



## Does Assimilation Shape the Economic Value of Immigrant Diversity?

Silje Haus-Reve, Abigail Cooke, Rune Dahl Fitjar & Tom Kemeny

To cite this article: Silje Haus-Reve, Abigail Cooke, Rune Dahl Fitjar & Tom Kemeny (2021): Does Assimilation Shape the Economic Value of Immigrant Diversity?, *Economic Geography*, DOI: 10.1080/00130095.2021.1897462

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2021.1897462>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, on behalf of Clark University.



Published online: 22 Apr 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2158



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Does Assimilation Shape the Economic Value of Immigrant Diversity?



**Silje Haus-Reve**   
UiS Business School  
University of Stavanger  
Stavanger  
Norway  
silje.haus-reve@uis.no

**Abigail Cooke**   
Department of Geography  
University at Buffalo-SUNY  
Buffalo, NY  
USA  
amcooke@buffalo.edu

**Rune Dahl Fitjar**   
UiS Business School  
University of Stavanger  
Stavanger  
Norway  
rune.d.fitjar@uis.no

**Tom Kemeny**   
School of Business and  
Management  
Queen Mary University  
of London  
London  
UK  
t.kemeny@qmul.ac.uk

**Key words:**  
immigration  
diversity  
assimilation  
productivity  
wages

## abstract

A growing literature has shown that greater diversity among immigrants offers material benefits in terms of higher wages and productivity. One limitation of existing work is that it has considered immigrants from a given country to be homogenous. However, immigrants differ in various ways, not least in their level of assimilation. This article considers how assimilation might shape diversity's economic effects. Intuition suggests two conflicting dynamics. Assimilation could lower barriers immigrants and natives face in interacting with one another, and thus enhance benefits. Equally, however, assimilation could reduce heuristic differences between immigrants and native-born workers, dampening spillovers from diversity. We use linked employer–employee data from Norway to test these ideas. We construct diversity indices at the regional and workplace scale to capture different aspects of assimilation, and observe how these are related to worker productivity, proxied using wages. We find that assimilation dampens externalities from immigrant diversity. Diversity among second-generation or childhood migrants offers smaller benefits than diversity in teenage or adult arrivals. Immigrants' cultural proximity to Norway, and their experience of tertiary education in Norway, each also reduce the social return to diversity. While assimilation processes may benefit society in various ways, these findings are consistent with the idea that, by diminishing the heuristic gaps between migrants and native-born workers, integration reduces the productivity externalities derived from immigrant diversity.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, on behalf of Clark University. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

## Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Neil Lee, Nola Hewitt-Dundas, Bjørn Asheim, and Mari Rege, and to the editor and anonymous reviewers at *Economic Geography*, for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article. We would also like to thank participants at the American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting 2019 in Washington, DC, and at the Geography of Innovation Conference 2020 in Stavanger, Norway, as well as at seminars at the Centre for Innovation Research at the University of Stavanger. The research for this article was funded by the Research Council of Norway under the Demosreg programme (project no. 209761). An earlier version of the article was also part of Haus-Reve's doctoral thesis, "Exposure to Diverse Knowledge as Driver of Innovation and Productivity," UiS Business School, University of Stavanger, Norway, 2019. Errors and omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

Immigration has rendered a large number of Western countries increasingly birthplace diverse. Researchers seeking to explore the economic effects of this change have considered that immigrants could substitute for, or complement, native workers in host countries. One potential source of complementarity is immigrants' and natives' differing heuristics and perspectives. If individuals from different backgrounds conceptualize issues in different ways, their interaction may lead to improved problem solving and creativity (Hong and Page 2004). This implies that diversity is associated with knowledge spillovers that also benefit natives. From an economic geography perspective (e.g., Audretsch and Feldman 1996), it is worth noting that these spillovers are not limited to the firm level, since interactions between immigrants and natives also take place at the regional scale external to the firm. Researchers have found evidence consistent with this hypothesis. A wealth of studies documents positive relationships between firm and regional immigrant diversity and worker productivity (e.g., Ottaviano and Peri 2006; Bakens, Mulder, and Nijkamp 2013; Alesina, Harnoss, and Rapoport 2016; Kemeny and Cooke 2018). Others trace links between diversity and innovation (Ozgen, Nijkamp, and Poot 2013; Lee 2014; Solheim and Fitjar 2018), and other positive economic outcomes (e.g., Nathan 2014; Rodríguez-Pose and Von Berlepsch 2019), even over the very long run (Rodríguez-Pose and Von Berlepsch 2014). However, the rewards from diversity need not be automatic. If their realization depends on interaction across cultural divides, then benefits should vary with the costs of that interaction (Kemeny 2017). Supporting this idea, recent work shows that the latent benefits of heterogeneity can be entirely choked off in locations marked by anti-immigrant attitudes (Kemeny and Cooke 2017).

In a diverse society, one likely factor regulating the cost of interaction is immigrants' level of integration or assimilation into their host society.<sup>1</sup> Using Norway as a setting, this article investigates whether and how assimilation processes affect the relationship between diversity and worker productivity. Theory offers two contrasting predictions. One possibility is that

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this article, we use the terms *assimilation* and *integration* interchangeably, except when we discuss a particular Norwegian historic forced assimilation policy aimed at the indigenous Sami population. Although these terms have different meanings, as we will discuss below, they cannot be distinguished in the data. The overall interest in the article is in examining the implications for spillovers of natives and immigrants becoming more similar, which can be a result of both assimilation and integration.

interactions with more integrated immigrants will produce larger positive externalities, since assimilation has reduced the cost of those interactions. Another possibility is that the act of assimilation itself reduces immigrants' heuristic distinctiveness—the very source of diversity's hypothesized benefits. If this is true, greater integration might actually reduce diversity's social return. To the best of our knowledge, no previous research has directly measured the role of assimilation in shaping the economic value of immigrant diversity. Indeed, other than considering variation in immigrants' human capital and other more narrowly *economic* factors, extant research has considered all individuals from a given country to be identical in terms of their potential to generate spillovers, regardless of their level of integration. The ambiguity in theoretical predictions and the scant existing empirical evidence motivate the present study.

The primary information used to test these ideas comes from the Norwegian linked employer–employee data (LEED). These data offer detailed information linking the full population of employers and employees in the private sector on an annual basis between 2001 and 2011. Building on the basic approach in Kemeny and Cooke (2018), this article estimates a series of models in which the analytical sample is limited to individuals with spells of work within the same workplace and local labor market. Variation in these models comes from annual changes in workers' wages, as a proxy for productivity, which we relate to changes in the amount of immigrant diversity in their surrounding context—both in workers' workplace and their region. This approach offers several advantages in identifying the relationship of interest. By following the same workers over time, we obviate potential bias that could arise from unobserved individual selectivity issues. It also accounts for the effects of a host of distinguishing features of workplaces and regional economies. To deal with potential bias from local idiosyncratic shocks and other factors, we conduct a variety of robustness checks, including instrumental variables estimates.

Aside from applying this approach to the Norwegian context, the novelty of this article rests on its examination of the role of assimilation in shaping the social return to immigrant diversity. We capture diversity using standard measures of birthplace fractionalization, but we subsequently also compare this to fractionalization measures that exclude more assimilated immigrants. Assimilation is a multidimensional process, interacting with language, culture, identity, social, and economic factors (Alba and Nee 1997; Brown and Bean 2006; Abramitzky, Boustan, and Eriksson 2014; Hainmueller, Hangartner, and Pietrantuono 2017; Jimenez 2017), as well as spatial factors, as noted in a growing area of geographic research (Goodwin-White 2008, 2016; Iskander, Riordan, and Lowe 2013; Connor 2020; Gilmartin and Dagg 2020; Vogiazides and Mondani 2020). Nonetheless, several likely contributors to assimilation processes are observable in public registers. With the aim of approximating immigrants' level of assimilation, we use information on the time they have spent in the country, their age at arrival, second-generation status, school attendance in Norway, their naturalization through citizenship, and the cultural and linguistic distance between Norway and their country of birth. We believe these indicators offer meaningful, if incomplete, insights into immigrants' level of assimilation.

