

CESIS

Electronic Working Paper Series

Paper No. 79

**The Creative Class or Human Capital?
- explaining regional development in Sweden**

Charlotta Mellander^a and Richard Florida^b

January 2007

^a Jönköping International Business School (charlotta.mellander@jibs.se)

^b School of Public Policy, George Mason University (florida@gmu.edu)

The Creative Class or Human Capital?

Explaining Regional Development in Sweden

Charlotta Mellander
Richard Florida

Abstract

Human capital is observed to be an important contributor to growth but unevenly distributed geographically. While there is consensus on the importance of human capital to economic development, debate takes shape around two central issues. First, there is the question of how best to measure human capital. Second, there is debate over the factors that yield the geographic distribution of human capital in the first place. We find that occupational or “creative class” measures tend to outperform educational measures in accounting for regional development across our sample of Swedish regions. We also find that universities, amenities or service diversity, and openness and tolerance affect the distribution of human capital. A key finding is also that each of these factors is associated with a different type of human capital and thus they play complimentary roles in the geographic distribution of talent.

JEL: O3 R1 R2 J24

Keywords: Creative occupations, Human Capital, Technology, Economic Development

Mellander is a PhD candidate in Economics at Jönköping International Business School (charlotta.mellander@jibs.se). Florida is the Hirst Professor of Public Policy at George Mason University (florida@gmu.edu)

Introduction

The role of talent and creativity in economic development has been the subject of growing interest and growing debate among economists, economic geographers, regional scientists, and other social scientists. Solow (1957) noted the effect of technology on economic growth. Lucas (1988) identified the role of human capital externalities in economic development. More recent research (Glaeser et al 1995; Glaeser 1998, 1999, 2000; Simon 1998) has empirically verified Lucas' conjecture regarding the role of human capital in regional development and growth. Berry and Glaeser (2005) have documented the growing divergence of human capital levels across U.S. regions over the past several decades. Florida (2002a, b, c, 2005, 2006) has argued for the need to better understand the factors that both produce human capital and enables regions to attract it, suggesting that human capital operates less as a static endowment or stock and more as a dynamic flow.

While there is broad consensus on the importance of human capital to economic development, debate revolves around two key issues. The first is how best to measure and account for human capital. The conventional measure of human capital is based on educational attainment, usually the share of a population with a bachelor's degree and above. More recent research suggests it is more important to measure what people do than what they study, and so occupationally-based measures, associated with the knowledge-based or creative occupations, have been introduced (Florida 2002a; Markusen 2004, 2006). A recent study (Marlets and Van Woerken, 2004) found that occupational measures of the creative class significantly outperform conventional human capital measures in accounting for regional development in the Netherlands.

Second, there is debate over the factors that affect the geographic distribution of human capital and the creative class. At least three different theories have been offered. The first argues that universities play a key role in creating initial advantages in human capital, which becomes cumulative and self-reinforcing over time (Glaeser et al, 2005). The second argues that amenities play a role in attracting and retaining highly-educated, high-skill households (Glaeser 1993; Glaeser et al, 2001; Shapiro 2006; Clark 2003). The third theory argues that tolerance and openness to diversity are important (Florida 2002a, b, c). Our view is that these three approaches need not be seen as mutually exclusive. Each of these factors can play complimentary a role in the distribution of talent.

To shed light on these issues, we develop a general model of talent and regional development, and use structural equations and path analysis models

to examine the independent effects of human capital, the creative class, and technology on regional development. We examine the factors that shape the geographic distribution of human capital and the creative class across 81 Swedish regions.

The model enables us to do three things. First, it explicitly tests for the differential effects on development of educational versus occupational measure of human capital or talent. Second, the model includes technology, the Solow factor, alongside talent, enabling us to parse the differential effects of each on economic development. Third, it tests for the effects of regional cultural and institutional factors – amenities, universities, and openness – on talent and turn on economic development. Our dependent variable is regional wages and our independent variables include measures of technology, educational and occupational talent, university presence, amenities (proxied by the diversity of service firms), and tolerance.

Across our sample of Swedish regions, we find that creative class measures tend to outperform conventional educational measures in accounting for regional development. We also find that universities have the strongest effect on the distribution of talent, amenities (i.e. service diversity), and openness and tolerance also play a role in the distribution of specific types of human capital. We conclude that the three play complimentary roles in explaining the distribution of talent.

Theory and Concepts

The literature on economic development is vast. Solow (1957) noted the effect of technology on economic growth. Solow's model treated technology as exogenous and not effected by the marginal rate of substitution between capital and labor. Ullman (1958) noted the role of human capital in his work on regional development. Jacobs (1961, 1969) emphasized the role of cities and regions in the transfer and diffusion of knowledge; as the scale and diversity of cities increase, so do the connections between economic actors that result in the generation of new ideas and innovations. Andersson (1985a, b) explored the role of creativity in metropolitan regions for economic development. With a historical sweep reaching as far back as Athens, Rome, and Florence, he stressed the importance of knowledge, culture, communications, and creativity in regional prosperity. He also argued that tolerance plays a role in stimulating creativity in cities and regions. Romer's (1986, 1987, 1990) endogenous growth model connected technology to human capital, knowledge, and economic growth. Invention in the neoclassical framework is no longer exogenous, but a purposeful activity demanding real resources.

The endogenous growth model developed by Lucas (1988) further clarified the role of human capital externalities in economic development. Building on Jacobs' and Romer's work, Lucas (1988) highlighted the clustering effect of human capital, which now embodied the knowledge factor. He recognized the role of great cities, which localize human capital and information, create knowledge spillovers, and become engines of economic growth. Cities reduce the cost of knowledge transfer, so ideas move more quickly, in turn giving rise to new knowledge more quickly.

Research has empirically verified the role of human capital in regional growth. Barro (1991) confirmed the relation between human capital and growth on a national level. Glaeser (2000) provided empirical evidence on the correlation between human capital and regional economic growth. Firms locate in areas of high human capital concentration to gain competitive advantages, rather than letting suppliers' and customers' geography alone dictate their location. A vast economic research has also shown that human capital is becoming more concentrated (Florida 2002b; Berry and Glaeser 2005), and there are reasons to believe that this division will continue, affecting not only regional growth levels, but also housing markets (Shapiro 2005; Gyourko, Mayer, Sinai, 2006).

