**It's not all About the Peers:
Reintroducing School Context to the School Segregation Literature**

Solveig Topstad Borgen¹

¹University of Oslo

Acknowledgements

I thank Professor Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund, Are Skeie Hermansen, and Nicolai Topstad Borgen for valuable inputs and comments. I am also grateful for comments from other colleagues at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo, and especially members of the Social Inequalities and Population Dynamics research unit. Earlier versions of this article has been presented at the 2018 European Consortium for Sociological Research Conference in Paris, at seminars at the University of Oslo, and at the Norwegian Demographic Association. This work was supported by the Norwegian Research Council [grant number 236793]. I have access to Norwegian administrative data through the project "Ethnic segregation in schools and neighbourhoods: consequences and dynamics". Statistics Norway made the administrative data available.

Declaration of interests:

None

Corresponding author

Solveig Topstad Borgen
University of Oslo
P.O. box 1096
Blindern
0317 OSLO
NORWAY

E-mail: s.t.borgen@sosgeo.uio.no

Abstract

This paper investigates the effect of attending immigrant-dense schools on student outcomes, which consists of the joint effect of immigrant peers and school context. The sorting of students into schools is not random, and a large immigrant peer effect literature uses school fixed effects to eliminate selection bias. However, keeping schools fixed also eliminates the effect of the school context and is accordingly unsuited to estimate the total effect of attending immigrant-dense schools. By using both a value-added approach and by drawing on application data to manage selection bias, this paper demonstrates that attending immigrant-dense upper secondary schools in Norway negatively affect students' completion of academic tracks, even though a school fixed effects model indicates no immigrant peer effects. These findings suggest that immigrant-dense schools affect students in other ways than through mere peer exposure, and that research on the consequences of school segregation should take into account the effect of both school context and peers.

Keywords

Application fixed effects, School segregation, School fixed effects, Peer effects, School effects, Immigrant

1. Introduction

A massive increase in migration to affluent Western European countries over the last decades has introduced new lines of social stratification (Heath et al., 2008). One strand of research that studies stratification along ethnic lines concerns the role of school segregation, meaning that students from different racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic backgrounds attend different schools (Owens, 2019, Coleman et al., 1966). A large literature has provided sound evidence on how peer composition affects student outcomes (peer effects) (Sacerdote, 2011), which is essential to understand the consequences of school segregation. However, immigrant school segregation could affect students' educational achievements via both the composition of the peer group and the contextual settings at segregated schools, such as teacher quality and school resources (Coleman et al. 1966). Compared to peer effects, the evidence on the impact of contextual differences between segregated schools is considerably more limited (Reardon and Owens, 2014).

The heavy emphasis on peer effects in the school segregation literature may be partly a legacy of the Coleman report, which concludes that “the social composition of the student body is more highly related to achievement, independent of the student’s own social background, than is any school factor” (Coleman et al., 1966:325). Additionally, the development of the counterfactual model of causality in the 1970s and onwards (Morgan and Winship, 2014), improvements in data availability (Einav and Levin, 2014) and computational efficiency (Cioffi-Revilla, 2017), and the novel use of school fixed effects models (Hoxby, 2000) may have nudged the literature towards estimating peer effects.

The school fixed effects approach has become popular because it removes or at least alleviates selection bias. Students in different schools may be systematically different on unobserved characteristics, known as the selection problem (Hoxby, 2000). By including school fixed effects, one compares subsequent cohorts of students who attend the same school. However, by comparing students within the same school, the fixed effects research design disregards the potential effects of contextual differences between schools. Thus, the widespread use of school fixed effects has provided us with an extensive literature that credible estimates immigrant peer effects (e.g., Hermansen and Birkelund, 2015, Conger, 2015, Hardoy et al., 2017, Fletcher et al., 2019). In contrast, the total effect of attending schools with different peer compositions remains underinvestigated.

This paper reintroduces the idea that immigrant school segregation may affect students’ educational outcomes beyond peer effects and uses methods that allow for credible estimation of the effects of attending immigrant-dense schools (effects of peers and school traits in total). Using high-quality population-wide Norwegian administrative data, I examine

whether attending immigrant-dense schools influences students' likelihood of completing upper secondary school. An application fixed effects strategy is used to address the selection problem without discarding the effect of school traits. While school fixed effects manage selection by comparing students who attend the same school, the application fixed effects strategy compares students who apply to the same school but are admitted to different schools.

While US school segregation research has mainly, but not exclusively, focused on black–white segregation (Reardon and Owens, 2014), a comprehensive immigrant school segregation literature has emerged in Europe (e.g., Brunello and De Paola, 2017). Unlike the segregation literature that measures immigrant school segregation as deviations from an even distribution of immigrants across schools, this paper relates to the literature that measures school segregation by the makeup of students and estimates effects of the proportion of immigrant peers (Owens, 2019). Thus, I ask whether a student's likelihood of completion would have been different had the student attended a school with a different immigrant density, not whether the likelihood of completion had been different if all immigrants were distributed equally across schools.

2. Theory and previous research

Attending immigrant-dense schools may affect students through interactions with immigrant peers and via school characteristics correlated with immigrant proportion, such as teacher quality, curriculum, and facilities (Reardon and Owens, 2014).

2.1. Immigrant peer effects

The scientific literature on peer effects is large (Sacerdote, 2011) and reaches back to the 1960s (Duncan et al., 1968). Peer effects arise from a complex process where various mechanisms are at odds with one another and where the influence of peers on academic outcomes is a composite of different mechanisms (Borgen et al., 2021). To begin, the *normative model* of peer effects argues that students are affected by their peers' achievement level as high-achieving peers make for a learning-oriented peer culture (Jencks and Mayer, 1990, Legewie and DiPrete, 2012, Goldsmith, 2011). Immigrants are a heterogeneous group with widely different educational performance; however, immigrants perform on average lower than natives in most OECD countries (OECD, 2010). Thus, according to the normative model of peer effects, one could expect on average adverse spillover effects of immigrant peers.

By itself, the normative model might give a too simplistic view of peer effects. According to the so-called 'frog pond' perspective, students evaluate themselves relative to their peer group (Jonsson and Mood, 2008, Crosnoe, 2009). Students may gain academic self-confidence and educational aspirations from standing out among their peers (Rosenqvist, 2018). Since immigrants have lower average achievement levels, having immigrant peers may positively affect student achievements (Crosnoe, 2009, Goldsmith, 2011).