This article relates broadly to the growing research on the relationship between immigrant diversity and productivity. While there is no direct evidence on a moderating role for assimilation in extant studies, some previous articles provide suggestive clues. For instance, without discussing assimilation, several articles consider whether diversity among both first- and second-generation immigrants generates spillovers (Möhlmann and Bakens 2015; Alesina, Harnoss, and Rapoport 2016), while others consider the effect of where immigrants have gone to school (Docquier et al. 2020). The present article advances the literature in two ways: by offering an explicit

conceptualization of the potential role of assimilation and by providing a deliberate, focused empirical investigation of the resulting hypotheses.

We find a robust positive association between worker productivity and immigrant diversity in Norwegian regions. There is also relatively consistent evidence that immigrants' integration into Norwegian society reduces the size of these benefits. Diversity spillovers for native Norwegians are largest when measures of regional diversity exclude the most assimilated immigrants—defined in terms of their age at arrival, experience of the Norwegian educational system, cultural proximity, naturalization, or second-generation status. We conclude that while immigrant diversity offers economic benefits, past a certain point, immigrants' assimilation into Norwegian culture appears to dampen these spillovers.

## Background

### The Literature on Immigrant Diversity and Productivity

4 When individuals with diverse perspectives and heuristics interact, they may collectively be better able to solve complex problems (Hong and Page 2001, 2004). This improved problem solving should be reflected in higher productivity.<sup>2</sup> While individual variation in heuristics and perspectives arises for various reasons, country of birth is widely considered to affect the way people understand the world (Nisbett and Ross 1980; Clearwater, Huberman, and Hogg 1991; Thomas and Ely 1996; Page 2008). As growing and diversifying immigration flows render societies more immigrant diverse (Özden et al. 2011), diversity could generate prosperity-enhancing spillovers.

These spillovers may arise from interactions at the scale of work teams, organizations, regional economies, and even countries. However, much of the empirical research—especially in economic geography—considers the regional scale. While findings are not universally consistent, researchers mainly detect a robust, positive, and statistically significant relationship between immigrant diversity and productivity (Ottaviano and Peri 2006; Nathan 2011, 2015; Kemeny 2012; Bellini et al. 2013; Lee 2014; Suedekum, Wolf, and Blien 2014; Trax, Brunow, and Suedekum 2015; Nijkamp and Poot 2015; Delgado Gómez-Flors and Alguacil 2018; Kemeny and Cooke 2018; Roupakias and Dimou 2018). Contrasting findings include Bakens, Mulder, and Nijkamp (2013) Longhi (2013), and Elias and Paradies (2016).

A particular strand of this research explores why the relationship between diversity and productivity varies across locations. One reason is that certain work activities or skills may be more likely to generate diversity spillovers (Suedekum, Wolf, and Blien 2014; Cooke and Kemeny 2017). Another is that human interaction can be costly, both in general and in particular across cultural divides. These costs vary across local contexts, with implications for the size of diversity spillovers. Attempts to test this idea at the regional scale support the notion that local institutional features that regulate the costs of interaction shape the association between diversity and productivity (Alesina and La Ferrara 2005; Kemeny 2012; Kemeny and Cooke 2017).

It is plausible that assimilation is a distinct factor shaping the cost of interaction. Assimilation, by definition, is “the process by which members of immigrant groups and host societies come to resemble one another” (US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2015, 2). If intercultural interaction is especially costly, then assimilation should reduce those costs. This could have two potential impacts on the association between diversity and productivity. Lower interaction costs could raise

---

<sup>2</sup> For further-reaching reviews at multiple scales, see Nathan (2014) and Kemeny (2017).

the spillovers garnered from immigrant diversity. Alternately, assimilation might narrow the socioeconomic and cultural distance between immigrants and the host society, thereby reducing immigrants' cultural distinctiveness. If this also reduces their heuristic distinctiveness, then assimilation could dampen spillovers from immigrant diversity.

Very few studies in the economics of diversity literature have touched on this dynamic at all; none have the kind of motivating theory described here. Moreover, what few hints we do get from existing evidence on childhood arrivals, the second generation, naturalization, and cultural proximity are inconclusive on the potential role of assimilation. Largely as robustness tests, a few articles have examined the impacts of excluding childhood arrivals from and/or including second-generation immigrants in their diversity measures. The logic behind this is that childhood arrivals are primarily socialized in the host country and thus may be *too assimilated* to be considered truly different from native-born residents. From the opposite logic, assimilation is a lengthy process that can extend across several generations, justifying the inclusion of second-generation migrants in the study of diversity. At the cross-country scale and for the Netherlands, respectively, Alesina, Harnoss, and Rapoport (2016) and Möhlmann and Bakens (2015) each find that the positive relationship detected between diversity and productivity does not depend on the inclusion of immigrants who are likely to be more assimilated—whether childhood, teen, or young adult arrivals, or second-generation immigrants. Meanwhile, several articles offer hints of some kind of *Goldilocks* principle around the effects of assimilation. Docquier et al. (2020) find larger spillovers from immigrants who arrive later in their lives, and the largest estimates are from immigrants who were educated in their home country through secondary school but received tertiary education in the destination country. Alesina, Harnoss, and Rapoport (2016) document a different kind of optimal cultural middle ground, showing that the association between birthplace diversity and per capita gross domestic product appears largest for immigrants originating from countries at intermediate levels of cultural proximity to the host country, defined by colonial relationships and languages.

### Immigration and Integration in Norway

It is important to distinguish social processes of immigrant integration from the longer and darker histories of forced assimilation policies. In Norway, such policies were largely targeted at the minority indigenous Sami population (e.g., Minde 2005). As Alba and Nee (1997, 827) write,

As a state-imposed normative program aimed at eradicating minority cultures, assimilation has been justifiably repudiated. But as a social process that occurs spontaneously and often unintentionally in the course of interaction between majority and minority groups, assimilation remains a key concept for the study of intergroup relations.

It is the latter that we engage with in this article, understood as the

process by which members of immigrant groups and host societies come to resemble one another. That process, which has both economic and sociocultural dimensions, begins with the immigrant generation and continues through the second generation and beyond ... [and] ... implies movement toward parity of critical life opportunities with the native-born [...] majority. (US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2015, 2)

Until recently, Norway had experienced only very limited immigration. A small stream of European refugees entered following World War II, but even then, rates of

immigration remained very modest until the late 1960s and early 1970s when workers from Pakistan, Turkey, and Morocco were among the early arrivals of labor migrants (Brochmann and Hagelund 2012). Since then, the extent and diversity of migrants have grown. Contemporary migration streams include highly skilled workers from Western Europe and North America filling jobs in the burgeoning oil industry, those seeking family reunification, and refugees or asylum seekers. In 1970, the Norwegian immigrant population consisted of less than 60,000 people, of which more than 80 percent were European. By 2018, the migrant population had swelled to more than 900,000, equivalent to 14 percent of the population. Less than half the migrant population is now European in origin (Statistics Norway 2018). Migration rates grew especially in response to the 2004 expansion of the EU, which opened Norway to increased flows of workers from Central and Eastern Europe. The largest foreign-born population is currently from Poland, followed by Lithuania, Sweden, Somalia, and Syria.

6 In the Norwegian policy context, assimilation is understood to mean full adoption of Norwegian identification. Conversely, integration implies full participation in social and economic life but maintenance of home country cultural identities by immigrants (Brochmann and Hagelund 2012). Though note that we use these terms effectively as synonyms, which is common (US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2015), partly because we lack access to self-reported identity markers that would allow us to make the distinction meaningfully. The earliest post-WWII refugees were expected to fully assimilate, but there was relatively little formal policy intervention regarding how this process would unfold (Brochmann and Hagelund 2012). Since the 1970s, integration, including respect for cultural differences and ideals of multiculturalism, has been the more dominant strain of Norwegian policy thinking. It has developed alongside a growing programmatic and bureaucratic involvement in this process (Hagelund 2002). This has also occurred alongside growing restrictions on who can immigrate. For example, similar to other European countries, Norway introduced a temporary ban on immigration in 1975, essentially limiting migration to highly skilled specialists as well as asylum seekers and refugees. The temporary ban was renewed several times until 1991, when it was replaced by a more restrictive permanent immigration law. However, membership of the European Economic Area created a new opening for labor migration under the terms of the Single Market, which became particularly relevant following the EU expansion in the mid-2000s.