While there is broad consensus on the importance of human capital to economic development, the current debate revolves around two key issues. The first is how best to measure and account for human capital. The conventional measure of human capital is based on educational attainment – generally, the share of the population with a bachelor's degree and above. More recent research suggests it may be more important to measure what people do than what they study. Thus, occupationally based measures, associated principally with the knowledge-based or creative occupations, have been introduced (Florida 2002a; Markusen 2004, 2006). The educational attainment measure, it has been pointed out, leaves out a small but incredibly influential group of entrepreneurs, like Bill Gates or Michael Dell, who for various reasons did not go to or finish college. The educational attainment measure is also quite broad, and therefore does not allow for nations or regions to identify specific types of human capital or talent. A recent study (Marlets and Van Woerken, 2004) found that occupational measures of the creative class significantly outperform conventional human capital measures in accounting for regional development in the Netherlands.

Second, there is debate over the factors that affect the geographic distribution of human capital in the first place. Since we know that talent is associated with economic development, and we also know that talent is spread unevenly, it is important to understand the factors that account for this

varied geography. Most economists currently conceptualize human capital as a stock or endowment, which belongs to a place in the same way that a natural resource might. But the reality is that human capital is a *flow*, a highly mobile factor that can and does relocate. The key question then becomes: What factors shape this flow and determine the divergent levels of human capital across regions?

Three different answers to that question have been offered. The first approach, offered by Glaeser and his collaborators (2005), is that human capital builds off itself. Places with an initial advantage tend to build on and gain from that advantage. The presence of major research universities has been found to be a key factor in this set of initial advantages as well in both the production and distribution of human capital.

Yet, the distribution of talent is not coincident with the distribution of universities. While some regions with great universities have large concentrations of talent, others operate mainly in the production of human capital, serving as “talent factories” which “export” highly educated people to other regions (Florida et al 2006). Florida (2005) has argued that the geographic connection from education to innovation and economic outcomes *in that same locale* may no longer hold. This is a result of the incredible mobility of highly-skilled and educated people within countries and even across borders. However good a region’s educational system might be, it is no guarantee it can hold on to its talent. We suggest that the university can be thought of as a necessary but insufficient condition for talent concentration.

The second approach argues that the distribution of talent is affected by the distribution of amenities. Roback (1982) expanded the traditional neoclassical model, where migration occurs in response to wage levels, economic opportunity, and land rent to include quality-of-life amenities. Glaeser, Kolko and Saiz (2001) found that consumer and personal service industries such as restaurants, theatres, and museums tend to be localized and thus demand geographical closeness between producer and consumer. Lloyd and Clark (2001) as well as Florida (2002a, 2002b, 2002c) stressed the role of lifestyle – in the form of entertainment, nightlife, culture, and so on – in attracting talent. Florida (2002c) introduced a measure of the producers of artistic and cultural amenities, the “bohemian index,” and found it to be associated with concentrations of talent and innovation. Shapiro’s (2006) detailed study of regional productivity growth found that “roughly 60 percent of the employment growth effect of college graduates is due to enhanced productivity growth, the rest being caused by growth in quality of life”.

The third approach argues that tolerance and openness to diversity affect the level and geographic distribution of human capital. Jacobs (1961) and Quigley (1998) have argued that firm-based diversity is associated with economic growth, but Jacobs also argued that diversity of individuals is important as well. Recent research has focused on the role of demographic diversity in economic growth. Ottaviano and Peri (2005) show how diversity among individuals, in the form of immigrants, increases regional productivity. Immigrants have complimentary skills to native born not because they perform different tasks, but also because they bring different skills to the same task. A Chinese cook and an Italian cook will not provide the same service nor good; neither will a German-trained physicist substitute perfectly for a U.S.-trained one. Noland (2005) found that tolerant attitudes toward gay and lesbians are associated with both positive attitudes toward global economic activity and international financial outcomes. In light of the results of his World Values Survey examines the relationship between cultural attitudes and economic development, Inglehart (2003, 2005) has said that openness toward to gay and lesbian population is the best indicator of the general tolerance of nations. Florida and Gates (2001) found a positive association between concentrations of gay households and regional development.

Page (2007) provides the basis for a general economic theory of human diversity and economic outcomes. He finds that not only does cognitive diversity lead to better decision-making but that it is associated with identity diversity, the diversity of people and groups, which enable new perspectives. Diversity broadly construed, he finds, is associated with higher rates of innovation and growth. Florida (2002) has argued that tolerance – specifically “low barriers to entry” for individuals – is associated with geographic concentrations of talent, higher rates of innovation, and regional development. The more open a place is to new ideas and new people – in other words, the lower its entry barriers for human capital – the more talent it will likely capture.

It is important to point out that these three institutional and cultural factors need not operate exclusively or in competition with each other. Rather, we suggest that they are likely to have complementary effects on the geographic distribution of talent. Such cultural and institutional factors may also act on regional economic development directly, as well as indirectly, via their effects on the level of human capital.

Model, variables, and methods

A schematic picture of our general model of talent, creativity, and regional development is provided in Fig.1. The model allows us to accomplish two useful analyses. First, it enables us to test conventional human capital measurements against occupational or creative class definitions simply by running the model with these differing definitions of talent. Second, it allows us to isolate the independent effects of talent and technology—Lucas versus Solow, if you will. The model also enables identification of regional cultural and institutional factors – namely, the university, amenities and service diversity, and tolerance – as they affect the geographic distribution of talent in the first place. The arrows identify the hypothesized structure of relationships among the key variables.




Figure 1: Model of key regional development paths

Variables

We now describe the variables in the empirical model. The variables cover all 81 Swedish labor market areas, and are for the time period 2003 (except for the tolerance variable, from 2006). Descriptive statistics for all measures and variables are provided in Table 1.

Dependent variable: regional development

The dependent variable in the model is a measure of wages per capita. While some use population or job growth as measures of development, those measures fail to control for the quality of development. Not all jobs are created equal; some pay a good deal more than others. Regions increasingly specialize in different kinds of economic activity, and therefore different kinds of jobs (Markusen 2004, 2006). By regional development, we mean the overall

level of development and living standards of a region. While wages is not a perfect measure of overall living standards, it is a reasonable proxy for regional development.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
University	81	0.31	0.465	0	1
Tolerance	81	2.4363	0.385	1.73	3.39
Service Diversity	81	159.14	48.936	56	259
<i>Talent:</i>					
BA or above	81	0.1682	0.055	0.08	0.38
Supercreative	81	0.1041	0.023	0.07	0.17
Creative	81	0.1976	0.035	0.13	0.31
<i>Professionals</i>					
Creative class	81	0.3018	0.053	0.20	0.48
<i>Decomposed supercreative:</i>					
Computer/ math	81	0.014	0.011	0.019	0.053
Arch/ engineering	81	0.007	0.006	0.000	0.029
Science	81	0.003	0.002	0.000	0.016
Education	81	0.073	0.011	0.057	0.119
Arts/ design/ media	81	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.023
Narrow super- creative class	81	0.031	0.019	0.006	0.105
Technology	81	0.621	0.256	0.023	1.67
Regional development (wages per capita)	81	90.351	13.391	60.606	138.635

Independent Variables

Talent

As noted above, there are two alternative measures of talent or human capital. The first is the conventional measure based on educational attainment, measured as the percentage of a population with a bachelor’s degree and above. The second is an occupationally-based measure of the creative class. Several studies have shown the efficacy of this occupationally based measure (Markusen 2004, 2006; Marlets and van Woorken, 2004).