Another mechanism through which immigrant peers might affect students is by so-called *congestion effects* (Lazear, 2001). Immigrants often have poorer language proficiency (Espenshade and Fu, 1997) and more behavioral problems than their native counterparts, perhaps because they have experienced trauma and distress (Caspi et al., 2002, Hällsten et al.,

2013). These characteristics may cause teachers to spend more time on discipline and less time teaching (McCoach and Siegle, 2001, De Bruyn et al., 2003), thereby harming students' educational achievements (Fletcher, 2010). At the same time, immigrants tend to have higher educational aspirations than their native counterparts (Jonsson and Rudolphi, 2011, OECD, 2010), show more positive attitudes towards school, and spend more time doing homework (Lauglo, 1999). This 'immigrant drive' (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001) leads us to expect the opposite of congestion effects; having more immigrant peers may create a better learning environment and positively affect students' achievements.

Furthermore, peers' parents constitute a part of students' networks that provides informal knowledge on how to achieve educational success. The benefit of this parental network may decline when it includes many immigrant parents with limited informal knowledge (Conger, 2015). On the other hand, many immigrants have parents who aspire for their educational careers, situating them to perform academically (Kao and Tienda, 1995). A strong community of aspiring parents can reinforce teachers' efforts to make students work hard (Coleman and Hoffer, 1987) and, consequently, positively influence their children's peers' educational outcomes.

2.2. Schools that host immigrant students

The school context of immigrant-dense schools may differ systematically from other schools in ways that may affect students' achievements. Such contextual differences could occur either if immigrants typically sort into schools with certain traits or if schools become different due to hosting immigrant students. First, studies have suggested that schools with a high share of immigrant students may have lower quality (Jennings et al., 2015). Students in immigrant-

dense schools may receive inferior schooling in terms of curriculum, time spent on curriculum, facilities, and information on their own achievements (Gandara et al., 2003). Furthermore, teaching traditions may be systematically different in immigrant-dense schools than in other schools (Cebolla-Boado and Garrido Medina, 2011). Additionally, teacher effectiveness, which influences students' educational outcomes (Hanushek et al., 2004), is considerably lower in schools that serve poor and minority students (Peske and Haycock, 2006). Schools that host many immigrant students are more likely to struggle with inexperienced teachers and teacher attrition and are accordingly at higher risk of offering low-quality teaching than other schools (Karsten et al., 2006, OECD, 2010).

Second – and contradictory to the first point – the sizeable native-immigrant performance gap has spurred a range of policy initiatives that pour extra resources into immigrant-dense schools (OECD, 2010). These initiatives may compensate for, or even outweigh, the potential challenges related to teacher attrition and teaching quality.

Finally, schools that differ in immigrant share may vary with respect to the characteristics of the native student body. Immigrants tend to be overrepresented in socioeconomically disadvantaged schools (Jean et al., 2007), which means that students in immigrant-dense schools are likely to have socioeconomically disadvantaged native peers as well as immigrant peers. Attending schools with socioeconomically disadvantaged peers has been shown to have adverse effects on individual academic performance (Portes and MacLeod, 1996, Cebolla-Boado and Garrido Medina, 2011, Legewie and DiPrete, 2012). Thus, attending an immigrant-dense school may affect student outcomes not only because of immigrant peer effects but also through peer effects stemming from disadvantaged native peers.

2.3. Previous research

There is a large empirical literature on immigrant peer effects. Some research finds negative immigrant peer effects on educational outcomes, including in Sweden (Szulkin and Jonsson, 2007), Israel (Gould et al., 2009), Italy (Ballatore et al., 2018), Austria (Schneeweis, 2015), the Netherlands (Veerman et al., 2013), and in the US (Fletcher et al., 2019). Other studies find no or even positive immigrant peer effects. Bifulco et al. (2011) and Conger (2015) find no peer effects of disadvantaged minority peers in the US setting; Ohinata and Van Ours (2013) find no spillover immigrant peer effects on natives in Dutch schools; Geay et al. (2013) find no peer effects of non-English-speaking students in the UK; and Brandén et al. (2018) find mixed—albeit modest—immigrant peer effects in Sweden. Silveira et al. (2019) find that both immigrant and non-immigrant students benefit from more immigration from investigating cross-national data from 41 high-income countries. Brunello and De Paola (2017) provide a detailed review of the literature and concludes that while the findings from Europe are mixed, the share of immigrant peers in class or school generally seems to have adverse effects on students, and more so on immigrant than native students.

In the Norwegian setting, Hermansen and Birkelund (2015) find no immigrant peer effects on short-term educational outcomes in lower secondary school and modest positive immigrant peer effects on long-term outcomes. Hardoy and Schøne (2013) find negative immigrant peer effects in Norwegian upper secondary schools, while no effects are found by Hardoy et al. (2018).

Like that of peer effects, there is a vast literature on the effect of school characteristics such as school resources and teacher quality on student outcomes (e.g., Jackson et al., 2016,

Morgan and Shackelford, 2018, Darling-Hammond, 2000). Thus, if one is concerned with research questions defining the effect of peers, school quality, or school resources as the relevant estimand, the literature provides a well of evidence. However, this is not the case when defining the estimand as the effect of attending immigrant-dense schools on student outcomes; research on the consequences of school segregation, considering *both* peer effects and contextual differences between schools, is scarce (Reardon and Owens, 2014, Raitano and Vona, 2010).

3. Norway as a case

Norway is comparable to other rich, European host countries with regard to migrant inflows (OECD, 2020). The proportion of immigrants and children of immigrants has increased rapidly over recent decades, from 1.5 percent in 1970 to 17.7 percent in 2019 (Statistics Norway, 2000, Statistics Norway, 2019a).¹ The largest immigrant groups as of 2018 (percentage of total population given in parentheses) originate from Poland (2.09), Lithuania (0.83), Somalia (0.80), Sweden (0.73), Pakistan (0.71), Iraq (0.63), Syria (0.56), Germany (0.52), and Eritrea (0.50).²

The Norwegian educational system consists of three main levels: compulsory education (ages 6–15), upper secondary education (ages 16–19), and higher education. Every student who completes compulsory education is entitled by law to upper secondary education (Education Act, 1998), and the vast majority, 92.8 percent of all those aged 16–18 years in 2019, attend upper secondary school (Statistics Norway, 2019b). Students enroll in either an academic track (usually a three-year program), culminating in University and College Admission Certification, or a vocational track (usually a four-year program including an apprenticeship).³

Contextual differences between Norwegian upper secondary schools are likely to be modest. Historically, social democratic ideas of equality and justice have substantially influenced school politics (Ofstedal Telhaug et al., 2006). For instance, all upper secondary schools are publicly funded, most are publicly owned, and most do not charge tuition fees. As of 2017, 90.2 percent of students in academic programs and 95.5 percent in vocational programs attend public schools.⁴ Moreover, although a school reform in 2006 gave local schools more freedom to define subject content and teaching methods, there remains a centralized basic curriculum prescribed by the government (Ofstedal Telhaug et al., 2006). Furthermore, compensatory resource allocation across schools could further reduce contextual differences between schools (Hægeland et al., 2005). The initial modest contextual differences between schools make Norway a conservative case for investigation, which should be considered in interpreting the effects of attending immigrant-dense schools.

