sectors (Table 1)

In constructing the creative class theory using official statistics, urbanized societies are composed of three or four social classes based on occupation. In a 2009 working paper entitled Service Class Prosperity in Ontario, Cervenan (2009:39) shows the employment composition across industries in Ontario where only four subsectors are significantly dominated by the creative class: management of companies and enterprises, information and cultural industries, educational services, and professional, scientific and technical services. In actual fact, the creative class is spread across all industrial sectors, but in that particular presentation, it can be seen how the ‘creative class’ and the ‘service class’ actually make up what is often called the tertiary sector (the service industry) as opposed to the secondary sector (or manufacturing, transformation, processing), and the primary sector (farming, fishing, mine extraction, logging).

The creative class theory is based on a few privileged symbolic spaces within the tertiary sector which, in addition to the above (management, information, culture, education, professional services, science and technology), includes to a large extent health care and social assistance as well as finance and insurance. Indeed the overwhelming majority of the creative class are the creative professionals “who work in a wide range of knowledge-intensive industries such as high-tech sectors, financial services, the legal and healthcare professions, and business management” (Florida 2002:69).

It can be said that the creative class theory was born of the information industry and a recasting of classical and newer industrial activity sectors; indeed a number of economists add a fourth sector to the classic three: information sector or knowledge-based services, quaternary. Clearly, both the tertiary and quaternary sectors account for the largest block in the employment market, but it appears that Richard Florida broke down the tertiary industry into two distinct categories (Creative Class and Service Class instead of the Quaternary and Tertiary sectors), renamed the conventional industrial classification, and finally transformed industrial employment sectors into classes (Table 1).
In her post-industrial recasting of labour division, Cervenan (2009) refers to John Goldthorpe who, in 1982, had coined “service class” to designate the intermediate job classification strata in order to break away from “the basically dichotomous class structure proper to the capitalist economic system” (Goldthorpe 1982:162). A new service class, then, is wedged among the orthodox Marxist social class division, and it stems from “the expansion of higher-grade white collar employment” (ibid., p.164). The ‘new class’, i.e., professional, administrative and managerial employees, may de described as follows:

“this is a [middle] class whose economic basis lies in its ‘cultural capital’ — that is, in its members’ possession of relatively high levels of education and training — and whose interests can therefore be differentiated both from those of the owners of capital in the conventional sense and from those who have no more to offer on the market than their labour.” (Goldthorpe 1982:165)

If there is a common thread within the creative class theory in terms of human or occupational definition, it is the education level index. Indeed Glaeser (2005:596) reviewed Florida’s indexes (patents per capita, bohemian index, etc.) and found that holding a post-secondary degree is the most significant indicator for employment in any of the ‘super creative core’ sectors. Regardless of the bohemian index, Glaeser demonstrates that a qualified workforce in the key factor for regional development.

### 5. Conclusion

The creative class theory is a construct based on class rationale and boosted by media technologies freed from research standards and constraints whereby published contents

---

**Table 1 – Creative Class categories compared to conventional industrial sector classification.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative Class Theory (ref. Cervenan 2009)</th>
<th>Industrial Sectors of the Economy (conventional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Class (incl. Super Creative Core)</td>
<td>Quaternary Sector (knowledge-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% unionized (p.27)</td>
<td>intellectual activities: government, culture, libraries, research, education, information and communication, financial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% university attainment (p.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Class</td>
<td>Tertiary Sector (service sector or service industry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-paid service jobs, feminized, significantly part-time, low human capital, earns less than 60% of the average creative class income (p.3)</td>
<td>retail and wholesale, transportation, distribution, entertainment &amp; culture, restaurants, clerical services, media, tourism, insurance, banking, healthcare, law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% unionized (p.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% university attainment (p.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>Secondary Sector (manufacturing, production sector, light and heavy) metal working, smelting, automobile, textile, chemical industries, engineering, aerospace, energy &amp; utilities, breweries, bottlers, construction, and shipbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% unionized (p.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% university attainment (p.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF class</td>
<td>Primary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, forestry</td>
<td>agriculture, mining, forestry, farming, fishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are granted unprecedented visibility and proximity; the theory’s discourse on economy and management draws on institutionally conferred credibility. Richard Florida’s self-presentation on creativeclass.com is witness to the professor’s commitment toward the philosophy he salutes. The author has grown into a public figure and just because he has reconfigured his social status—from professor to media icon—his work cannot be assessed exclusively from the scholarly, ideological and methodological standpoints.

Before we even begin an examination of the creative class theory in the framework of urban and regional concerns, it is fitting that we ask ourselves whether a creative class exists in society and how the standard notion has turned out to be so totally depleted of meaning.

At the core Florida’s creative class theory is a shake-up of current industrial sector conventions layered onto geographic representations increasingly distant from the original billboard announcement. Yet the creative class concept as a social and intellectual phenomenon summons remedial social cohesion around worldwide political themes that can and must be addressed at the city level for efficiency: the energy crisis, environmental concerns, demographic issues including south-north population pressures, public health, cultural and religious antagonisms.

This n\textsuperscript{th} construct of a summittal social class nevertheless provides plenty of data in need of weighted interpretation and utters a resourceful discourse to which geographic factors provide higher visibility. A creative class may be rising, but at this stage the question would be Who’s Your Class and not Who’s Your City. Normally in cities and regions, location comes into play not in terms of social class but in terms of land use and occupation, of neighbourhoods, and of cultural, commercial, residential and industrial districts. Florida’s attempt at an anthology of collective being in the form of social classes based on occupation—whether downtown or in the suburbs—reactivates (i) a sense of place at the regional level for branding purposes, but more importantly it focuses on sectoral development policies, and in Canada the focus has been mainly on cultural aspects (Tremblay, R. and Tremblay, D.-G. 2010:5), i.e., diversity and not class.
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