Florida (2002a) defines the creative class to include occupations in which individuals “engage in complex problem solving that involves a great deal of independent judgment and requires high levels of education or human capital.” This includes a “super-creative core” – composed of computer and math occupations; architecture and engineering; life, physical, and social

science; education, training, and library positions; arts and design work; and entertainment, sports, and media occupations – as well as other “creative professionals,” akin to classical knowledge workers, including management occupations, business and financial operations, legal positions, healthcare practitioners, technical occupations, and high-end sales and sales management. We employ both the standard definition of the super-creative core and a narrow definition which excludes educational occupations. We also decompose the super-creative core to isolate the independent effects of its five sub-groups on regional development and to identify the factors that affect their concentrations. All talent variables are measured as shares of the regional labor force (population age 16-64). The measures are based on 2003 education and occupation data from Statistics Sweden.

Technology

We include a technology variable to account for the independent effects of technology on regional development. The measure is a location quotient that takes into account the technology industry national share and its relation to the technology industry regional share. This is based on 2003 establishment industry data from Statistics Sweden.

Regional Institutional and cultural factors

The distribution human capital and the creative class has been found to be associated with universities, tolerance, and amenities or service diversity. We include measures of all three variables in our model and analysis.

Universities: Swedish universities often have small branches in other nearby regions To exclude those the university measure is a dummy variable equal to 1 (otherwise 0) if the number of university teachers is 100 or more, in order to capture if there is an existing regional university with a size large enough to influence. The measure is based on 2003 occupational data from Statistics Sweden.

Amenities and service diversity: Getting systematic measures of cultural and recreational amenities, as the literature has noted (see esp. Florida 2002a) is fraught with problems, so here we follow Glaser, Kolko and Saiz (2001) and utilize the diversity of consumer and personal service firms as a proxy measure for amenities. Regions that offer a greater array of services have more to offer diverse groups of people. This variable is operationalized as the number of service industry codes represented within the local labor market that could be regarded as attractive to consumers. It is based on 2003 industry data from Statistics Sweden.

Tolerance/ Diversity: Diversity has been found to impact economic development in two ways. As noted above, we utilize a measure of service diversity to capture firm-based diversity (Jacobs 1961; Quigley 1998). There is also the effect of individual-level diversity. Immigration is a commonly used measure of diversity. But Sweden has a much lower level of immigration than countries like U.S. and Canada where there is also more variance in the concentration of immigrants across regions. Following Inglehart's (1989, 1997, 2003, 2005) finding that openness toward the gay and lesbian population is the best available indicator of tolerant attitudes currently available, we use a measure of attitudes toward gays and lesbians to capture tolerance and openness to diversity. In line with this, we argue that diversity within regions – in this case, the concentration of gay and lesbian households – creates a more open-minded and tolerant cultural, social, and economic milieu. Multiple perspectives and different kinds of people are more likely to flourish in such places, thus affecting both the geographic distribution of talent and also technology and regional development outcomes more directly.

Our tolerance measure is based on an index published by the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights which ranks Swedish municipalities. Since we use the local labor market level, we take the maximum municipality ranking within each region.

Methods

We use path analysis and structural equations to examine the relationships between variables in the model. In order to analyze the dynamics between this set of variables adequately structural equation modeling is used. Structural equation models (SEM) may be thought of as an extension of regression analysis and factor analysis, expressing the interrelationship between variables through a set of linear relationships, based upon their variances and covariances. In other words, structural equation replaces a (usually large) set of observable variables with a small set of unobservable factor constructs, thus minimizing the problem of multicollinearity (further technical description in Jöreskog, 1973). The parameters of the equations are estimated by the maximum likelihood method.

It is important to stress that the graphic picture of the structural model (Fig.1) expresses direct and indirect correlations, not actual causalities. Rather, the estimated parameters (path coefficients) provide information of the relation between the set of variables. Moreover, the relative importance of the parameters is expressed by the standardized path coefficients, which allow for interpretation of the direct as well as the indirect effects. We do not assume

any causality among university, tolerance and service diversity but rather treat them as correlations.

From the relationships depicted in the model (Fig.1) we estimate three equations:

$$Talent = \beta_{11}University + \beta_{12}ServiceDiversity + \beta_{13}Tolerance + e_3 \quad (1)$$

$$Technology = \beta_{21}Universities + \beta_{24}Talent + e_2 \quad (2)$$

$$RegionalGrowth = \beta_{31}University + \beta_{34}Talent + \beta_{35}Technology + e_1 \quad (3)$$

Findings

We begin by providing a general picture of the geographic distribution of technology, talent, creativity, and other economic, social, and cultural resources in Sweden. We then turn to the results of the path analysis and structural equations models.

Table 2 shows the regional distribution of population, technology, human capital, and various measures of the creative class for leading Swedish regions. (Concentrations for all occupational groups and regions are included in Appendix 1). Stockholm, home to roughly 22 percent of the Swedish population, accounts for 28 percent of wages, 30 percent of human capital and the national creative class, and 41 percent of technology. The top three regions account for 39 percent of the population, but roughly 46 percent of wages, 50 percent of the creative class, 52 percent of human capital, and 59 percent of technology.