The Norwegian upper secondary school application and admission regime has features that facilitate the use of application fixed effects, presented in detail in section 4.3. Individuals usually apply for public upper secondary schools in one joint application addressed to their home county (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2018), where they rank their school and program preferences. Applicants usually compete for admission to their preferred schools and programs based on their grade point average (GPA) from lower secondary schools (Regulations to the Education Act, 2006), and receive an offer of admission only to the highest-ranked school and program preference for which their GPA suffices. That is, if the applicants' GPAs entitle them to admission to their first choice of school and program, they will not get an offer of admission to any of their lower ranked choices. Consequently, students with similar

school preferences and approximately similar GPAs—characteristics that are likely to account for school selection—may be sent to different schools depending on whether their GPA suffice for outcompeting other applicants.⁵

4. Methods

4.1. Data and sample

I use high-quality population-wide administrative data constructed by merging several administrative registers, which include information on all Norwegian residents since 1960 and information on their siblings, parents, and grandparents. The analysis sample contains those who enroll in an academic upper secondary track at age 16 between 2003 and 2010. Academic track programs include ‘general studies’, ‘sports and physical education’, and ‘music, dance, and drama’, which are the programs that have remained parts of the academic track throughout the time span of the data despite reforms of the upper secondary education (Report No. 030 (2003-2004) to the Storting, 2004). The sample excludes immigrants who arrive after school starting age, students attending private schools, schools that admit fewer than ten students on average each year, and school cohorts with fewer than ten students (because private schools and small schools are likely to be specialized or serve students with special needs). Information on school applications exists for almost 96 percent of the remaining sample.

4.2. Measures

The outcome variable is completing upper secondary education, indicating 1 if the individuals are registered with a completed education within the nominal three years plus one year, and 0 otherwise.⁶ The treatment variable is the individual’s proportion of immigrant peers within

the school program cohort (excluding the individual), measured at the beginning of upper secondary education. A peer is considered an immigrant if he/she is born abroad or has only foreign-born parents.

Individual controls include dummies for gender, family status (if the student lived in an intact or reconstituted family at age 16), residential relocation during compulsory education, country of origin, and immigrant category, as well as first-order terms for mother's age when giving birth, number of siblings, and birth order, and first- and second-order terms for grade point average (GPA) from lower secondary school.⁷ Parental controls measured when the individual is aged 11-15 include first- and second-order terms for the sum of parents' average annual earnings (ranked in percentiles within childrens' birth cohort), and a dummy for parental receipt of social welfare indicating whether the parents received total social welfare transfers above the monthly basic amount rate in one or more years.⁸ Dummies indicate whether the highest education of the parents when the individual is aged 16 falls into either category: No registered education, basic compulsory education, upper secondary education, postsecondary education at the BA level, and postsecondary education at the MA level. Other controls include sets of dummies indicating the individual's lower secondary school, lower secondary school county, school cohort, and study program.

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics along with a t-test of the difference between native and immigrant means. On average, immigrants have worse academic achievements (GPA) and lower socioeconomic status than natives (parents' income, education, and social welfare transfers).

[Table 1]

4.3. Analytical strategies

Four linear probability models (i.e., OLS-models) are estimated. The first model disregards potential confounding variables (controlling for cohorts and programs only)

$$Y_{ispc} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{ispc} + \delta_c + \gamma_p + \varepsilon_{ispc} \quad (1)$$

, while the second model includes a rich set of control variables for observed individual and parental characteristics

$$Y_{ispc} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{ispc} + \beta_2 X_{ispc} + \delta_c + \gamma_p + \varepsilon_{ispc} \quad (2)$$

, where i , s , p , and c indicate individuals, schools, programs, and cohorts, respectively. Y is the likelihood of completion, I is the individual's proportion of immigrant peers, X is a vector of individual and parental characteristics (including prior academic achievements), δ is cohort fixed effects, γ is program fixed effects, and ε is an individual error term clustered on upper secondary school.

Model 2 captures the effect of both peers and school traits, as it compares students who attend different schools. The inclusion of GPA from lower secondary school makes Model 2 resemble what is often referred to as a value-added model (VAM) (Hanushek and Rivkin, 2010).⁹ Studies have suggested that the potential selection bias is likely to be small in VAMs (Koedel et al., 2015).

Nevertheless, I use an application fixed effects strategy to further strengthen the design, which resembles how the seminal study by Dale and Krueger (2002) have used application data in the higher education literature.¹⁰ The application fixed effects model, Model 3, groups students in the same cohort who rank the same school and program first in their application list for upper secondary school. The general idea is that students reveal some of their otherwise unobserved characteristics, such as academic ambition, through their upper secondary education applications. Including application fixed effects may accordingly further alleviate confounding. Model 3 with application fixed effects can be written as follows:

$$Y_{ispca} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{spc} + \beta_2 X_{ispca} + \gamma_p + \lambda_a + \varepsilon_{ispca} \quad (3)$$

, where the subscript a indicates application groups and λ is application fixed effects. Cohort fixed effects (δ) are redundant, as cohorts are constant within the application fixed effects. The vector of individual and parental characteristics, X , is the same as in the value-added model above (equation 2). Thus, the application fixed effects model compares individuals who apply for the same school and program but are admitted to different schools, net of background variables such as prior academic achievements, gender, and parental characteristics.¹¹

In the fourth and final model, I include school-by-program fixed effects instead of the application fixed effects. This model compares students who attend the same school and program across cohorts, while adjusting for prior academic achievements and other individual and parental characteristics. The school fixed effects model uses idiosyncratic variations in

immigrant proportion over time within a school and program, making it well suited for estimating the causal effects of peers (Hoxby, 2000). The strategy also removes the effect of any time-invariant contextual differences between schools and programs. This makes the strategy unsuitable for investigating the effect of attending immigrant-dense schools, as these schools may differ not only concerning peer composition but also with regard to other contextual traits (Coleman et al., 1966, Reardon and Owens, 2014). The school fixed effects model can be written as

$$Y_{ispc} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 I_{spc} + \beta_2 X_{ispc} + \delta_c + \alpha_{sp} + \varepsilon_{ispc} \quad (4)$$

where α is school-by-program fixed effects. Program fixed effects (γ) are redundant, as the effects of programs are constant within the school-by-program fixed effects.¹²

While a school-by-program fixed effects strategy compares students *attending* the same school and program combination, the application fixed effects strategy compares students who *prefer* to attend the same combination. Notwithstanding this key difference, the application fixed effects model may account for selection bias just as well as the school-by-program fixed effects model; if students self-select into schools and programs on unobserved characteristics, it seems plausible that students' school preferences will take account of bias caused by self-selection in the same manner as students' school attendance. The school and application fixed effects models have complementary strengths; the school fixed effects model allows for isolating peer effects from other school characteristics, whereas the application fixed effects model allows identifying the total effects of attending immigrant-dense schools (including peer effects).