Immigration and integration policy remain contentious policy issues, in particular as pertains to asylum policy. Norway has had a significant anti-immigrant party since the 1970s, and mainstream parties have also become increasingly restrictive on immigration. This has also been reflected in growing criticism of the multicultural ideals from anti-immigrant movements (Eriksen 2016), although Norwegian integration policy remains fundamentally anchored in multiculturalism.

## Empirical Approach

The first aim of this article is to describe the relationship between immigrant diversity and worker productivity in the Norwegian economy. The second aim is to investigate whether any estimated diversity spillovers are moderated by immigrant integration into Norwegian society.

To satisfy these aims, we make use of linked employer–employee data from Norwegian individual and establishment registers. The annual data spans the period 2001 to 2011 and covers all inhabitants in Norway over the age of sixteen who are employed in the private sector and all establishments located in Norway. The registers

provide a range of information about individual workers, such as their place and year of birth, mothers' place of birth, sex, educational background, place of residence and employment, employer, working hours, and annual wage. For immigrants, the registers provide information on when they first entered the country, their age, and if they have any education from schools in Norway. At the establishment level, the registers include information on location, industry, and number of employees. Additional establishment-level variables are calculated from the individual registers based on the composition of each establishment.

We adapt approaches used in recent studies that leverage matched employer–employee data in other country contexts (e.g., Trax, Brunow, and Suedekum 2015; Kemeny and Cooke 2018). Though workers may appear in the data in numerous jobs in different places and times, we limit attention to each worker's single longest work spell, defined as a period of employment in a workplace and region lasting at least two consecutive calendar years. We further limit the analytical sample by excluding those registered as working part time and earning very low wages.<sup>3</sup> We also drop establishments with fewer than ten employees, to ensure that measures of diversity in establishments are sensible.

Like several existing studies, we use individual earnings as a proxy for productivity. Since individuals in the analytical sample are fixed in locations and workplaces for the entirety of their spell, variation in the models arises from the panel structure of the data. The estimates are based on how workers' earnings respond to changes in the immigrant composition of the region in which they live as well as in the establishment in which they work. The basic estimating equation is described as follows:

$$\ln(w)_{ipjt} = \beta_1 d_{jt} + \beta_2 d_{pjt} + X'_{ipjt} + E'_{pjt} + C'_{jt} + \mu_{ipjt} \quad (1)$$

In this equation,  $\ln(w)$  is the log annual wage of an individual worker in establishment  $p$  located in region  $j$  at time  $t$ . The two independent variables of interest are  $d_{jt}$  and  $d_{pjt}$ , which measure diversity among the immigrant population at the scale of the region and the establishment, respectively. The vectors  $X'$ ,  $E'$ , and  $C'$  capture time-varying characteristics of workers, establishments, and regions. The standard error term is denoted by  $\mu_{ipjt}$ . In estimation, we decompose this error term, adapting a two-way fixed effects error components model (Baltagi 2013), such that

$$\mu_{ipjt} = \mu_{ipj} + \gamma_t + \nu_{ipjt} \quad (2)$$

The first error component represents a key feature of our approach. In a conventional two-way fixed effects model, this term would represent a fixed parameter capturing stationary unobservable individual-level factors. However, as the sample is limited to spells of *stayers*,  $\mu_{ipj}$  absorbs bias not just from individual-level unmeasured characteristics but also time-invariant unobservables at the workplace and regional scales. At the individual level, these might include differences in workers' innate ability, intelligence, or motivation. Establishment-specific features could include enduring differences in capital intensiveness or product quality. And at the level of regions, deep-rooted variation in specialization and agglomeration could be relevant (Kemeny and Storper 2015). The remainder of the error term is decomposed in the standard manner, with  $\gamma_t$  being a time fixed effect that absorbs bias from unobserved time-specific shocks,

<sup>3</sup> Note: We exclude earnings that are below 100,000 Norwegian kroner (NOK).



such as recessions and other business cycle effects. Finally,  $v_{ipjt}$  represents the remaining stochastic disturbance term. The primary identifying assumption is that pertinent nonstationary unobserved factors are uncorrelated with changes in regional or establishment-level diversity. We seek to validate this assumption through various robustness checks.

We contend that an equivalent equation predicting rents is not required in order to identify the relationship of interest. As Acemoglu and Zilibotti (2001) argue, in regions that contain tradeable sectors, earnings unadjusted for cost-of-living differences will reflect underlying productivity, since such firms are faced with national and not regional prices. Nonetheless, though wages are commonly used as an (imperfect) proxy for productivity in more market-oriented economies like the US, one potential challenge in the present context is that, under the Norwegian system of collective bargaining, wages are set annually through a combination of central and local negotiations. The result is a relatively compressed wage structure that will not fully reflect individual productivity. One possible risk, then, is that we underestimate the true productivity impacts of diversity. Seeking to mitigate potential bias from this source, we exploit the fact that wage-setting processes are more important in some sectors than others. In the analysis, we probe the sensitivity of the results in a subset of industries in which we can expect closer links between productivity and wages.

### Measuring Diversity and Assimilation

In the baseline model, we include workplace- and region-specific measures of diversity in which immigrants are considered to be heterogeneous in terms of their birthplace only. To do so, we use a variant of a standard fractionalization index, which we estimate specifically across all in-sample workers of the nonnative population. To ensure that our measure of workplace diversity is sensible, we restrict the sample to jobs at establishments with at least ten employees. We also focus on the working nonnative population and restrict the sample to individuals who are closely connected to the labor market.<sup>4</sup> The fractionalization index is apt, since it captures both the breadth of countries from which individuals originate as well as the relative sizes of these different country groups. Though region-focused researchers have sometimes used other indicators to describe diversity, the fractionalization index remains by far the most common, and results across different measures tend toward consistency.<sup>5</sup> At the regional scale, the baseline index is calculated as follows:

$$d_{jt} = 1 - \sum_{r=1}^R s_{jrt}^2 \quad (3)$$

Where  $s$  is the proportion of all immigrants in region  $j$  who were born in country  $r$  at time  $t$ ; and  $R$  is the maximum number of countries captured in the immigrant population of the region. The index ranges between a low of zero, meaning all immigrants come from a single country, and a maximum diversity value nearing one (more specifically  $(1 - 1/R)$ ), reflecting a situation where each immigrant group occupies the same proportion of the total immigrant population.<sup>6</sup> We exclude native Norwegians

<sup>4</sup> This includes nonnative workers in the 20 percent position or more and between the ages of sixteen and sixty-seven.

<sup>5</sup> For a wider discussion of measurement, consult Dawson (2012), Kemeny (2017), Nijkamp and Poot (2015).

<sup>6</sup> The index can be thought of as summarizing the probability that two immigrants who meet at random in a particular context were born in two different countries.

from Equation 3 because to do otherwise would render the measure almost perfectly correlated with the simple share of all foreign born in the population. This would conflate effects from overall immigration with effects from diversity, defined in terms of the mix of countries from which immigrants hail. At the same time, in all models, we include the simple share of foreign born as a control, to ensure we can separately account for effects that derive from aggregate flows of immigration.