Table 2: Regional distribution of key resources

	<i>Population</i>	<i>Wages</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Human Capital</i>	<i>Super-creative</i>	<i>Creative Class</i>
Stockholm	21.5	27.7	41.2	30.3	30.2	30.0
Gothenburg	10.3	11.0	11.7	12.5	11.8	11.6
Malmö	7.3	6.9	7.5	9.1	7.9	7.4
Helsingborg	3.4	2.9	2.1	2.7	2.5	2.7
Uppsala	3.2	2.8	3.1	4.6	3.6	3.1
Linköping	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.9	3.1	2.7
Örebro	2.5	2.2	1.5	2.1	2.1	2.2
Uddevalla	2.3	2.0	1	1.6	1.6	1.8
Skövde	2	1.7	1	1.3	1.4	1.5
Västerås	2	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9
<i>Sum</i>	<i>57.2</i>	<i>61.7</i>	<i>73.5</i>	<i>68.8</i>	<i>66.1</i>	<i>64.9</i>
Σ Others (N=71)	42.8	38.3	26.5	31.2	33.9	35.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Figures 1 and 2 shed further light on the uneven distribution of key factors, providing maps of the regional concentration of wages and technology firms.




Figure 1: Regional distribution of wages




Figure 2: Regional distribution of technology firms

Table 3 is a correlation matrix for the major variables. There are significant correlations among human capital, the creative class, technology, and regional development (measured as wages). The correlation between the creative class and regional development (.703) is considerably higher than that between human capital and regional development (.420). The correlation between the creative class and technology (.764) is also higher than that between human capital and technology (.655).

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

	<i>University</i>	<i>Tolerance</i>	<i>Service Diversity</i>	<i>Human Capital</i>	<i>Creative Class</i>	<i>Super-creatives</i>	<i>Technology</i>
<i>University</i>	1						
<i>Tolerance</i>	0.629**	1					
<i>Service Diversity</i>	0.760**	0.726**	1				
<i>Human Capital</i>	0.705**	0.637**	0.701**	1			
<i>Creative Class</i>	0.745**	0.649**	0.811**	0.822**	1		
<i>Super-creative</i>	0.674**	0.494**	0.615**	0.830**	0.88**	1	
<i>Technology</i>	0.598**	0.464**	0.526**	0.655**	0.764**	0.72**	1
<i>Regional development (wages)</i>	0.551**	0.501**	0.730**	0.420**	0.703**	0.448**	0.574**

Figure 4 provides scatter-graphs which further compare the efficacy of the creative class and conventional human capital measures. The scatter-plots

chart the relationship between these two talent measures and two key variables – technology and regional development.




Figure 4: Human capital versus the creative class

The regression line for the creative class is clearly steeper, and there are fewer outliers. The same pattern holds for the relationship between it and technology. Nearly all of the regions with higher shares of creative class employment also have higher than predicted location quotients for technology. This is not the case for human capital, where the three top regions actually fall below the predicted value. The creative class measure, according to these analyses and the correlation matrix, outperform the conventional human capital measures in accounting for both technology and regional development.

Results from path analysis and structural equations models

To further gauge the differential effects of human capital and the creative class on regional development observe the results of the path analysis and structural equations models. We begin the model for conventional human capital and follow with the model for the creative class. We then introduce models for two definitions of the super-creative core and additional models for the key occupations that make up the super-creative core: computer and math; scientific occupations; engineering; education; and arts, design and entertainment. The models examine the effects of the various measures of talent on technology and regional development and also isolate the effects of three key factors – universities, service diversity, and tolerance – on the level and geographic distribution of talent.

A path analysis is provided for each definition of talent based on the standardized β -coefficients. This standardized coefficient is based upon the regression where all the variables in the regression have been standardized first by subtracting each variable's mean and dividing it by the standard deviation associated by each variable. This coefficient can be used to analyze the relative importance of the explanatory variables in relation to the dependent variable. Also, the other structural equation results are reported for.

Human Capital (BA university degree or more)




Figure 5: Path analysis for human capital

We begin with the findings for the model based on the conventional measure of human capital (share of the population with a bachelor's degree). As Figure 5 and Table 4 show, conventional human capital does not have a direct effect on regional development; the coefficient is negative and non-

significant. Instead, conventional human capital works indirectly through its interaction with technology. The coefficient between technology and regional development is positive and significant, as is the coefficient between conventional human capital and technology. In other words, human capital works in combination and through technology to affect regional development.

Turning next to the factors associated with concentrations of conventional human capital, our findings indicate that the university plays the strongest role. In fact, the university tends to play a strong role across the board in this model, with coefficients that are positively and significantly related to technology and regional development as well as to human capital. The coefficients for service diversity and tolerance are also both positively and significantly related to human capital.

Table 4: Results for human capital model

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	4.341*** (0.001)	0.149** (0.019)	11.272*** (0.002)
Tolerance	2.991** (0.049)		
Service Diversity	0.030** (0.036)		
Talent		0.022*** (0.000)	-0.337 (0.301)
Technology			22.532*** (0.000)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.581	0.466	0.405

Creative Class

Arguments have been proposed that favor education to occupation in order to explain growth. Do they have the same effect and do they play the same role within this economic eco-system? Figure 6 plots the relationship between human capital and the creative class.




Figure 6: Creative class versus human capital

While the two measures tend to correlate closely in regions with lower shares, they diverge in regions with higher levels. In these cases, a higher share of human capital does not necessarily imply a larger share of creative occupations.




Figure 7: Path analysis for creative class

The coefficient between the creative class and regional development is positive and significant, as Figure 7 and Table 5 show. This stands in contrast to the result for conventional human capital. The coefficient for the creative class is also positively and significantly associated with technology. Technology is not associated with regional development. The creative class acts directly on both technology and on regional development.

Looking at the factors that are associated with the creative class, the coefficients for the university and service diversity are positive and significant, while the coefficient for tolerance is not. The university no longer plays a direct effect on either technology or regional development as that effect is apparently picked up by the creative class.

Table 5: Results for creative class model

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	3.273*** (0.003)	0.036 (0.549)	1.653 (0.629)
Tolerance	1.097 (0.376)		
Service Diversity	0.058*** (0.000)		
Talent		0.036*** (0.000)	1.511*** (0.000)
Technology			4.434 (0.491)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.699	0.586	0.499

Creative Professionals

We now look at the findings for sub-components of the creative class. Let's start with creative professionals who include occupations spanning finance, health-care, law, and education.




Figure 8: Creative Professionals and regional development

Figure 8 plots the relationship between the group of creative professionals and regional development, showing a clear, linear relationship with very few outliers.




Figure 9: Path analysis for creative professionals

As Figure 9 and Table 6 show, creative professionals, like the creative class more generally, have a direct effect on both technology and regional development. Neither technology nor the university has a direct effect on regional development. Service diversity is the only factor that is positively and significantly associated with the level and distribution of creative professionals.