A drawback of the application fixed effects approach is that it leaves students who apply for the least popular school and program combinations out of the estimation, which is presumably the very least ambitious students. The least popular school and program combinations have fewer applicants and are more likely to admit all applicants. Students who rank an unpopular combination at the top of their application will thus end up in fixed effects groups where all students are admitted to the same school and program, leading to no variation in either school context or peers in these groups of students. Consequently, the application fixed effects results cannot be directly generalized to the least ambitious students.

Another potential challenge of using application fixed effects is variations in application and admission practices across counties and changes in these practices over time. For example, while counties normally allow students to apply for any school in the county, as stated in section 3, some counties restrict available schools to those within the local county region (The counties' information service for applicants to upper secondary education and training, 2018). I manage potential bias from shifts and variations in admission regimes by utilizing only within-cohort variations, and by controlling for lower secondary school county. Besides, evaluations of changes in admission practices have shown little change in applicants' behavior (Lødding and Helland, 2007). Consequently, different practices across counties and time should not bias the estimates. However, practices that restrict the number of schools available for the students could reduce the estimates' precision because such practices limit the number of students in each application group that actually attend different schools.¹³

5. Results

Figure 1 shows the distribution of immigrant peers with vertical lines indicating the immigrant share at the 10th and 90th percentile, which is 0 and 20.5 percent, respectively.

[Figure 1]

[Table 2]

The top row in Table 2 shows that, on average, immigrants account for 9.5 percent of students' peers, with a standard deviation of 11.2. The fixed effect approaches utilize only the variation in immigrant proportion within each fixed effect group. The amount of utilized variation is expressed in Table 2 by the standard deviation of residuals from regressing the proportion of immigrants on each of the fixed effects specifications. Application fixed effects utilize more variation than school-by-program fixed effects, as the between-school standard deviation (0.047) is larger than the within-school standard deviation (0.036).

[Table 3]

Table 3 describes the different fixed effects groupings. As expected, there are more and smaller application groups than school-by-program groups. These preliminary results show a fair amount of variation in immigrant proportions within both school-by-program groups and application groups by which to identify potential effects.

5.1. Main analyses

Table 4 presents models estimating the effect of proportion immigrant peers on completing an academic track in upper secondary school. The coefficients represent changes in completion when the share of immigrant peers changes from 0 to 1 (0 to 100%), and can be multiplied with about 0.2 to compare a range comparable to the 90th vs. the 10th percentile (see Figure 1). In a naïve model without any individual-level controls nor fixed effects (Model 1), students at the 90th percentile have 4.7 percentage points lower likelihood of completion compared to students at the 10th percentile (-0.235×0.2).

Including prior academic achievements and other individual and parental characteristics (Model 2) substantially reduces the effect size; the value-added model indicates that students at the 90th percentile have close to 1 percentage points lower likelihood of completion compared to students at the 10th percentile (0.0471×0.2). Including application fixed effects on top of the value-added specification (Model 3) strengthens the effects somewhat, to 1.46 percentage points (0.073×0.2).

[Table 4]

Model 4 identifies immigrant peer effects by including school-by-program fixed effects to the value added-specifications instead of the application fixed effects. Thus, it utilizes idiosyncratic variation in the proportion of immigrants across cohorts within each school and program, and keeps the school context constant. The immigrant peer effects estimated by Model 4 are of similar magnitude as the effects estimated by the value-added model but not statistically significant ($p\text{-value} = 17.7$). Because the school fixed effects model utilizes less of the variation

in the data (see Table 3), the standard error in this model is larger than in the value-added model and the application fixed effects model. The school fixed effects coefficient needs to be at 0.063 for it to be significant at the 5% level with the current standard error (i.e., standard error*1.96).

Online appendix F shows results from analyses that estimate effects on immigrant and native students separately. The negative effect of attending immigrant-dense schools does not apply to immigrant students or, alternatively, it is too small to be identified with the current data (Model 3). In contrast, the estimated immigrant peer effects are positive for immigrant students, but far from significant (Model 4). Below, I report results from elaborative analyses based on Model 3 (application fixed effects) and Model 4 (school-by-program fixed effects).

5.2. Trends and thresholds

Figure 2 examines the potential nonlinear effects of immigrant share by including dummies for no immigrant peers, 0–10 percent, 10–20 percent, 20–30 percent, 30–40 percent, and over 40 percent immigrant peers (with no immigrant peers as the reference group). The left-most panel compares students in different school settings using the application fixed effects model (Model 3). It reveals that the likelihood of completion tends to decrease gradually as the proportion of immigrants increases. Students in school settings with more than 40 percent immigrant peers have 5.29 percentage points lower likelihood of completing compared to students in school settings without immigrant peers.

[Figure 2]

The right-most panel shows immigrant peer effects estimated using a school-by-program fixed effects model (Model 4). The coefficients are close to zero for immigrant proportions less than 40 percent with fairly tight confidence intervals. Thus, the peer effect estimate of having more than 40 percent immigrant peers is negative but imprecisely estimated and not significant at conventional levels.

5.3. Region of origin

The proportion of immigrant peers is defined without regard for the peers' country of origin in the main analyses. However, immigrant characteristics may vary substantially according to their country or region of origin, as shown by Table H1 in online appendix H. Figure H1 and Table H2 show results from analyses exploring divergent effects of attending schools with a high share of different immigrant subgroups. The application fixed effects model discloses significant negative effects of attending a school setting with peers from Sub-Saharan Africa and from the Middle East, North Africa, and Greater Arabia. These results indicate that the overall negative effect of attending immigrant-dense schools found in the main analyses could be driven by the contextual setting at schools with many students from these specific regions. The school-by-program fixed effects model indicates negative effects of having immigrant peers from the region Scandinavia, Western Europe, and North America and from the region Sub-Saharan Africa. However, while the estimated effect of immigrants from the first group is borderline significant at the 5 percent level, the estimated effect of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa is highly imprecise.