In addition to measuring diversity in a way that treats all immigrants equally, we consider that the presence of differently assimilated immigrants may influence the social return from heterogeneity. Exploring this empirically demands measures of assimilation. Assimilation includes a component of individual migrant experience that changes over time. It is partly a function of time spent in the country, but also depends on factors such as language proficiency (Daley, Hu, and Min Warman 2019), interethnic marriage (Furtado and Trejo 2013), and social networks (Majerski 2019). It also captures a collective experience shared by waves of migrants and their descendants, which becomes inscribed into the host society itself. Measuring the gaps between immigrant and native-born populations involves a wide range of relevant indicators (e.g., Borjas 1994). As one comprehensive review for the US put it, relevant issues include

attitudes toward social issues, citizenship, crime, education, family structure, health, income, language, occupations, political participation, religion, and residence. Of course this is a complicated process to measure, in part because immigrants are very diverse themselves and have very different starting points in all of these domains when they arrive and because immigrants change at different paces across domains and individuals, but also because Americans are also changing. (US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2015, 20)

Such a multifaceted understanding of this dynamic social process means that any single indicator will be incomplete. There are also aspects of this process that resist quantification, especially at scale. For example, Jimenez (2017, 10–11) argues that assimilation needs to be understood as a relational process that at least partly involves developing a “working consensus around ethnic, racial, and national belonging” and “interpreting the details of daily living.” Register data are not structured to capture such a nuanced and meaning-laden phenomenon. However, the basic nature of this process suggests some ways in which administrative data sources may be useful:

By its very nature, integration is a process that unfolds over time. The pace of integration may be sped up or slowed down by individual characteristics, contexts of reception, or one’s structural position in society, but it always also depends on the duration of exposure to the host country’s culture and society. (US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2015, 413)

This quotation highlights the importance of time spent in the host country, suggesting meaningful dimensions of assimilation may be captured with immigrants’ year of arrival and age at arrival. It also suggests the relevance of background characteristics, such as the cultural proximity between the origin and host culture, and exposure to host country societal institutions, such as its educational system. Immigrants’ naturalization status is another useful and measurable indicator of assimilation. Most countries in Europe—Norway included—premise the acquisition of citizenship on minimum periods of residence, and facility with the host country language, customs,

culture, and political system. Meanwhile, naturalization confers on immigrants the ability to participate in society with the same rights as native-born citizens. Naturalization thus signals one form of assimilation, indicating that the immigrant has become a full member of the host society (Gathmann and Keller 2018; Peters, Schmeets, and Vink 2019).

Equation 3 presumes that all immigrants from country  $R$  are homogenous, contributing equally to the overall measure of diversity. However, the discussion thus far suggests that immigrants' different levels of assimilation into their host society might shape the effects of diversity on productivity. We operationalize this idea by measuring diversity while gradually narrowing—or in some cases, extending—the definition of immigrants by considering the most assimilated as natives. This allows us to examine how this influences the size of the spillovers estimated from diversity.<sup>7</sup> We do so for a wide range of potential indicators of assimilation: length of stay, age at arrival, educational background, second generation status, naturalization, and cultural and linguistic proximity between the native country and Norway. We assume that immigrants are more likely to have been assimilated if they have stayed in Norway for an extended period, were very young when arriving in the country, are part of the second generation, have studied at a Norwegian university, have been naturalized through citizenship, or were born in a culturally similar society or initially immigrated from a country with linguistic proximity to the Norwegian language.<sup>8</sup>

The Immigration Database provides information on time of arrival in Norway and of naturalization through citizenship, if relevant. The National Educational Database (NUDB) records the educational experience of individuals—including immigrants—at Norwegian universities. We capture second-generation status using each individual's mother's country of birth. Cultural proximity is measured in two ways: The simplest measure excludes immigrants from neighboring countries—Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland—which share many cultural similarities with Norway. The more sophisticated measure estimates the linguistic proximity between each immigrant's native language and Norwegian, exploiting CEPII data that describe such proximity for ninety country pairs.<sup>9</sup> Building on work by Desmet, Weber, and Ortuño-Ortín (2009) and Ferrucci and Lissoni (2019), we adapt Equation 3 to create weighted diversity measures, where more linguistically proximate cultures contribute less to diversity than those that are more distant.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> As a means of comparing the benefits from diversity across differently assimilated groups, we also considered building mutually exclusive sets of diversity measures capturing different assimilation levels. Ideally, one would include these in a single *horse race* model, in which one could directly compare, say, any benefits of diversity derived from very recent immigrants to those that have remained in Norway for a long time. We ultimately discarded this idea, as it wrongly assumes that the productivity-enhancing interactions must occur within groups narrowly defined on the basis of their level of assimilation. Regardless of its statistical appeal, this does not make sense from a theoretical perspective.

<sup>8</sup> The previous quotation suggests a dynamic path to assimilation, which we have tried to operationalize by describing immigrants' length of stay. We would ideally have liked to capture other time-varying aspects of the process of assimilation, such as language acquisition and engagement in local social networks, but no data are available for these characteristics.

<sup>9</sup> The CEPII data measure linguistic proximity based on the lexical similarity scores between forty-item word lists drawn from different languages. For more information about the data, see [http://www.cepii.fr/CEPII/en/bdd\\_modele/bdd\\_modele.asp](http://www.cepii.fr/CEPII/en/bdd_modele/bdd_modele.asp).

<sup>10</sup> For each country pair, we take the inverse of the original proximity scores, standardizing them to values ranging between 0 and 1.

## Establishment-Level and Regional Controls

Though the inclusion of individual–workplace–region and time fixed effects account for many potential drivers of changes in the dependent variable, in all models we additionally include controls to account for time-varying factors specific to regions and establishments. As described in the previous section, we control for the share of foreign born at both the regional and establishment scale. When we limit attention in the diversity measures to immigrants at particular levels of integration, we also adjust proportions of foreign born to the same subgroup. Additional control variables include establishment employment and regional population, accounting for internal and external economies of scale, respectively. As a means of capturing confounding effects from spillovers due to education, we additionally control for the share of employees with tertiary education in each region and establishment.

## Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides summary statistics for the analytical sample. The data set includes nearly 1.3 million individuals working in almost 35,000 establishments. Average earnings are around 440,000 NOK.<sup>11</sup> The average age of the workers is forty-two and the average spell in the same establishment and region is above seven years in the period 2001–11.<sup>12</sup>

Economic regions correspond to local administrative units at level 2 (LAU 2) as defined by Statistics Norway. We additionally merge regions that are functionally integrated into the same labor market, following Gundersen and Juvkam (2013). This yields a total of seventy-eight regions that are roughly equivalent to local labor markets.<sup>13</sup> The average region has around 21,000 employees, of which 6 percent have obtained a tertiary education. Jobs in tradable sectors account for 38 percent of total employment. High technology sectors account for 1 percent, while knowledge intensive services account for almost 20 percent of total employment. Norway experienced a large growth in immigration between 2001 and 2011, with the share of foreign born expanding from 4.5 to 11 percent.<sup>14</sup>

Figure 1 illustrates the relationships between mean wages, diversity, and population in each region, averaging across all years. It highlights the positive association between fractionalization and wages, and between fractionalization and population.

## Results

In this section, we first examine the overall relationship between immigrant diversity and wages. Subsequently, we examine how this relationship is influenced by assimilation processes.

### Overall Immigrant Diversity Spillovers in Norway


Table 2 shows the results for the overall relationship between diversity and wages in the Norwegian context, estimated using a panel fixed effects estimator with standard

<sup>11</sup> In 2011, 440,000 NOK was the equivalent of approximately US\$51,000.

<sup>12</sup> Because they are time invariant, other individual level variables, such as gender and nationality, drop out in estimation, but are included in Table 1 to better describe the sample.

<sup>13</sup> The same classification has been used in several previous studies at the regional scale in Norway (e.g., Herstad, Aslesen, and Ebersberger 2014; Fitjar and Timmermans 2019; Haus-Reve, Fitjar, and Rodríguez-Pose 2019).

<sup>14</sup> For more information, see <https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning>.



12

Figure 1. Wages and birthplace fractionalization in Norwegian regions.  
 Note: Points on the scatterplot reflect regional average values of wages and birthplace fractionalization among immigrants. The size of the points are weighted by regional population.