Table 6: Results for creative professionals' model

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.918 (0.188)	0.122** (0.043)	0.096 (0.973)
Tolerance	0.965 (0.224)		
Service Diversity	0.047*** (0.000)		
Talent		0.040*** (0.000)	2.847*** (0.000)
Technology			3.207 (0.539)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.713	0.508	0.610

Super-creatives

The super-creative core, composed of scientists and technologists, artists, designers and entertainers, has been seen as defining the innovative cutting-edge of capitalism. Figure 10 plots the relationship between super-creatives and regional development. The relationship between super-creatives and regional development is not as clear as for creative professionals and development. The observations are not so closely clustered around the regression line; outliers are far more numerous.




Figure 10: Super-creatives and regional development




Figure 11: Path analysis for super-creative core

As Figure 11 and Table 7 show, the coefficient between the super-creative core and regional development is negative and insignificant, while the coefficient between it and technology is positive and significant. Thus, like conventional human capital, the effect of the super-creative core on regional development appears to occur indirectly through its interaction with technology. Also as in the model for conventional human capital, the university plays an important role being positively and significantly related to technology and regional development as well as to the super-creative core. The coefficients between the super-creative core and tolerance and service diversity are insignificant. All in all, the university plays a sizeable role in this model.

Table 7: Results for Super-creative core

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	2.356*** (0.000)	0.113** (0.045)	10.568*** (0.002)
Tolerance	0.132 (0.851)		
Service Diversity	0.011 (0.106)		
Talent		0.066*** (0.000)	-0.671 (0.414)
Technology			22.837*** (0.000)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.479	0.542	0.402

Dimensions of the super-creative core

The super-creative core is composed of distinct subgroups, some of whom – engineers and computer and math professionals, for example – may be thought of as more closely linked to technology and regional development. We ran models for each of the five major sub-groups that compose the super-creative core: computer and math, the sciences, engineering, education, and the arts and summarize the key findings below.

Education-related occupations




Figure 12: Path analysis for education-related occupations

Figure 12 and Table 8 present the findings for the education sub-group. The coefficient between it and technology is insignificant. The coefficient between it and regional development is negative and significant. The education occupations thus appear to have a negative effect on regional development. Even though a large share of this group is primary and secondary-level teachers, this finding is interesting, as it stands in contrast to a great deal of the conventional wisdom on the relationship between education, innovation, and economic growth.

In the main, it is assumed that innovation and economic growth require strong educational systems. The conventional wisdom implies that strong education is a prerequisite of robust innovation and economic growth. But Florida (2005) has shown that the mobility of human capital has broken the connection between regional education and regional development at least to some degree. Furthermore, since education is a public good in Sweden, the distribution of these occupations is relatively uniform. In fact, Swedish regions with lower levels of regional development, education-related are




Figure 14: Path analysis for super-creative core (without education-related occupations)

Figure 14 and Table 9 summarize the key findings here. The coefficients for this redefined super-creative core are now positively and significantly associated with both technology and regional development. This is a considerable change from the model for the original definition of the super-creative core where the coefficient for it and regional development was insignificant. The refined super-creative core also appears to now overwhelm both university and technology variables in relation to regional development. Looking at the factors associated with the distribution of the super-creative core, service diversity now plays a considerable role alongside the university.

Table 9: Results for super-creative core without education

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.011** (0.017)	0.096**** (0.069)	4.799 (0.128)
Tolerance	0.003 (0.788)		
Service Diversity	0.000*** (0.000)		
Talent		8.690*** (0.000)	3.430*** (0.000)
Technology			5.714 (0.385)
Obs	81	81	81
R2	0.537	0.588	0.481

Computer and math occupations




Figure 15: Path analysis for computer and math occupations

Computer and math occupations are thought to have a strong direct connection to innovation and economic growth. But as Figure 15 and Table 10 show, the findings indicate that their effect on growth is indirect, operating through technology. The coefficient for computer and math occupations and regional development is insignificant, while the coefficient between them and technology is positive and significant. The university plays a considerable role in this overall model, being positively and significantly related to regional development and technology, as well as to computer and math occupations.

Table 10: Results for computer and math occupations

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.661* (0.061)	0.235*** (0.000)	8.741*** (0.006)
Tolerance	-0.018 (0.965)		
Service Diversity	0.005 (0.191)		
Talent		0.090*** (0.000)	1.448 (0.278)
Technology			17.099*** (0.006)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.229	0.469	0.406

Scientific occupations




Figure 16: Path analysis for life, physical and social science occupations

It is also often argued that scientific occupations are key contributors to technological innovation and economic growth. Figure 16 and Table 11 show the findings for the scientific occupations encompassing the physical, life and social sciences. The coefficient between scientific occupations and regional development is insignificant. Yet again, the effects of these occupations on development appear to work indirectly via technology. The coefficient between the scientific occupations and technology is positive and significant. In this model, the university again plays an important role in technology and regional development, though it is not associated with these occupations directly. Service diversity is the only regional factor significantly explaining it.

Table 11: Results for scientific occupations

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.065 (0.329)	0.237*** (0.000)	7.890** (0.016)
Tolerance	0.086 (0.259)		
Service Diversity	0.002*** (0.003)		
Talent		0.330*** (0.003)	8.088 (0.193)
Technology			17.485*** (0.003)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.427	0.421	0.409

Engineering and architecture




Figure 17: Path analysis for architecture and engineering occupations

Engineering has long been seen as a very important source of technological innovation and economic growth. Not surprisingly, engineering and architecture occupations are positively and significantly associated with both technology and regional development, as Figure 17 and Table 12 show. Service diversity is a main factor associated with the concentration of these occupations. The university plays a role in this model being positively and significantly associated with both technology and also to some extent related to regional development. Surprisingly, it is not associated with clusters of engineering-related occupations.

Table 12: Results for engineering and architecture occupations

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.268 (0.123)	0.160*** (0.002)	5.321* (0.073)
Tolerance	-0.053 (0.788)		
Service Diversity	0.007*** (0.000)		
Talent		0.207*** (0.000)	10.184*** (0.000)
Technology			6.754 (0.259)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.477	0.529	0.508

Arts, design and entertainment




Figure 18: Path analysis for arts/ design/ entertainment occupations

Artistic and cultural occupations are typically thought of as consumers, as opposed to producers, of resources. Our findings for arts, design, entertainment, and media occupations confound this conventional wisdom, as Figure 18 and Table 13 show. The coefficients for arts-related occupations are positively and significantly related to both technology and to regional development. Its effects on these two factors are roughly as significant as for the engineering-related occupations – and more significant than for the math, computer, and scientific occupations. Also of interest are the factors that are associated with the level and geographic distribution of the artistic occupations. The university no longer plays a significant role. Here, the largest standardized coefficients are tolerance and service diversity, both significant and approximately on the same level.