6. Conclusion

The seminal Coleman report from 1966 (Coleman et al., 1966) set out to investigate school segregation by examining differences in peer composition and differences in educational contexts across schools, such as teacher quality and school resources. While recent decades have provided a large body of literature on immigrant peer effects, research considering both peer effects and contextual differences between schools is scarce (Reardon and Owens, 2014). This paper highlights that immigrant school segregation may conceptually play a role in social stratification even in the absence of peer effects and demonstrates this empirically by using credible identification strategies.

The results indicate that attending immigrant-dense schools in Norway has a small but significant, negative effect on students' likelihood of completing upper secondary education. This effect could be due to immigrant peer effects, school traits correlated with immigrant peers, or both. These results are from a well-established value-added approach that is known to handle bias from students selecting into schools (Koedel et al., 2015), and additionally draws on application data to further limit potential selection bias. A school fixed effects model that allows for isolating the immigrant peer effects from other school traits correlated with immigrant peers, shows no significant immigrant peer effects. Overall, the results suggest that other school traits than the immigrant peers are responsible for the adverse effects of attending immigrant-dense schools.

This paper's results fit with previous research in that it finds little evidence for immigrant peer effects (Hardoy et al., 2017). Finding no immigrant peer effects could suggest that students are unaffected by having immigrant peers, or that complex and contradicting mechanisms

produce peer effects that even each other out (Borgen et al., 2021). For instance, the potential adverse effects of having, on average, low-achieving immigrant peers (OECD, 2010) could be outweighed by positive externalities of these peers' 'immigrant drive' (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Alternatively, it could be that immigrant peer effects exist but are too small to be identified by the current data and model. Finding significant negative effects of attending immigrant-dense schools, in the absence of significant peer effects, indicates the educational disadvantages of attending immigrant-dense schools are not caused solely, or perhaps even at all, by exposure to immigrant peers. Rather, it may suggest that students in immigrant-dense schools are offered an inferior educational setting.

The literature that uses credible identification strategies to investigate the effects of attending immigrant-dense schools is sparse, and more research is needed to support the findings in this paper. Furthermore, more research is needed to unpack the mechanisms behind the negative effects of attending immigrant-dense schools. Previous research suggests explanations such as differing teacher quality (Hanushek and Rivkin, 2010, Peske and Haycock, 2006), differing curricula, time spent on curricula, facilities, and achievement feedback (Gandara et al., 2003), differing teaching traditions (Cebolla-Boado and Garrido Medina, 2011), and differing peer compositions according to socioeconomic background (Portes and MacLeod, 1996, Cebolla-Boado and Garrido Medina, 2011, Legewie and DiPrete, 2012). Investigating the existence and comprehensiveness of such differences across segregated schools, and investigating the mechanisms producing systematic differences between segregated schools, could provide valuable, policy-relevant insights.

Even the modest effects found in this paper could suggest consequences of school segregation that are of both theoretical and practical importance. First, the effect size of attending immigrant-dense schools on completion should be seen in the light of the prospects of measures to increase completion. It is notoriously difficult to identify and implement measures that increase completion rates (OECD, 2012). Finding that school segregation affects completion even in a modest manner could thus serve as a valuable guideline for identifying measures to increase completion. In this perspective, this study's effect size is quite large. This paper's results suggest that a 20 percentage point increase in immigrant peers reduces the likelihood of upper secondary education completion by 1.46 percentage points. To put it in context, this effect size is equal to about 14.3 and 18.4 percent of the sample's raw native-immigrant gap and raw girl-boy gap in completing academic upper secondary education, respectively. Moreover, relative to the baseline dropout rate of 17.5 percent in this study's sample, 1.46 percentage points increase in upper secondary dropout amounts to an 8.3 percent increase in the dropout rate, which is arguably sizable.

Second, upper secondary school completion is a critical outcome, as school dropout is related to a range of disadvantages for individuals and society (OECD, 2012). Thus, even a relatively modest effect of school segregation on completion may have substantial consequences. Furthermore, using completion as an outcome as opposed to a continuous outcome variable such as GPA may entail that students make an extra effort not to reach the 'tipping point' of the outcome. Recall also that the estimation strategy fails to include the least ambitious students, who may be closer to this tipping point. The outcome measure and the estimation strategy could accordingly underestimate the consequences of attending immigrant-dense schools.

Third, the effect size could be larger among students in vocational tracks where completion rates are generally lower (Statistics Norway, 2018b). Another less obvious implication of restricting the sample to students on the academic track is that it favors theories that anticipate positive effects of immigrant density. While immigrants are less likely to enroll in academic programs than vocational programs (OECD, 2010), those who enroll in academic programs are more likely to be academically able (Bjørkeng, 2013). Consequently, students in academic programs with a high immigrant share may be more likely to experience positive spillover effects of the ‘immigrant drive’. The estimated negative effect of attending immigrant-dense school programs could thus be *net* of potentially positive spillover effects of ‘immigrant drive’.

Finally, differences in school contexts across schools in Norway are likely to be modest, as the vast majority of Norwegian upper secondary schools are public, publicly funded, and without tuition fees (Ofstedal Telhaug et al., 2006). Finding negative effects of attending immigrant-dense school contexts in an assumedly conservative case like Norway suggests that the effects of immigrant school segregation may be substantially larger in settings with more contextual differences between schools. More research is needed to confirm whether there are effects of attending immigrant-dense schools even though peer effects are nonexistent.

ENDNOTES

¹ The immigrant population is often clustered in urban areas (OECD, 2010). The 33.1 percent immigrants in Oslo, the capital of Norway, is considerably higher than the 15 percent elsewhere in Norway (Statistics Norway, 2018a). Results presented in online appendix A show that, with the current data, the models are not able to detect differing effects in and outside Oslo.

² Calculated by the author from the StatBank Norway website provided by Statistics Norway (accessed May 22, 2018): <https://www.ssb.no/statbank>

³ As of 2018, there are five academic and eight vocational programs. This paper investigates students who attend academic programs, because completion of the vocational track depends to some degree on the local availability of apprenticeships, which in turn may be related to local variations in proportions of immigrants.

