Building Bridges and Widening Gaps

Efficiency Gains and Equity Concerns of Labor Market Expansions

BY Aline Bütikofer, Katrine V. Løken and Alexander Willén

DISCUSSION PAPER

Institutt for samfunnsøkonomi
Department of Economics

SAM 19/2019

ISSN: 0804-6824

October 2019

Building Bridges and Widening Gaps

Efficiency Gains and Equity Concerns of Labor Market Expansions*

Aline Bütikofer
Norwegian School of Economics

Katrine V. Løken
Norwegian School of Economics and University of Bergen

Alexander Willén
Norwegian School of Economics and UCLS

October 20, 2019

Abstract

We exploit the opening of a large bridge to study how access to a larger labor market affects economic efficiency, and how these potential efficiency gains are distributed across workers. The bridge we study connected the third largest city of Sweden to the capital of Denmark, and led to a substantial increase in the labor market opportunities of Swedes. Using unique cross-country matched registry data, we find that the bridge led to a large increase in cross-country commuting among Swedes, driven both by extensive and intensive employment responses. This commuting effect translates into a significant increase in the average wage of Swedes residing close to the bridge, providing strong evidence of an efficiency gain for individuals in Sweden. However, these efficiency gains are unevenly distributed across workers: the effect is largest for high-educated men and smallest for low-educated women. Thus, the efficiency gains come at the cost of rising income inequality and an increase in the gender wage gap, both within- and across-households. These equity effects are driven not only by differences in the propensity to commute, but also by occupational segregation.

*The authors gratefully acknowledge comments by Peter Fredriksson and seminar participants at the Norwegian School of Economics, Paris School of Economics, Lund University and EALE. This work was partially supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence Scheme, FAIR project No 262675. Willén gratefully acknowledges financial support from SNF. Emails: aline.buetikofer@nhh.no, katrine.loken@nhh.no, alexander.willen@nhh.no. Address all authors: Department of Economics, Norwegian School of Economics, Helleveien 30, 5045 Bergen, Norway.

1 Introduction

Developing and expanding the transportation infrastructure of a region can bring the benefits of larger and more concentrated labor markets to peripheral regions. Not only does such expansions serve to increase the job market opportunities of individuals in the affected areas, but it may also improve the quality of employer-employee matches (Greenstone, Hornbeck, and Moretti, 2010; Heuermann and Schmieder, 2018; Gibbons, Lyytikäinen, Overman, and Sanchis-Guarner, 2019). However, these benefits might not be equally distributed: High-educated workers and men are more likely to commute long distances for the same type of jobs compared to low- educated workers and women (Le Barbanchon, Rathelot, and Roulet, 2019). The expansion of local labor markets might therefore have substantial consequences for income inequality and the gender wage gap. As labor markets have grown rapidly in size during the past decades, both due to improved transportation infrastructure and reduced commuting costs, these potential equity effects could represent an overlooked obstacle to income and gender equality.[1] However, lack of exogenous variation in labor market size has made it difficult to credibly and comprehensively study this question.

In this paper, we ask how access to a larger labor market affects economic efficiency, and how these potential efficiency gains are distributed across workers. To obtain exogenous variation in labor market access, we exploit the opening of a large bridge, which connects two of the largest cities in Scandinavia. In particular, we study the opening of the Öresund Bridge, which connects the capital of Denmark, Copenhagen, to the third largest city of Sweden, Malmö.[2] The 16km long road and rail link over the Öresund bridge was completed in 2000, and did not only connect the Scandinavian peninsula to Central Europe, but also led to a massive expansion of the labor market opportunities of Swedes in Malmö and neighboring municipalities.[3] In particular, a city of 250,000 inhabitants gained access to a much larger labor market with substantially higher wages in this time period.[4] Armenter, Koren, and Nagyy (2014) argue that bridges have historically had a connecting role and that the economic development on both sides of the bridge has traditionally converged. This makes the opening of the Öresund Bridge a well-suited laboratory for answering our question of interest.[5]

Using unique cross-country matched registry data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Den-

[1] Many different other drivers of the persistent gender gap and rising income inequality has been discussed including work flexibility, preferences and norms (Blau and Kahn, 2007; Goldin, 2014)

[2] The Öresund bridge became famous after the 2011-2018 Scandinavian-noir crime television series *The Bridge*, shown in more than 100 countries

[3] As both Sweden and Denmark are part of the European Union, workers can move freely across the bridge and do not require work visas to find employment across the border. In addition, there is no border and passport controls as both Sweden and Denmark are part of the Schengen Agreement.

[4] Using the 1999 Danish-Swedish exchange rate (1:1.16) and publicly-available wage information on Copenhagen from Statistics Denmark, the average wage in Copenhagen in 1999 was 155,000 SEK. The average wage in Copenhagen was thus 13 percent higher than the average wage in Malmö in 1999, shown in Appendix Table A1.

[5] There are many large bridge openings across the world every year, serving the purpose of connecting local labor markets and increasing economic growth. An example of a recent one is the opening of the Bogibeel bridge in India in 2018 and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau bridge connecting Hong Kong, Macau, and mainland China in 2018.

mark, we are able to trace Swedes across the border and observe their employment and income histories both in Sweden and in Denmark. Using a non-parametric event study design, we examine the efficiency and equity effects of the bridge by comparing the labor market outcomes of individuals in Malmö with individuals in non-Scania border municipalities before and after the opening of the bridge. The results from this analysis not only increase our understanding of the employment and wage effects of access to a larger labor market; the rich data also give us a unique opportunity to better understand how benefits from such access are distributed between different groups in a society and within households.