Table 13: Arts, design, and entertainment occupations

	<i>Talent</i>	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Regional Development</i>
Variables	Eq 1	Eq 2	Eq 3
University	0.131 (0.114)	0.161*** (0.006)	3.468 (0.262)
Tolerance	0.303*** (0.001)		
Service Diversity	0.003*** (0.005)		
Talent		0.342*** (0.000)	19.414*** (0.000)
Technology			8.723 (0.124)
Observations	81	81	81
R2	0.602	0.484	0.516

Conclusion

Our research has examined the role of talent and creativity in regional development. We advanced a general model for regional development where regional institutional and cultural factors affect the distribution of human capital and the creative class, and where the concentration of talent in turn affects technology and regional development. We ran the model for several definitions of human capital and the creative class, using path analysis and structural equations models to focus on two issues of considerable importance.

First, we compared the performance of occupational measures like the creative class, super-creative core, and others against more conventional educational attainment measures in accounting for regional development. Our overall findings indicate that creative class measures outperform the conventional educational attainment measure, at least in the case of Sweden. They also indicate that occupations in the arts and culture, which have not typically been associated with regional development, play a significant direct role in the process. We should note that our overall findings are in line with those of Marlets and Van Woerken (2004), who suggest that such occupational measures may well set a “new standard” for measuring human capital and at minimum deserve more attention in empirical studies of regional and cross-national development.

Second, we examined three factors that have been seen to affect the distribution of human capital and the creative class: universities, amenities (i.e service diversity), and tolerance. Generally speaking, our findings indicate

that the university plays the most important role across the board, being significant in many versions of the model. This is in line with the findings by Berry and Glaeser (2005) and Florida (2006). The university plays a significant direct role in technology and regional development in several versions of the model as well. This suggests that the university is a central hub institution of the talent-driven creative economy, and crucial to talent, technology, and regional development.

Our research further suggests that service diversity and tolerance also play significant roles in the geographic distribution of talent. Service diversity is significantly related to the distribution of conventional human capital, the creative class, creative professionals, and several permutations of the super-creative core. Tolerance is significantly related to conventional human capital as well as to arts, design, and entertainment occupations. It is important to point out that all three regional attraction factors are correlated strongly with one another. Consequently, we suggest that these factors do not operate in competition with one another, but tend to attract or affect different types of talent. They can be thus said to play complementary roles in the geographic distribution of talent.

Generally speaking, these findings suggest that the structure of relationships between the above factors, talent, and regional development is more complicated and differentiated than previous approaches have allowed. We look to future research on Sweden, the United States, and other countries to advance our understanding of how these factors and mechanisms work to condition economic development and living standards in regions and nations across the globe.

References

- Andersson, Å. E. 1985a. Creativity and Regional Development. *Papers of the Regional Science Association*. 56:5-20.
- Andersson, Å. E. 1985b. *Creativity – The Future of Metropolitan Regions*. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Barro, R. J. 1991. Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 106(2): 407-443.
- Berry, C. R., Glaeser, E. L. 2005. The Divergence of Human Capital Levels Across Cities. NBER Working Paper No. 11617. September 2005.
- Clark, T. N., Lloyd, R., Wong, K. K., Jain, P. 2002. Amenities Drive Urban Growth. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 24:5: 493-515.
- Clark, T. N. 2003. Urban Amenities: Lakes, Opera and Juice Bars Do They Drive Development? In: *The City as an Entertainment Machine*. Research in Urban Policy. Volume 9: 103-140. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Florida, R., Gates, G. 2001. *Technology and Tolerance – The Importance of Diversity to High-Technology Growth*, Urban Institute, June 01
- Florida, R. 2002a. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Florida, R. 2002b. The Economic Geography of Talent. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 92(4): 743-755.
- Florida, R. 2002c. Bohemia and economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*. 2: 55-71.
- Florida, R. 2004. Response to Edward Glaeser's review of *The Rise of the Creative Class*.
<http://www.creativeclass.org/acrobat/ResponsetoGlaeser.pdf>
- Florida, R. 2005. *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.
- Florida, R., Gates, G., Knudsen, B., Stolarick, K. 2006. The University and the Creative Economy.
<http://www.creativeclass.org/rfcgdb/articles/University%20For%20City%20and%20Community%204.pdf>

- Florida, R. 2006. Where the brains are. *The Atlantic Monthly*. 298(3):34
- Glaeser, E. L. 1994. Cities, Information, and Economic Growth. *Cityscape*. 1(1): 9-47
- Glaeser, E. L. 1998. Are cities dying? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 12:139-160
- Glaeser, E. L. 1999. *The future of urban research: Non-market interactions*. Washington, DC. Brookings Institute.
- Glaeser, E. L. 2000. The new economics of urban and regional growth. In *The Oxford handbook of economic geography*, ed Gordon, C., Meric, G., Feldman, M. 83-98, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glaeser, E. L. 2000b. Cities and Ethics: An Essay for Jane Jacobs . *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 22:4: 473-494.
- Glaeser, E. L., Kolko, J., Saiz, A. 2001. Consumer City. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 1:27-50.
- Glaeser, E. L. 2004. Book Review of Richard Florida's "The Rise of the Creative Class", http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/glaeser/papers/Review_Florida.pdf
- Gyourko, J., Mayer, C., Sinai, T. 2006. Superstar Cities. NBER Working Paper No 12355. July 2006.
- Inglehart, R. 1989. *Culture Shifts in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernization and Post-Modernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R., Baker, W. 2000. Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*. 65:19-51
- Inglehart, R., Norris, P. 2003. *Rising Tide*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Inglehart, R., Welzel, C. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, J. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York: Random House.
- Jacobs, J. 1969. *The Economies of Cities*, New York: Random House.
- Jöreskog, K.G. 1973. Analysis of covariance structures. in *Multivariate analysis* vol III. ed Krishnaiah. P.R. New York: Academic Press.
- Kotkin, J. 2000. *The new geography*. New York: Random House.
- Lloyd, R. Clark, T. N. 2001. The city as an entertainment machine. In Research in urban sociology. vol 6, *Critical perspectives on urban redevelopment*, ed Fox Gotham, K. 357-78. Oxford: JAI/Elsevier.
- Lucas, R. 1988. On the Mechanics of Economic Development. *Journal of Monetary Economics*. 22: 3-42.
- Markusen, A. 2004. Targeting Occupations in Regional and Community Economic Development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 70(3): 253-268
- Markusen, A. Barbour, E. 2006. Regional Occupational and Industrial Structure: Does One Imply the Other? *International Regional Science Review*. forthcoming
- Marlet, G. van Woerkens, C. 2004. *Skills and Creativity in a Cross-section of Dutch Cities*. Discussion Paper Series 04-29, Tjalling C. Koopmans Research Institute.
- Noland, M. 2005. Popular Attitudes, Globalization and Risk. *International Finance*. 8(2):199-229
- Ottaviano, G. I. P., Peri, G. 2005. Cities and Culture. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 58:304-337
- Page, S. 2007. *The Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. forthcoming
- Quigley, J. M. 1998. Urban Diversity and Economic Growth. *Journal of Economic Perspective*, 12: 127-138