⁴ Calculated by the author from the StatBank Norway website provided by Statistics Norway (accessed June 18, 2018): <https://www.ssb.no/statbank>

⁵ Despite the competition-based admission regime, the county must consider that an applicant is entitled to admission to one of his/her three top program preferences. Furthermore, the county must prioritize applicants with preferential rights for reasons such as special needs (Education Act, 1998).

⁶ Online appendix B shows results from the main models using exam grades from upper secondary school as an outcome. Attending immigrant-dense schools seem to be positive for natives' exam grades, which contradicts the main results that find negative effects on completion. Analyses on exam grades condition on students completing school, and are accordingly estimated on a selected sample of students, which could explain the contradicting results.

⁷ Country of origin equals mother's country of birth if the individual is born in Norway (regardless of father's country of birth). However, if both the individual and the mother are born in Norway, the individual inherits the father's country of birth.

⁸ Earnings consist of all income that generates pensions. The basic amount rate indicates eligibility for benefits from the Norwegian Social Insurance Scheme such as unemployment benefits, disability benefits and the old-age pensions.

⁹ VAMs traditionally include a pre-treatment measure of the outcome on the right-hand side of the equation. Model 2 adheres to the same logic as students' academic achievements is highly predictive of the outcome completion.

¹⁰ Other similar uses of application data in the higher education literature include Dale and Krueger (2011) and Borgen (2014).

¹¹ Online appendix C shows analyses where I interact the application fixed effects with GPA, which allows the effect of GPA on completion to vary across application groups. Including these interactions does not significantly alter the estimates.

¹² Controls for peer group size is left out of all models for the sake of comparability across models. Online appendix D shows that the main results are not sensitive for including controls for log peer group size.

¹³ A third potential challenge is that the county may base up to 50 percent of admissions to the two programs 'sports and physical studies' and 'music, dance and drama' on documented skills or admission tests, in addition to GPA (Regulations to the Education Act, 2006). In online appendix E, I test whether such additional admission criteria affect my main results by running the application fixed effects model on a sample of students who compete for admission to general studies only, where the competition is based purely on GPA. I find no significant differences between this analysis and the main analysis.

REFERENCES

- Ballatore, R. M., Fort, M. & Ichino, A. 2018. Tower of Babel in the Classroom: Immigrants and Natives in Italian Schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 36, 885-921.
- Bifulco, R., Fletcher, J. M. & Ross, S. L. 2011. The effect of classmate characteristics on post-secondary outcomes: Evidence from the Add Health. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 3, 25-53.
- Bjørkeng, B. 2013. Yrkesfag - lengre vei til målet. *Samfunnsspeilet, Statistics Norway*, 1/2013.
- Borgen, N. T. 2014. College quality and hourly wages: Evidence from the self-revelation model, sibling models and instrumental variables. *Social Science Research*, 48, 121-134.
- Borgen, N. T., Borgen, S. T. & Birkelund, G. E. 2021. The counteracting nature of contextual influences: Peer effects and offsetting mechanisms.
- Brandén, M., Birkelund, G. E. & Szulkin, R. 2018. Ethnic Composition of Schools and Students' Educational Outcomes: Evidence from Sweden. *International Migration Review*. , Online first. Retrieved August 9, 2018 (<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0197918318769314>).
- Brunello, G. & De Paola, M. 2017. School Segregation of Immigrants and Its Effects on Educational Outcomes in Europe. EENEE Analytical Report No. 30. *European Commission*.
- Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., Martin, J., Craig, I. W., Taylor, A. & Poulton, R. 2002. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science*, 297, 851-854.
- Cebolla-Boado, H. & Garrido Medina, L. 2011. The impact of immigrant concentration in Spanish schools: school, class, and composition effects. *European Sociological Review*, 27, 606-623.
- Cioffi-Revilla, C. 2017. *Introduction to computational social science*, New York, Springer.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D. & York, R. 1966. *Equality of educational opportunity*, Washington DC, U.S. Office of Education.
- Coleman, J. S. & Hoffer, T. 1987. *Public and private high schools: The impact of communities*, New York, Basic Books.
- Conger, D. 2015. Foreign-born Peers and Academic Performance. *Demography*, 52, 569-592.
- Crosnoe, R. 2009. Low-income students and the socioeconomic composition of public high schools. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 709-730.
- Dale, S. & Krueger, A. B. 2011. Estimating the return to college selectivity over the career using administrative earnings data. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Dale, S. B. & Krueger, A. B. 2002. Estimating the payoff to attending a more selective college: An application of selection on observables and unobservables. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 1491-1527.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 2000. Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education policy analysis archives*, 8, 1.
- De Bruyn, E. H., Deković, M. & Meijnen, G. W. 2003. Parenting, goal orientations, classroom behavior, and school success in early adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 24, 393-412.
- Duncan, O. D., Haller, A. O. & Portes, A. 1968. Peer influences on aspirations: A reinterpretation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 74, 119-137.
- Education Act 1998. Act relating to primary and secondary education [Education Act]. In: EDUCATION, M. O. (ed.). Oslo: Ministry of Education.

- Einav, L. & Levin, J. 2014. The data revolution and economic analysis. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, 14, 1-24.
- Espenshade, T. J. & Fu, H. 1997. An analysis of English-language proficiency among US immigrants. *American Sociological Review*, 288-305.
- Fletcher, J. 2010. Spillover effects of inclusion of classmates with emotional problems on test scores in early elementary school. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29, 69-83.
- Fletcher, J., Kim, J., Nobles, J., Ross, S. & Shaorshadze, I. 2019. The Effects of Foreign-Born Peers in US High Schools and Middle Schools. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gandara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J. & Callahan, R. 2003. English Learners in California Schools: Unequal resources,'Unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11.
- Geay, C., McNally, S. & Telhaj, S. 2013. Non-native Speakers of English in the Classroom: What Are the Effects on Pupil Performance? *The Economic Journal*, 123, F281-F307.
- Goldsmith, P. R. 2011. Coleman revisited: School segregation, peers, and frog ponds. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48, 508-535.
- Gould, E. D., Lavy, V. & Paserman, D. M. 2009. Does Immigration Affect the Long-Term Educational Outcomes of Natives? Quasi-Experimental Evidence*. *The Economic Journal*, 119, 1243-1269.
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F. & Rivkin, S. G. 2004. Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39, 326-354.
- Hanushek, E. A. & Rivkin, S. G. 2010. Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review*, 100, 267-71.
- Hardoy, I., Mastekaasa, A. & Schøne, P. 2017. Immigrant concentration and student outcomes in upper secondary schools: Norwegian evidence. *European Societies*, Online first.
- Hardoy, I., Mastekaasa, A. & Schøne, P. 2018. Immigrant concentration and student outcomes in upper secondary schools: Norwegian evidence. *European Societies*, 20, 301-321.
- Hardoy, I. & Schøne, P. 2013. Does the Clustering of Immigrant Peers Affect the School Performance of Natives? *Journal of Human Capital*, 7, 1-25.
- Heath, A. F., Rothon, C. & Kilpi, E. 2008. The second generation in Western Europe: Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 211-235.
- Hermansen, A. S. & Birkelund, G. E. 2015. The Impact of Immigrant Classmates on Educational Outcomes. *Social Forces*, 94, 615-646.
- Hoxby, C. 2000. Peer effects in the classroom: Learning from gender and race variation. *NBER Working Paper Series*, w7867. Retrieved September 20, 2018 (<http://www.nber.org/papers/w7867>).
- Hægeland, T., Raaum, O. & Salvanes, K. G. 2005. Pupil achievement, school resources and family background. *IZA Discussion Paper No. 1459*, Retrieved September 20, 2018 (https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=648059).
- Hällsten, M., Szulkin, R. & Sarnecki, J. 2013. Crime as a price of inequality? The gap in registered crime between childhood immigrants, children of immigrants and children of native Swedes. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53, 456-481.
- Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C. & Persico, C. 2016. The effects of school spending on educational and economic outcomes: Evidence from school finance reforms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131, 157-218.