**Table 1**

*Summary Statistics, Full Analytical Sample, 2001–11*

Variable	Mean	Std.
<i>Individual characteristics</i>		
Age	42.08	11.43
Annual wage (10,000 NOKs)	43.30	28.50
Spell duration in years	7.20	3.03
Female	0.32	0.46
Norwegian born	0.90	0.29
Tertiary educated	0.27	0.44
<i>Establishment characteristics</i>		
Birthplace fractionalization	0.67	0.33
Share foreign born	0.10	0.12
Firm size	35.20	301
Share of tertiary educated employees	0.11	0.16
<i>Region characteristics</i>		
Birthplace fractionalization	0.93	0.03
Share foreign born	0.09	0.12
Region size (10,000s)	2.13	5.68
Share of tertiary educated employees	0.06	0.03
Tradeable sector	0.38	0.08
Total observations	6,769,024	
Individuals	1,262,272	
Establishments	34,708	
Regions	78	

errors clustered at the level of the establishment. In column 1, we include only establishment-level predictors. Assuming a threshold of 0.05, the coefficient for establishment-level diversity is not statistically significant. As expected, the share of foreign born, establishment size, and share of tertiary educated employees are each positively and significantly related to earnings. The second model in this table adds regional predictors. The establishment-level measure of diversity remains unrelated to worker

Table 2

*Baseline Model, Immigrant Diversity, and Earnings for Workers in Norway, 2001–11*

Dependent variable: log of annual earnings		
	Est. Only	Baseline
	(1)	(2)
<i>Establishment measures:</i>		
Diversity	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
Share foreign born	0.016* (0.008)	0.001 (0.007)
Firm size ( <i>log</i> )	0.062*** (0.002)	0.059*** (0.002)
Share of tertiary educated employees	0.075*** (0.012)	0.072*** (0.011)
<i>Regional measures:</i>		
Diversity		0.065*** (0.017)
Share foreign born		0.315*** (0.063)
Employment ( <i>log</i> )		0.167*** (0.013)
Share of tertiary educated employees		0.054 (0.028)

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by establishment. Year and individual–establishment–region fixed effects are included in both models. Sample consists of 6,769,024 observations nested in 1,262,272 individuals and 34,708 establishments. In model (1)  $R^2$  is 0.234 and in model (2)  $R^2$  is 0.236.

wages. Meanwhile, the coefficients for both regional birthplace diversity and the regional share of foreign born are positive and statistically significant. These results are broadly consistent with findings from studies of diversity spillovers in other national contexts. However, the spillovers from diversity in the Norwegian case appear not to flow from the workplace scale, whereas, in the US case, workplace effects are significant but small. We hereafter refer to this model as the baseline, to be compared against the results that follow.

Before turning to the question of assimilation, we probe the robustness of the overall relationship of interest. One strength of the analytical approach taken in this article lies in its ability to account for a wide range of sources of stationary unobserved heterogeneity. Still, there remain various threats to validity that are worth addressing.

As discussed earlier, one possible concern with respect to internal validity is that the Norwegian system of collective bargaining could weaken or even sever the association between individuals' earnings and their productivity. We address this issue by limiting the analysis to tradable industries, where the link between wages and individual productivity should be strongest. We define tradable sectors following a classification set out in Mano and Castillo (2015). In these sectors, international competitive pressures mean that employers are more likely to have to pay wages that more closely reflect productivity. The first model of Table 3 presents results estimated over this subsample of workers. The relationship is consistent with the baseline estimates: a positive and significant coefficient for diversity at the regional scale, and no association between earnings and diversity at the workplace level. Hence, we do not find reason to believe that the baseline results are purely a function of the structure of collective wage bargaining in some Norwegian industries. Instead of being driven by greater immigrant diversity, rising wages could also be the result of unobserved local shifts in labor demand. Indeed, local demand shocks could raise wages while shifting

Table 3

Robustness Checks, Immigrant Diversity, and Earnings for Workers in Norway, 2001–11

	Dependent variable: log of annual earnings			
	Fractionalization coeffs.		Counts (millions)	
	Region	Establishment	Observations	Individuals
(1) Tradables only	0.086** (0.027)	0.001 (0.001)	3.9	0.07
(2) With Bartik index	0.048*** (0.015)	0.000 (0.000)	6.7	1.3
(3) With unemployment	0.064*** (0.017)	0.000 (0.000)	6.7	1.3
(4) GMM-IV FE	0.154*** (0.026)	0.011*** (0.005)	4.2	0.8

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by establishment. Each numbered row of this table represents results drawn from a distinct regression, containing regional- and establishment-level shares of tertiary educated, shares of foreign born, and size as controls, as well as year and individual–workplace–region fixed effects. In Model (1)  $R^2 = 0.275$ , in (2)  $R^2 = 0.236$ , and (3)  $R^2 = 0.234$ . For Model (4), Kleibergen-Paap LM (underidentification) is 5023 ( $p = 0.000$ ) and Hansen's  $J$  is 0.380 ( $p = 0.538$ ).

14

the supply of different types of workers. Due to the generally higher geographic mobility of immigrants compared to natives, this could stimulate greater inflows of immigrants, possibly, though not necessarily, producing an increase in immigrant diversity. In the Norwegian case, this is particularly pertinent for regions specializing in oil extraction, which may become *boom regions* in periods of rising oil prices (Fitjar and Timmermans 2019). We follow common practice in addressing this concern by using a method developed by Bartik (1991) in which the aim is to capture local demand in a manner that is unrelated to changes in local supply. The Bartik measure applies industry-specific national employment growth rates to initial local industry employment shares, as follows:

$$Bartik_j = \sum_{l=1}^L e_{jlt-1} (\ln E_t - \ln E_{t-1}) \quad (4)$$

where  $(\ln E_t - \ln E_{t-1})$  captures the growth in log national employment in industry  $l$  at time  $t$  and the local employment share in this industry is indicated by  $e_{jlt-1}$ . We use data on regional industry structure based on two-digit NACE codes to build this indicator.<sup>15</sup> The results in Table 3, Model 2 indicate that the inclusion of the Bartik index as a control variable does not materially change the relationship of interest.

A second approach to deal with a potential mismatch between demand and supply focuses on the aggregate supply side. The logic here is related to the situation described immediately above. A relative shortage in the supply of labor could spur greater immigration, and potentially greater diversity. A labor shortage would also put upward pressure on wage levels. In this situation, what in the preceding models would appear to be a relationship between diversity and earnings, would in fact be spurious. Model 3 in Table 3 presents coefficients on diversity variables for a model that includes annual measures of local unemployment, using official data from Statistics Norway on

<sup>15</sup> Because of the change to NACE rev. 2 in 2007, we convert all NACE codes back to NACE rev. 1.1, allowing us to apply this index for the whole time period.

registered unemployment at the municipality level. While the sign on the unemployment variable is negative, as expected, the inclusion of this indicator does not meaningfully alter the nature of the estimated diversity coefficients. This suggests the observed link between diversity and earnings is not explained by labor shortages.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, we address lingering concerns regarding the potential endogeneity of the diversity measures through instrumental variables estimates. Finding suitably exogenous *external* instruments for these variables is a major challenge, given their finely granular and dynamic nature. Following others in this situation (i.e., Trax, Brunow, and Suedekum 2015; Cooke and Kemeny 2017), we rely on lags of workplace and regional immigrant diversity, applied using the general method of moments fixed effects estimator. Based on exploration of which lags do not directly predict the outcome, we settle on an instrument matrix that includes one- to three-year lags of immigrant diversity at each scale. Estimates using these instruments pass basic tests—of under-identification, confirming sufficient instrument strength; and overidentification, which suggests instruments jointly satisfy the orthogonality condition. The estimates themselves, presented in Model 4 of Table 3, broadly support the original estimations at the regional level. In this specification, establishment diversity also emerges as significantly related to earnings.

Summarizing, although we cannot fully eliminate the possibility that idiosyncratic shocks or other factors are driving the relationship of interest, the robustness checks using instrumental variables, a subset of traded sectors, and controlling for labor shortages and demand shocks produce evidence that confirm a significant positive association between regional immigrant diversity and earnings, consistent with the idea of spillovers. More concretely, taking the baseline model into account, an average worker experiences a 0.195 percent rise in wages for a one standard deviation increase in regional diversity.

### Assimilation and Diversity Spillovers

Having confirmed a robust, positive association between regional immigrant diversity and wages in the Norwegian case, we now address the role of assimilation in mediating this relationship. We begin by using length of stay as a proxy for assimilation. Table 4 presents coefficients and standard errors for the key independent variables of interest: region- and workplace-level immigrant diversity. Each row in the table presents results from a unique model. While each model includes the full battery of control variables discussed above, for simplicity we do not report coefficients for these variables, since they offer largely consistent predictions across models and are in line with expectations and the baseline findings. Models 1 to 4 progressively exclude migrants who have stayed in Norway for longer periods of time from workplace and regional calculations of immigrant diversity. Hence, Model 1 can be understood to capture the role of diversity in shaping earnings when diversity is measured only among the least assimilated, while Model 4 is the most inclusive (and most similar to the baseline), excluding only those that have remained in Norway for more than fifteen years.