- Roback, J. 1982. Wages, Rents, and the Quality of Life. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 90:6: 1257-1278.
- Romer, P. M. 1986. Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy*. 90 (October): 1002-37.
- Romer, P. M. 1987. Crazy explanations of the productivity slowdown. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*. 2: 163-202.
- Romer, P. M. 1990. Endogenous technical change. *Journal of Political Economy*. 98(5): S71-S102.
- Shapiro, J. M. 2006. Smart Cities: Quality of Life, Productivity, and the Growth Effects of Human Capital. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. vol 88(2): 324-335.
- Simon, C. 1998. Human capital and metropolitan employment growth. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 43:223-43
- Solow, R. 1956. A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 70: 65-94.
- Ullman, E. L. 1958. Regional development and the geography of concentration. *Papers and proceedings of the Regional Science Association*. 4:179-98

Appendix 1: Occupational concentrations in all Swedish regions

	<i>BA and above</i>	<i>Total Creative Class</i>	<i>Creative Professionals</i>	<i>Super-creatives</i>	<i>Education Training Library</i>	<i>Computer Math</i>	<i>Life Physical and Social Science</i>	<i>Achitecture Engineering</i>	<i>Art Design etc</i>	<i>Population</i>
Stockholm	30,33	29,99	29,89	30,18	20,99	46,00	28,13	34,86	42,53	21,50
Göteborg	12,46	11,62	11,52	11,81	10,41	12,19	13,98	18,21	10,81	10,30
Malmö	9,06	7,41	7,16	7,88	7,91	6,68	10,51	9,24	7,57	7,26
Helsingborg	2,68	2,75	2,91	2,46	2,85	1,73	2,23	1,90	2,49	3,41
Uppsala	4,62	3,07	2,76	3,65	4,14	2,47	9,24	2,48	2,47	3,20
Linköping	2,90	2,69	2,49	3,06	2,94	2,73	3,98	5,07	1,59	2,71
Örebro	2,05	2,17	2,21	2,09	2,60	1,44	2,16	1,18	1,68	2,45
Uddevalla	1,57	1,85	1,97	1,63	2,09	,87	1,56	1,16	1,19	2,26
Västerås	1,79	1,92	1,94	1,87	1,87	1,58	1,88	2,87	1,38	1,97
Skövde	1,30	1,46	1,49	1,42	1,97	,72	1,15	,50	1,00	1,97
Karlstad	1,60	1,66	1,66	1,68	1,89	1,54	1,30	1,36	1,31	1,74
Jönköping	1,43	1,66	1,72	1,53	1,83	1,17	1,21	1,09	1,26	1,66
Norrköping	1,36	1,61	1,62	1,59	1,82	1,05	1,65	1,66	1,36	1,86
Gävle	1,25	1,52	1,52	1,52	1,79	1,21	,91	1,36	1,15	1,71
Sundsvall	1,33	1,63	1,65	1,61	1,59	2,16	1,29	1,06	1,37	1,64
Borås	1,16	1,55	1,64	1,38	1,69	,87	,97	,82	1,59	1,79
Kristianstad	1,38	1,40	1,42	1,35	1,81	,72	,95	,91	,84	1,86
Luleå	1,63	1,57	1,49	1,71	2,01	1,28	1,11	1,57	1,46	1,67
Falun	1,35	1,49	1,50	1,47	1,67	1,11	1,20	1,27	1,47	1,66
Umeå	2,20	1,64	1,48	1,93	2,38	1,20	2,41	1,11	1,55	1,56
Växjö	1,20	1,32	1,33	1,29	1,47	1,09	,82	,78	1,47	1,40
Kalmar	1,11	1,10	1,10	1,10	1,42	,68	,76	,59	,97	1,36
Halmstad	1,09	1,06	1,13	,93	1,21	,41	,76	,64	,89	1,34
Karlskrona	,93	,89	,89	,88	,93	,80	,47	1,05	,71	,99
Östersund	,92	,96	,99	,92	1,12	,80	,74	,29	,87	1,04
Eskilstuna	,71	,87	,89	,83	,96	,75	,59	,56	,68	1,01
Gnosjö	,39	,68	,76	,54	,74	,29	,26	,25	,36	,80
Falkenberg	,68	,78	,83	,69	,95	,26	1,20	,20	,57	1,04
Eksjö	,52	,66	,70	,57	,85	,22	,33	,19	,35	,93
Skellefteå	,59	,69	,68	,70	,82	,73	,34	,34	,59	,85
Lidköping	,45	,53	,58	,45	,64	,16	,41	,23	,30	,74