- Jean, S., Causa, O., Jimenez, M. & Wanner, I. 2007. Migration in OECD countries: Labour Market Impact and Integration Issues. *OECD Economics Department Working Papers* No. 562. OECD Publishing (NJ1).
- Jencks, C. & Mayer, S. E. 1990. The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. *Inner-city poverty in the United States*, 111, 186.
- Jennings, J. L., Deming, D., Jencks, C., Lopuch, M. & Schueler, B. E. 2015. Do differences in school quality matter more than we thought? New evidence on educational opportunity in the twenty-first century. *Sociology of Education*, 88, 56-82.
- Jonsson, J. O. & Mood, C. 2008. Choice by contrast in Swedish schools: How peers' achievement affects educational choice. *Social forces*, 87, 741-765.
- Jonsson, J. O. & Rudolphi, F. 2011. Weak performance—strong determination: school achievement and educational choice among children of immigrants in Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, 27, 487-508.
- Kao, G. & Tienda, M. 1995. Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76, 1-19.
- Karsten, S., Felix, C., Ledoux, G., Meijnen, W., Roeleveld, J. & Van Schooten, E. 2006. Choosing segregation or integration? The extent and effects of ethnic segregation in Dutch cities. *Education and Urban Society*, 38, 228-247.
- Koedel, C., Mihaly, K. & Rockoff, J. E. 2015. Value-added modeling: A review. *Economics of Education Review*, 47, 180-195.
- Lauglo, J. 1999. Working harder to make the grade: Immigrant youth in Norwegian schools. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 2, 77-100.
- Lazear, E. P. 2001. Educational production. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 777-803.
- Legewie, J. & DiPrete, T. A. 2012. School context and the gender gap in educational achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 463-485.
- Lødding, B. & Helland, H. 2007. Alle får, men hvem får hva? Evaluering av Oslo kommunes inntaksordning til videregående opplæring i studieretning for allmennfag/utdanningsprogram for studiespesialisering. . *NIFU-rapport*. Oslo.
- McCoach, D. B. & Siegle, D. 2001. A comparison of high achievers' and low achievers' attitudes, perceptions, and motivations. *Academic Exchange*, 2, 71-76.
- Morgan, S. L. & Shackelford, D. T. 2018. School and teacher effects. *Handbook of the Sociology of Education in the 21st Century*. Springer.
- Morgan, S. L. & Winship, C. 2014. *Counterfactuals and causal inference. Methods and Principles for Social Reserach*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. 2018. *Slik søker du videregående* [Online]. Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training,. Retrieved from: https://utdanning.no/tema/soknad_og_opptak/slik_soker_du_videregaende [Accessed March 12 2018].
- OECD 2010. *Closing the gap for immigrant students: Policies, practice and performance*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2012. *Equity and quality in education: Supporting disadvantaged students and schools*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2020. International Migration Outlook 2020. In: PUBLISHING, O. (ed.). Paris.
- Oftedal Telhaug, A., Mediås, O. A. & Aasen, P. 2006. The Nordic model in education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 245-283.

- Ohinata, A. & Van Ours, J. C. 2013. How immigrant children affect the academic achievement of native Dutch children. *The Economic Journal*, 123, F308-F331.
- Owens, A. 2019. "School Segregation by Race/Ethnicity and Economic Status. In: DOMINA, T., GIBBS, B. G., NUNN, L. & PENNER, A. (eds.) *Education and society: An introduction to key issues in the sociology of education*. Univ of California Press.
- Peske, H. G. & Haycock, K. 2006. Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students Are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality: A Report and Recommendations by the Education Trust. *Education Trust*, Retrieved September 20, 2018 (<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=eD494820>).
- Portes, A. & MacLeod, D. 1996. Educational progress of children of immigrants: The roles of class, ethnicity, and school context. *Sociology of Education*, 69, 255-275.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. 2001. *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*, Univ of California Press.
- Raitano, M. & Vona, F. School heterogeneity, parental background and tracking: Evidence from PISA 2006. 31st General Conference of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, St. Gallen, Switzerland, 2010. 22-8.
- Reardon, S. F. & Owens, A. 2014. 60 Years After Brown: Trends and Consequences of School Segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 199-218.
- Regulations to the Education Act 2006. Regulation to the Education Act. In: EDUCATION, M. O. (ed.). Oslo: Ministry of Education.
- Report No. 030 (2003-2004) to the Storting 2004. Kultur for læring. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Reserach.
- Rosenqvist, E. 2018. Two functions of peer influence on upper-secondary education application behavior. *Sociology of Education*, 91, 72-89.
- Sacerdote, B. 2011. Peer effects in education: How might they work, how big are they and how much do we know thus far? *Handbook of the Economics of Education*. Elsevier.
- Schneeweis, N. 2015. Immigrant concentration in schools: Consequences for native and migrant students. *Labour Economics*, 35, 63-76.
- Silveira, F., Dufur, M. J., Jarvis, J. A. & Rowley, K. J. 2019. The Influence of Foreign-born Population on Immigrant and Native-born Students' Academic Achievement. *Socius*, 5, 2378023119845252.
- Statistics Norway. 2000. *Population by country background. 1970-2000*. [Online]. Statistics Norway. Retrieved from: https://www.ssb.no/a/english/kortnavn/innvbef_en/arkiv/tab-2000-11-13-10-en.html [Accessed October 3 2017].
- Statistics Norway. 2018a. *14 prosent av befolkningen er innvandrere* [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/14-prosent-av-befolkningen-er-innvandrere> [Accessed August 14 2018].
- Statistics Norway. 2018b. *Completion rates of pupils in upper secondary education* [Online]. Statistics Norway. Retrieved from: <https://www.ssb.no/en/vgogjen> [Accessed September 25 2018].
- Statistics Norway. 2019a. *Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents* [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef> [Accessed November 12 2019].
- Statistics Norway. 2019b. *Upper secondary education* [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.ssb.no/en/utdanning/statistikker/vgu/aar> [Accessed May 8 2018].