At the establishment level, we find a modest but positive and significant effect of diversity among less assimilated immigrants with up to ten years residence. When we include more assimilated immigrants who have stayed in Norway for more than fifteen years, the diversity spillovers turn insignificant. Estimates at the regional scale indicate the consistent presence of a positive, statistically significant association between

<sup>16</sup> In all cases where information has been summarized, full estimates are available upon request.



Table 4

## Diversity Spillovers by Assimilation, Defined as Length of Stay

Models	Diversity coefficients	
	Establishment ( $\beta_1$ )	Regional ( $\beta_2$ )
(Baseline)	0.001 (0.001)	0.065*** (0.017)
(1) 2 years or less	0.001* (0.007)	0.026*** (0.006)
(2) 5 years or less	0.003*** (0.001)	0.057*** (0.007)
(3) 10 years or less	0.002*** (0.001)	0.051*** (0.010)
(4) 15 years or less	0.001 (0.001)	0.050* (0.001)

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by establishment. Each numbered row of this table represents results drawn from a distinct regression, containing regional- and establishment-level shares of tertiary educated, share of foreign born, and size as controls, as well as year and individual-workplace-region fixed effects. Centered R2 values range from 0.236 to 0.276. All models estimated on 6,769,024 observations nested in 1,262,272 individuals.

16

earnings and regional diversity, regardless of the level of assimilation. The raw coefficients themselves suggest that spillovers rise with assimilation. However, formal tests of differences between the coefficients across these different models, using the  $z$ -score approach described for large samples in Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995), reveal that the only significant differences in the regional length-of-stay estimates are between diversity among those staying two years or less and those staying five years or less.<sup>17</sup> In other words, we detect that the association between regional diversity and earnings is larger when diversity includes immigrants who have stayed no more than five years as compared with no more than two years. No differences are measured between other models, including when compared against the baseline. Overall, this suggests that, when defined in terms of length of stay, there is only modest evidence that assimilation plays an important moderating role in the relationship between diversity and productivity.

Table 5 explores the results for other dimensions of assimilation. In the interpretation, we emphasize regional coefficients, as we find no significant relationships at the establishment scale. Models 1 and 2 consider two dimensions of assimilation that relate to immigrants' exposure to host country institutions: their age at arrival and whether they attended a Norwegian university. Regarding age at arrival, we set a threshold of age thirteen to differentiate earlier and later arrivals. This corresponds to the end of primary school enrollment and follows the findings from Chetty, Hendren, and Katz (2015) on differential neighborhood effects for US families moving with children at

<sup>17</sup> As in Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995), we undertake the formal comparison of coefficients across pairs of regression models (with each model denoted as  $m1$  or  $m2$ ) by calculating  $z$ -scores and associated  $p$ -values according to the following equation:  $z = (\hat{\beta}_{m1} - \hat{\beta}_{m2}) / \sqrt{s_{m1}^2(\hat{\beta}_{m1}) + s_{m2}^2(\hat{\beta}_{m2})}$ , where  $s$  indicates the standard error for the regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}$ . The null hypothesis tested is that the two models yield coefficients with differences that are not statistically significant. Across all of the comparisons made using the  $z$ -score method, we assume an  $\alpha$  threshold of 5%.

Table 5

*Diversity Spillovers by Various Dimensions of Assimilation*

Models	Dependent variable: log of annual earnings	
	Diversity coefficients	
	Establishment ( $\beta_1$ )	Regional ( $\beta_2$ )
(Baseline)	0.001 (0.001)	0.065*** (0.017)
<i>Exposure to host country institutions:</i>		
(1) Arrived after age 13	0.000 (0.001)	0.156*** (0.030)
(2) Did not attend university in Norway	0.008 (0.020)	2.153*** (0.770)
<i>Cultural proximity to native country:</i>		
(3) Excluding neighboring countries	0.001 (0.001)	0.194*** (0.031)
(4) Linguistically weighted proximity	0.000 (0.001)	0.139*** (0.027)
<i>First and second-generation status:</i>		
(5) Including second generation	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.024 (0.031)
<i>Naturalization:</i>		
(6) Not born with Norwegian citizenship	-0.008 (0.005)	0.229*** (0.060)
(7) Not naturalized	-0.004 (0.005)	0.185*** (0.039)

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses, clustered by establishment. Each numbered row of this table represents results drawn from a distinct regression, containing regional- and establishment-level shares of tertiary educated, share of foreign born, and size as controls, as well as year and individual–workplace–region fixed effects.  $R^2$  values range from 0.211 to 0.276. All models estimated on 6,769,024 observations nested in 1,262,272 individuals.

different ages. Immigrants who arrived after age thirteen are assumed to be less assimilated than those who arrived as children. In Model 1, we find a more pronounced positive coefficient than in the baseline for regional diversity among later arrivals. Formal testing indicates the coefficient is significantly larger than that estimated for all immigrants (the baseline). Similarly, in Model 2, we also find a more pronounced positive coefficient for regional diversity than in the baseline when diversity is limited to workers who did not attend university in Norway—those we consider to be less assimilated.

Models 3 and 4 in Table 5 explore how cultural distance may factor into assimilation proxies. Model 3 presents estimates when we define diversity excluding immigrants from neighboring countries, specifically Denmark, Iceland, and Sweden. This results in a greater positive coefficient than in the baseline, with the point estimate for regional diversity being relatively large. Based on a formal test, we conclude that the difference between this coefficient and the baseline model is statistically significant. Similar results are obtained in Model 4, where we capture assimilation by weighting more culturally distinct immigrants' contribution to diversity more strongly, using the measure of linguistic proximity. In this case, however, comparison of  $z$ -scores indicates no significant differences from the baseline.

Model 5 reports results when we additionally count the children of immigrants as sources of potential immigrant diversity. Unlike the analyses above, this measure expands rather than restricts the definition of diversity. The results show that the effects of both establishment and regional diversity disappear when including second-

generation migrants. This corresponds to the results of Alesina, Harnoss, and Rapoport (2016), but contrasts with Möhlmann and Bakens (2015). In the context of our focus on how assimilation modulates diversity spillovers, we interpret this result to mean that the second-generation is sufficiently integrated into Norwegian society that it does not contribute to heuristic heterogeneity in the way the second generation's parents do. The bottom panel of Table 5 considers a final dimension of assimilation: naturalization. We examine the impact of naturalization in two ways. First, in Model 6, we restrict the measure of diversity to include only those born as non-Norwegian citizens (i.e., excluding those who are foreign born to Norwegian parents and thus qualify for citizenship from birth). The coefficient for regional diversity remains positive and significant. A second approach is to exclude from diversity measures all those immigrants who have been naturalized as Norwegians. In keeping with the overall pattern, regional diversity measured in this way returns more positive coefficients than for the baseline. Using the *z*-score method, we can be 95 percent confident that the relationship between diversity and earnings in both these models is stronger than in the baseline model. We take this as providing further evidence that less-assimilated immigrants are a more important source of potential spillovers.

18

## Conclusion

This article makes two main contributions to the growing literature in economic geography and related fields on immigrant diversity spillovers. First, it examines whether greater immigrant diversity makes Norwegian workers more productive. Second, it asks whether any such spillovers are affected by immigrants' assimilation into their host society. Assimilation might help migrants to better share ideas with each other and with the native-born population, thereby enabling larger spillovers. On the other hand, highly assimilated migrants may offer perspectives and heuristics that are less distinctive than their less-assimilated peers. This article is the first to explicitly investigate whether assimilation conditions the economic benefits from diversity that have been documented in other studies.

We find a consistently positive and significant relationship between rising earnings and rising immigrant diversity in Norwegian regions. Contrastingly, we find little evidence that greater immigrant diversity in Norwegian workplaces yields improvements in earnings. This latter finding, while not identical to comparably multiscale work for the US (i.e., Kemeny and Cooke 2018), similarly suggests that the regional scale is the primary site of spillovers.