Nyköping	,50	,57	,61	,49	,59	,34	,28	,45	,42	,68
Örnsköldsvik	,43	,51	,53	,48	,59	,32	,45	,46	,34	,61
Gotland	,49	,48	,50	,46	,61	,29	,25	,09	,47	,64
Katrineholm	,35	,40	,42	,38	,57	,10	,15	,17	,21	,65
Karlskoga	,26	,42	,41	,45	,43	,33	,49	,83	,30	,50
Oskarshamn	,27	,36	,39	,31	,46	,09	,20	,12	,19	,51
Karlshamn	,30	,39	,41	,34	,47	,18	,21	,23	,21	,49
Arboga	,26	,38	,39	,35	,42	,31	,16	,31	,19	,52
Hudiksvall	,31	,34	,36	,32	,43	,16	,24	,17	,20	,52
Ludvika	,26	,34	,36	,31	,40	,12	,34	,38	,13	,47
Ljungby	,20	,30	,33	,25	,36	,11	,09	,15	,17	,41
Avesta	,22	,28	,28	,27	,38	,11	,13	,22	,13	,42
Sollefteå	,26	,30	,31	,29	,43	,12	,12	,11	,15	,47
Västervik	,25	,28	,29	,25	,38	,06	,28	,07	,16	,41
Bollnäs	,20	,28	,29	,26	,39	,08	,02	,07	,23	,43
Mora	,21	,27	,29	,23	,33	,09	,08	,09	,18	,39
Älmhult	,17	,31	,33	,26	,27	,30	,03	,15	,37	,31
Arvika	,22	,22	,23	,21	,33	,05	,15	,05	,13	,39
Hultsfred	,14	,20	,20	,20	,31	,04	,06	,04	,18	,34
Kiruna	,16	,21	,20	,22	,28	,18	,10	,13	,14	,26
Tranås	,17	,21	,22	,20	,27	,07	,16	,09	,15	,32
Åmål	,17	,20	,20	,21	,30	,08	,10	,14	,09	,32
Simrishamn	,25	,19	,20	,18	,27	,05	,08	,06	,09	,36
Söderhamn	,15	,21	,22	,19	,26	,12	,19	,05	,17	,30
Fagersta	,12	,17	,17	,16	,22	,07	,24	,10	,08	,26
Sunne	,14	,18	,18	,17	,27	,03	,13	,02	,13	,30
Strömstad	,17	,16	,17	,15	,22	,06	,02	,08	,12	,26
Gällivare	,11	,15	,17	,12	,17	,04	,10	,08	,06	,21
Kalix	,12	,14	,13	,14	,21	,06	,07	,06	,06	,20
Ljusdal	,10	,15	,14	,18	,19	,32	,01	,02	,09	,22
Lycksele	,11	,14	,14	,14	,19	,06	,15	,08	,07	,18
Filipstad	,07	,11	,10	,12	,18	,04	,13	,05	,05	,21
Bengtstors	,07	,10	,09	,11	,13	,17	,03	,01	,04	,17
Hagfors	,06	,08	,08	,08	,11	,05	,07	,03	,05	,15
Malung	,05	,08	,09	,07	,11	,02	,00	,00	,09	,12
Vilhelmina	,07	,08	,08	,08	,14	,02	,01	,00	,02	,16

Strömsund	,07	,07	,07	,07	,11	,01	,01	,02	,04	,15
Härjedalen	,04	,08	,07	,10	,10	,21	,01	,01	,03	,12
Åre	,07	,07	,07	,07	,11	,02	,04	,01	,06	,11
Årjäng	,04	,05	,05	,05	,09	,01	,00	,01	,02	,11
Haparanda	,06	,05	,05	,06	,09	,04	,02	,00	,02	,12
Vansbro	,03	,04	,04	,04	,06	,01	,01	,00	,02	,08
Arvidsjaur	,04	,05	,05	,05	,07	,03	,02	,00	,03	,08
Storuman	,04	,04	,05	,04	,06	,02	,00	,00	,02	,07
Jokkmokk	,04	,04	,04	,04	,07	,01	,02	,02	,02	,06
Pajala	,03	,04	,03	,05	,08	,03	,00	,00	,02	,08
Övertorneå	,03	,03	,02	,04	,06	,01	,00	,00	,01	,06
Överkalix	,02	,02	,02	,03	,03	,04	,00	,00	,01	,04
Arjeplog	,02	,02	,02	,02	,04	,00	,00	,00	,02	,04
Sorsele	,02	,02	,02	,01	,02	,01	,00	,00	,01	,03

Appendix 2: Bivariate correlations for all included variables

	<i>Univ- ersity</i>	<i>Toler- ance</i>	<i>Serv. Divers.</i>	<i>BA and above</i>	<i>Creat. Prof.</i>	<i>Total Creative Class</i>	<i>Super- creative</i>	<i>Educ/ Train/ Libr.</i>	<i>Comp /Math</i>	<i>Life /Phys /Soc</i>	<i>Arch /Eng.</i>	<i>Arts/ Design etc</i>	<i>Narrow Super- creative</i>	<i>Techn</i>	<i>Wage/c ap</i>
University	1														
Tolerance	0.629 (**)	1													
Service Diversity	0.760 (**)	0.726 (**)	1												
BA and above	0.705 (**)	0.637 (**)	0.701 (**)	1											
Creative Prof.	0.696 (**)	0.667 (**)	0.836 (**)	0.711 (**)	1										
Total Creative Class	0.745 (**)	0.649 (**)	0.811 (**)	0.822 (**)	0.951 (**)	1									
Super- creative	0.674 (**)	0.494 (**)	0.615 (**)	0.830 (**)	0.690 (**)	0.880 (**)	1								
Educ/Train/ Libr	0.249 (*)	0.042	0.053	0.505 (**)	0.084	0.293 (**)	0.555 (**)	1							
Comp/Math	0.456 (**)	0.339 (**)	0.441 (**)	0.431 (*)	0.508 (*)	0.643 (**)	0.724 (**)	-0.011	1						
Life/Phys/So c	0.551 (**)	0.540 (**)	0.638 (**)	0.773 (**)	0.599 (**)	0.687 (**)	0.687 (**)	0.324 (**)	0.310 (**)	1					
Arch/Eng.	0.596 (**)	0.493 (**)	0.679 (**)	0.632 (**)	0.741 (**)	0.786 (**)	0.703 (**)	0.055 (**)	0.486 (**)	0.639 (**)	1				
Arts/Design etc	0.652 (**)	0.698 (**)	0.727 (**)	0.629 (**)	0.826 (**)	0.827 (**)	0.667 (**)	0.065 (**)	0.540 (**)	0.496 (**)	0.585 (**)	1			
Narrow Super- creative	0.661 (**)	0.568 (**)	0.706 (**)	0.698 (**)	0.777 (**)	0.883 (**)	0.873 (**)	0.079	0.874 (**)	0.633 (**)	0.810 (**)	0.761 (**)	1		
Techn.	0.598 (**)	0.464 (**)	0.526 (**)	0.655 (**)	0.695 (**)	0.764 (**)	0.721 (**)	0.184	0.570 (**)	0.540 (**)	0.689 (**)	0.660 (**)	0.756 (**)	1	
Wagesum/ Cap	0.551 (**)	0.501 (**)	0.730 (**)	0.420 (**)	0.780 (**)	0.703 (**)	0.448 (**)	-0.237 (*)	0.440 (**)	0.472 (**)	0.685 (**)	0.697 (**)	0.676 (**)	0.574 (**)	1