- Szulkin, R. & Jonsson, J. O. 2007. Ethnic segregation and educational outcomes in Swedish comprehensive schools. *SULCIS Working Paper Series*, 2007:2
- The counties' information service for applicants to upper secondary education and training. 2018. *Application and admission to Vg1* [Online]. The counties' information service for applicants to upper secondary education and training. Retrieved from: <https://www.vilbli.no/en/en/no/application-and-admission-to-vg1/a/025180> [Accessed August 14 2018].
- Veerman, G.-J. M., van de Werfhorst, H. G. & Dronkers, J. 2013. Ethnic composition of the class and educational performance in primary education in The Netherlands. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 19, 370-401.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

	Mean	SD	min-max	Natives	Immigrants	Diff. in means
Completion within 4 years	0.825	n/a	0-1	0.830	0.729	0.102***
Proportion of immigrant peers	0.095	0.112	0-0.978	0.085	0.264	-0.179***
Proportion of peers from						
Scandinavia, W. Europe, and N. America	0.022	0.019	0-0.400	0.021	0.023	-0.001***
Eastern Europe	0.019	0.020	0-0.333	0.018	0.030	-0.012***
Asia	0.025	0.029	0-0.333	0.023	0.058	-0.036***
Middle East, N. Africa, and Greater Arabia	0.039	0.072	0-0.762	0.032	0.148	-0.116***
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.008	0.013	0-0.286	0.007	0.018	-0.011***
Latin America	0.006	0.010	0-0.333	0.006	0.008	-0.002***
Gender	0.550	n/a	0-1	0.552	0.526	0.026***
Number of siblings	1.904	1.139	0-18	1.871	2.447	-0.576***
Parity	1.829	0.950	0-15	1.810	2.142	-0.332***
Relocated	0.122	n/a	0-1	0.116	0.223	-0.107***
Mother's age at birth	28.942	4.870	14-55	29.003	27.951	1.052***
Intact or reconstituted family	0.787	n/a	0-1	0.785	0.808	-0.022***
GPA from secondary school	44.688	6.222	0.909-60	44.870	41.778	3.092***
Immigrant category						
No immigrant background	0.849	n/a	0-1	0.902	0	0.902***
Born abroad by two foreign-born parents	0.019	n/a	0-1	0	0.316	-0.316***
Born in Norway by two foreign-born parents	0.040	n/a	0-1	0	0.684	-0.684***
Born abroad with one Norwegian parent	0.009	n/a	0-1	0.010	0	0.010***
Born in Norway with one foreign-born parent	0.071	n/a	0-1	0.075	0	0.075***
Born abroad by Norwegian-born parents	0.012	n/a	0-1	0.013	0	0.013***
Ranked parents' income	60.918	27.523	1-99	62.690	32.545	30.145***
Parents' social welfare support	0.061	n/a	0-1	0.049	0.252	-0.203***
Parents' highest level of education						
Postsecondary, MA level or more	0.180	n/a	0-1	0.184	0.120	0.064***
Postsecondary, BA level	0.409	n/a	0-1	0.418	0.267	0.151***
Upper secondary	0.357	n/a	0-1	0.359	0.325	0.033***
Basic compulsory or less	0.052	n/a	0-1	0.039	0.266	-0.227***
Unknown	0.001	n/a	0-1	0	0.021	-0.021***

Academic program			0-1			
Sports and physical studies	0.133	n/a	0-1	0.138	0.060	0.078***
Music, dance and drama	0.073	n/a	0-1	0.076	0.020	0.056***
Specialization in general studies	0.794	n/a	0-1	0.786	0.920	-0.134***
Log school program size	4.529	0.710	0.693-6.207	4.510	4.840	-0.330***
Observations	196881			185310	11571	
Years of admission 2003-2010						

Note: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001 from a two-tailed t-test comparing the difference between native and immigrant means.

Table 2: Immigrant proportion overall and within fixed effects groups

	Controls included	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Observations
Overall		0.095	0.112	0	0.978	196881
Application fixed effects		0	0.052	-0.665	0.758	196881
	x	0	0.047	-0.622	0.746	196881
School x program fixed effects		0	0.037	-0.355	0.326	196881
	x	0	0.036	-0.393	0.344	196881

Note: Controls include cohort, program, first and second order terms for standardized GPA from lower secondary school, gender, number of siblings, birth order, residential relocation, mother's age at birth, family structure, immigrant category, country of origin, county for lower secondary school, lower secondary school, first- and second order terms for parents' earnings, parents' social welfare transfers, and parents' education.

Table 3: Description of fixed effects groups

Fixed effects groupings	Number of groups	Mean size	SD of size	Min size	Max size
Application	7113	27.67904	43.10784	1	403
School x program	527	373.5882	367.5432	1	2252

Table 4: Effects of proportion immigrant peers on completion of academic track

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Proportion immigrant peers	-0.235*** (0.0547)	-0.0471* (0.0190)	-0.0730*** (0.0215)	-0.0435 (0.0322)
Cohort fixed effects	x	x	x	x
Program fixed effects	x	x	x	x
Controls (including GPA)		x	x	x
Application fixed effects			x	
School x program fixed effects				x
Observations	196881	196881	196881	196881

Note: All models include cohort fixed effects and program fixed effects. Model 2-4 include controls specified in note to Table 2. Model 3 include application fixed effects and Model 4 include school-by-program fixed effects. Standard errors clustered on upper secondary school in parentheses.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed test).

Figure 1: Proportion of students with different proportions of immigrant peers, separate for natives and immigrants.

Figure 2: Effects of having different proportions immigrant peers on likelihood of completion.

Note: Estimates obtained from regressing completion on dummies for proportion of immigrants. See note to Table 4 for other model specifications. Confidence intervals (95 percent confidence level) are from standard errors clustered on upper secondary school. See online appendix G for exact estimates and standard errors.