Assimilation does appear to shape the economic benefits from immigrant diversity. Particularly at the regional scale, we find evidence consistent with the idea that, past a certain threshold, assimilation weakens or eliminates the existence of diversity spillovers. This story emerges fairly clearly across a wide range of distinct measures of assimilation. While assimilation defined in terms of length of stay does not seem important, as compared with the baseline, we detect larger spillovers when regional diversity is estimated across subsets of immigrants who can be considered less assimilated: those who arrived after the age of thirteen, did not attend university in Norway, did not emigrate from other Nordic countries, were not born with Norwegian citizenship, and were not naturalized citizens. All of this evidence suggests that highly assimilated immigrants are less of a source of spillovers from regional diversity. When we extend, rather than limit, the definition by also including diversity from second-generation immigrants, the spillovers from diversity disappear altogether, providing further evidence for the role of assimilation in dampening spillovers. At the

establishment scale, changes in the diversity around workers remain largely unrelated to their productivity. Length of stay is somewhat of an exception, where rising diversity among less-assimilated immigrants is, albeit modestly, related to rising earnings.

Overall, the results in this article provide further evidence of the existence of benefits that derive from living and working in immigrant-diverse contexts. Perhaps more importantly, they highlight that not all immigrants contribute equally to such benefits and suggest a role for assimilation in shaping spillovers.

These findings do not produce unambiguous lessons for public policy. As an example, consider the finding that second-generation immigrants do not contribute to immigrant diversity. This might be because the children of immigrants are heuristically similar enough to citizens who have multigenerational Norwegian roots. But this does not imply that second-generation migrants do not contribute directly to productivity, only that they are not observably different from the rest of the Norwegian labor force in this respect. This is in fact indicative of successful integration, which is an important national policy goal in its own right (Brochmann and Hagelund 2012) and one that could be fruitfully taken up at the regional policy scale as well (Connor 2020; Gilmartin and Dagg 2020; Vogiazides and Mondani 2020). Immigration has complex effects on both natives and the immigrants themselves, even in narrow economic terms; it involves costs and benefits, with spillovers being only one part of a much more multidimensional picture.

Even with a narrow focus on spillovers, though, the findings in no way weaken policy incentives to integrate immigrants into host societies. Even if this were acceptable, the slightly smaller returns from the most recent immigrants suggest that some basic integration is useful for unlocking the potential of these spillovers. It does, however, suggest that finding ways of allowing immigrants to maintain and share their differing heuristics could allow for more unique and positive contributions to the economic performance of their adopted firms and regions. At a time when immigration and multiculturalism are increasingly contentious in many countries, this offers a word of caution. Introducing restrictions or barriers to immigrants' way of life in order to promote integration can come at the cost of reducing the benefits of the diversity that these groups provide to their host societies. Furthermore, the attenuation of the spillovers with more time spent in the country suggests potential benefits from welcoming new immigrants every year, in order to continuously add to the heuristic diversity in society. Over time, assimilation processes will reduce this heuristic diversity, suggesting that societies—and especially those with economies premised on complex problem solving and innovation—need a mechanism for regenerating variety.

As always, the findings come with caveats. The use of linked employer–employee data provides information on the composition of the population but ultimately gives only a birds-eye view of the assimilation process itself. Further studies are needed to give a more detailed account of how the assimilation process unfolds at the micro level and how this affects diversity spillovers. Such research can also shed more light on individual, as well as geographic, variation in assimilation across different immigrants and different host societies. This article represents a first venture into a topic that has received little attention in the literature on the costs and benefits of immigrant diversity. As the results show that assimilation is potentially an important mediator of diversity spillovers, further studies are needed to unpack these dynamics.

- Abramitzky, R., Boustan, L. P., and Eriksson, K. 2014. A nation of immigrants: Assimilation and economic outcomes in the age of mass migration. *Journal of Political Economy* 122 (3): 467–506. doi:10.1086/675805.
- Acemoglu, D., and Zilibotti, F. 2001. Productivity differences. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116 (2): 563–606. doi:10.1162/00335530151144104.
- Alba, R., and Nee, V. 1997. Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review* 31 (120): 826–74. doi:10.1177/019791839703100403.
- Alesina, A., Harnoss, J., and Rapoport, H. 2016. Birthplace diversity and economic prosperity. *Journal of Economic Growth* 21 (2): 101–38. doi:10.1007/s10887-016-9127-6.
- Alesina, A., and La Ferrara, E. 2005. Ethnic diversity and economic performance. *Journal of Economic Literature* 43 (3): 762–800. doi:10.1257/002205105774431243.
- Audretsch, D. B., and Feldman, M. P. 1996. R&D spillovers and the geography of innovation and production. *American Economic Review* 86 (3): 630–40.
- Bakens, J., Mulder, P., and Nijkamp, P. 2013. Economic impacts of cultural diversity in the Netherlands: Productivity, utility and sorting. *Journal of Regional Science* 53 (1): 8–36. doi:10.1111/jors.12012.
- Baltagi, B. 2013. *Econometric analysis of panel data*, 5th ed. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bartik, T. J. 1991. *Who benefits from state and local economic development policies?* Kalamazoo, MI: WE Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Bellini, E., Ottaviano, G., Pinelli, D., and Prarolo, G. 2013. Cultural diversity and economic performance: Evidence from European regions. In *Geography, institutions and regional economic performance*, ed. R. Crescenzi and M. Percoco, 121–42. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Borjas, G. J. 1994. Long-run convergence of ethnic skill differentials: The children and grandchildren of the great migration. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 47 (4): 553–73. doi:10.1177/001979399404700403.
- Brochmann, G., and Hagelund, A. 2012. Norway: The land of the golden mean. In *Immigration policy and the Scandinavian welfare state 1945–2010*, ed. G. Brochmann and A. Hagelund, 149–224. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, S. K., and Bean, F. D. 2006. Assimilation models, old and new: Explaining a long-term process. Migration Information Source. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/assimilation-models-old-and-new-explaining-long-term-process>.
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., and Katz, L. F. 2015. The effects of exposure to better neighborhoods on children: New evidence from the moving to opportunity experiment. Working Paper 21156. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w21156>.
- Clearwater, S., Huberman, B., and Hogg, T. 1991. Cooperative solution of constraint satisfaction problems. *Science* 254 (5035): 1181–83. doi:10.1126/science.254.5035.1181.
- Clogg, C. C., Petkova, E., and Haritou, A. 1995. Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (5): 1261–93. doi:10.1086/230638.
- Connor, D. S. 2020. Class background, reception context, and intergenerational mobility: A record linkage and surname analysis of the children of Irish immigrants. *International Migration Review* 54 (1): 4–34. doi:10.1177/0197918318806891.

- Cooke, A., and Kemeny, T. 2017. Cities, immigrant diversity, and complex problem solving. *Research Policy* 46 (6): 1175–85. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2017.05.003.
- Daley, A., Hu, M., and Min Warman, C. 2019. Language proficiency and immigrants' economic integration. IZA World of Labor. <https://wol.iza.org/uploads/articles/518/pdfs/language-proficiency-and-the-economic-integration-of-immigrants.one-pager.pdf?v=1>.
- Dawson, J. 2012. Measurement of work group diversity. PhD diss., Aston University.
- Delgado Gómez-Flors, M., and Alguacil, M. 2018. The impact of immigrant diversity on wages. The Spanish experience. *Sustainability* 10 (9): 3312. doi:10.3390/su10093312.
- Desmet, K., Weber, S., and Ortuño-Ortín, I. 2009. Linguistic diversity and redistribution. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 7 (6): 1291–318. doi:10.1162/JEEA.2009.7.6.1291.
- Docquier, F., Turati, R., Valette, J., and Vasilakis, C. 2020. Birthplace diversity and economic growth: Evidence from the US states in the post-World War II period. *Journal of Economic Geography* 20 (2): 321–54.
- Elias, A., and Paradies, Y. 2016. The regional impact of cultural diversity on wages: Evidence from Australia. *IZA Journal of Migration* 5 (1): 1–24. doi:10.1186/s40176-016-0060-4.
- Eriksen, T. H. 2016. Social anthropology and the shifting discourses about immigrants in Norway. In *Engaged anthropology*, ed. T. Bringa and S. Bendixsen, 99–120. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Ferrucci, E., and Lissoni, F. 2019. Foreign inventors in Europe and the United States: Diversity and patent quality. *Research Policy* 48 (9): 103774. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.019.
- Fitjar, R. D., and Timmermans, B. 2019. Relatedness and the resource curse: Is there a liability of relatedness? *Economic Geography* 95 (3): 231–55. doi:10.1080/00130095.2018.1544460.
- Furtado, D., and Trejo, S. J. 2013. Interethnic marriages and their economic effects. In *International handbook on the economics of migration*, ed. A. Constant and K. Zimmermann, 276–92. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Gathmann, C., and Keller, N. 2018. Access to citizenship and the economic assimilation of immigrants. *Economic Journal* 128 (616): 3141–81. doi:10.1111/ecoj.12546.
- Gilmartin, M., and Dagg, J. 2020. Spatializing immigrant integration outcomes. *Population, Space and Place* e2390. doi:10.1002/psp.2274.
- Goodwin-White, J. 2008. Placing progress: Contextual inequality and immigrant incorporation in the United States. *Economic Geography* 84 (3): 303–32. doi:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2008.tb00367.x.
- . 2016. Is social mobility spatial? Characteristics of immigrant metros and second generation outcomes: 1940–1970 and 1970–2000. *Population, Space and Place* 22 (8): 807–22. doi:10.1002/psp.1960.
- Gundersen, F., and Juvkam, D. 2013. Inndelinger i senterstruktur, sentralitet og ba- regioner. [Division into centre structures, centrality and residence and labour market regions]. NIBR Report 2013:1.
- Hagelund, A. 2002. Problematizing culture: Discourses on integration in Norway. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 3 (3–4): 401–15. doi:10.1007/s12134-002-1022-7.
- Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D., and Pietrantonio, G. 2017. Catalyst or crown: Does naturalization promote the long-term social integration of immigrants? *American Political Science Review* 111 (2): 256–76. doi:10.1017/S0003055416000745.
- Haus-Reve, S., Fitjar, R. D., and Rodríguez-Pose, A. 2019. Does combining different types of collaboration always benefit firms? Collaboration, complementarity and product innovation in Norway. *Research Policy* 48 (6): 1476–86. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2019.02.008.
- Herstad, S. J., Aslesen, H. W., and Ebersberger, B. 2014. On industrial knowledge bases, commercial opportunities and global innovation network linkages. *Research Policy* 43 (3): 495–504. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2013.08.003.
- Hong, L., and Page, S. 2001. Problem solving by heterogeneous agents. *Journal of Economic Theory* 97 (1): 123–63. doi:10.1006/jeth.2000.2709.
- . 2004. Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101 (46): 16385–89. doi:10.1073/pnas.0403723101.

- Iskander, N., Riordan, C., and Lowe, N. 2013. Learning in place: Immigrants' spatial and temporal strategies for occupational advancement. *Economic Geography* 89 (1): 53–75. doi:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2012.01171.x.
- Jimenez, T. 2017. *The other side of assimilation: How immigrants are changing American life*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Kemeny, T. 2012. Cultural diversity, institutions, and urban economic performance. *Environment and Planning A* 44 (9): 2134–52. doi:10.1068/a44385.
- . 2017. Immigrant diversity and economic performance in cities. *International Regional Science Review* 40 (2): 164–208. doi:10.1177/0160017614541695.
- Kemeny, T., and Cooke, A. 2017. Urban immigrant diversity and inclusive institutions. *Economic Geography* 93 (3): 267–91. doi:10.1080/00130095.2017.1300056.
- . 2018. Spillovers from immigrant diversity in cities. *Journal of Economic Geography* 18 (1): 213–45. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbx012.
- Kemeny, T., and Storper, M. 2015. Is specialization good for regional economic development? *Regional Studies* 49 (6): 1003–18. doi:10.1080/00343404.2014.899691.
- Lee, N. 2014. Migrant and ethnic diversity, cities and innovation: Firm effects or city effects? *Journal of Economic Geography* 15 (4): 769–96. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbu032.
- 22 Longhi, S. 2013. Impact of cultural diversity on wages, evidence from panel data. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 43 (5): 797–807. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2013.07.004.
- Majerski, M. M. 2019. The earnings of immigrant and native-born men in Canada: The role of social networks and social capital. *Sociological Quarterly* 60 (2): 314–36. doi:10.1080/00380253.2018.1526054.
- Mano, R., and Castillo, M. 2015. The level of productivity in traded and non-traded sectors for a large panel of countries. Working Paper 15/48. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2016/12/31/The-Level-of-Productivity-in-Traded-and-Non-Traded-Sectors-for-a-Large-Panel-of-Countries-42750>.
- Minde, H. 2005. Assimilation of the Sami—Implementation and consequences. Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International, 196. London, Ontario: Western University. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1248&context=aprci>.
- Möhlmann, J., and Bakens, J. 2015. Ethnic diversity and firm productivity in the Netherlands. In *The economics of cultural diversity*, ed. P. Nijkamp, J. Poot, and J. Bakens, 397–424. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Nathan, M. 2011. The long-term impacts of migration in British cities: Diversity, wages, employment and prices. LSE Spatial Economics Research Centre (SERC) Discussion Paper 67. London: London School of Economics. <http://www.spataleconomics.ac.uk/textonly/SERC/publications/download/sercdp0067.pdf>.
- . 2014. The wider economic impacts of high-skilled migrants: A survey of the literature for receiving countries. *IZA Journal of Migration* 3 (1): 1–20. <https://izajodm.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/2193-9039-3-4#citeas>.
- . 2015. Same difference? Minority ethnic inventors, diversity and innovation in the UK. *Journal of Economic Geography* 15 (1): 129–68. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbu006.
- Nijkamp, P., and Poot, J. 2015. Cultural diversity: A matter of measurement. In *The economics of cultural diversity*, ed. P. Nijkamp, J. Poot, and J. Bakens, 17–51. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Nisbett, R., and Ross, L. 1980. *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ottaviano, G., and Peri, G. 2006. The economic value of cultural diversity: Evidence from US cities. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6 (1): 9–44. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbi002.
- Özden, C., Parsons, C. R., Schiff, M., and Walmsley, T. L. 2011. Where on earth is everybody? The evolution of global bilateral migration 1960–2000. *World Bank Economic Review* 25 (1): 12–56. doi:10.1093/wber/lhr024.
- Ozgen, C., Nijkamp, P., and Poot, J. 2013. The impact of cultural diversity on firm innovation: Evidence from Dutch micro-data. *IZA Journal of Migration* 2 (1): 18. doi:10.1186/2193-9039-2-18.

- Page, S. 2008. *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Peters, F., Schmeets, H., and Vink, M. 2019. Naturalisation and immigrant earnings: Why and to whom citizenship matters. *European Journal of Population* 36 (3): 511–45. doi:10.1007/s10680-019-09540-1.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., and Von Berlepsch, V. 2014. When migrants rule: The legacy of mass migration on economic development in the United States. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104 (3): 628–51. doi:10.1080/00045608.2014.892381.
- . 2019. Does population diversity matter for economic development in the very long term? Historic migration, diversity and county wealth in the US. *European Journal of Population* 35 (5): 873–911. doi:10.1007/s10680-018-9507-z.
- Roupakias, S., and Dimou, S. 2018. Impact of cultural diversity on local labor markets. Evidence from Greece’s “age of mass migration.” *Manchester School* 88 (2): 282–304. doi:10.1111/manc.12301.
- Solheim, M. C., and Fitjar, R. D. 2018. Foreign workers are associated with innovation, but why? International networks as a mechanism. *International Regional Science Review* 41 (3): 311–34. doi:10.1177/0160017615626217.
- Statistics Norway. 2018. Innvandring: 14 prosent av befolkningen er innvandrere [14 percent of the population are immigrants]. <https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/14-prosent-av-befolkningen-er-innvandrere>.
- Suedekum, J., Wolf, K., and Blien, U. 2014. Cultural diversity and local labour markets. *Regional Studies* 48 (1): 173–91. doi:10.1080/00343404.2012.697142.
- Thomas, D., and Ely, R. 1996. Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review* 74 (5): 79–90.
- Trax, M., Brunow, S., and Suedekum, J. 2015. Cultural diversity and plant-level productivity. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 53:85–96. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2015.05.004.
- US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2015. *The integration of immigrants into American society*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Vogiazides, L., and Mondani, H. 2020. A geographical path to integration? Exploring the interplay between regional context and labour market integration among refugees in Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (1): 23–45. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2019.1588717.