When studying income inequality and the gender wage gap, the Nordic welfare model is often portrayed as a success story of socioeconomic and gender equality. The model is based on a redistributive tax system with public social insurance, cash benefits to poor families, generous family policies and board quotas. Some aggregate statistics support this view: men and women have almost identical participation rates in the labor market and intergenerational income mobility is among the highest in the world. On the other hand, there are also statistics that do not fit with this depiction of the Scandinavian welfare states. First, the labor markets are highly gender segregated, and even though the gender wage gap has decreased substantially during the past century, there is a persistent wage difference between men and women. Second, while somewhat smaller than in for example the UK, the US, Germany, and France, there is also large child penalties for mothers both in Denmark and Sweden (Kleven, Landais, Posch, Steinhauer, and Zweimüller, 2019). Third, while income inequality is low compared to other countries, it has - similar to other OECD countries - increased over the past decade. Concurrently with these trends in inequality and the gender wage gap, the size of Scandinavian labor markets, and commuting distances, have been increasing. For example, the share of cross-municipality commuters in Sweden has doubled over the past 30 years, and the local labor markets have expanded significantly in size. Currently, Statistics Sweden defines 70 local labor markets in the country, down from 112 in 1990. Understanding whether the growing labor markets are a driving forces behind the observed trends in income inequality and the stagnated decline in the gender wage gap is a key issue in explaining why societies—even those committed to equality—are failing to close these gaps.

We present four key findings. First, the bridge led to a large increase in the employment flows of Swedes to Denmark. The commuting effect is largest for individuals in Malmö, but also extends to neighboring municipalities within the county, Scania. Second, the access to the larger labor market positively affected the wages of Swedes residing close to the bridge. In terms of magnitude, we find that individuals close to the bridge experienced a 16 percent increase in their wages eight years after the opening of the bridge.[6] This provides strong evidence of an efficiency gain for individuals in Malmö due to the expansion of labor market opportunities. Third, the wage effect is largest for high-educated men and smallest for low-educated women. This differential impact

[6]These effects are shared equally between individuals born in Scania and individuals moving to Scania post the opening of the bridge.

across skill groups and across genders led to an increase in both across- and within-household wage inequality. Fourth, effects are driven not only by differences in the propensity to commute, but also by occupational segregation. Specifically, women are more likely to work in the service sector where the gains from the labor market expansion are smaller, while men are more likely to have business and STEM-related occupations with much higher returns to commuting. A battery of robustness checks support these key findings.

This paper makes several contributions to the literature. First, we expand the literature on the effects of access to transportation infrastructure. The consequences of infrastructure on interregional trade flows are well-documented (Michaels, 2008; Banerjee, Duflo, and Qian, 2012; Donaldson, 2018; Gibbons, Lyytikäinen, Overman, and Sanchis-Guarner, 2019), and Heuermann and Schmieder (2018) demonstrates that a reduction in travel time raises the number of individuals commuting from relatively large to small cities. We complement this literature by expanding the set of outcomes to not only examine the effect on commuting, but also on wages, and by studying the distributional impact of such labor market expansions across different groups of workers. Second, we are the first to analyze how the efficiency gains from access to a large labor market are distributed across a society. These findings advance the large literature on the drivers of income inequality (see Alvaredo, Chancel, Piketty, Saez, and Zucman, 2018, for a recent world inequality report with key references) and help understand why better economic opportunities might be in conflict with societal goals of income equality and narrowing the gender wage gap (Blau and Kahn, 2007; Le Barbanchon, Rathelot, and Roulet, 2019). Third, our paper is related to a small but growing empirical literature on the labor market effects of cross-border commuting. While Dustmann, Schönberg, and Stuhler (2017) study East German natives' employment opportunities and wages after an unexpected inflow of Czech cross-border migrants, Beerli, Ruffner, Siegenthaler, and Peri (2018) look at the effect of an inflow of cross-border workers on Swiss natives' labor market outcomes as well as firm productivity and innovation. Both these papers are clearly complementary to our work as they focus on labor market outcomes among natives while we are, to our knowledge, the first to investigate labor market effects among cross-border commuters and stayers in the sending country.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides institutional background on the bridge. Section 3 describes the data. Section 4 discusses the identification strategy. All results are shown in Section 5. Section 6 concludes.

2 Background

The Öresund bridge (OB) was officially opened to the public on July 1, 2000. This large-scale infrastructure project involved the construction of an underwater tunnel, an artificial island, an artificial peninsula, and a bridge. It is the longest combined road and rail bridge in Europe and connects two major metropolitan areas: the Danish capital, Copenhagen, and the Swedish city of

Malmö, the third largest city in the country.[7] The construction of the bridge was motivated by a need to improve Northern European transportation links, regional development, and airport communications.[8] The agreement between Denmark and Sweden was signed in 1991, and construction began in 1995, five years prior to the inauguration.[9] Despite a number of unexpected setbacks, such as the discovery of 16 unexploded bombs from the Second World War on the seafloor, the bridge was completed three months ahead of schedule. The total cost of construction was about 4 billion Euro and is entirely user-financed though E-passes and railway tickets.[10]

The Öresund region represents the largest metropolitan area of Northern Europe. Administratively, it consists of 33 Swedish municipalities (the county of Scania) and 46 Danish municipalities (the Capital Region and Region Zealand); Appendix Figure A1 provides a visual illustration. The Öresund region has a combined landmass of 21,000 square kilometers, a population of 4 million people, and makes up slightly more than a quarter of the countries' combined GNP.[11] Note that the bridge was not built at the most narrow part of the Öresund strait (Helsingör-Helsingborg) but between the two metropolitan cities of the region, Copenhagen and Malmö.

Individuals can travel across the bridge with car, train and bus. There are no border controls as both Sweden and Denmark are part of the EU and the Schengen Agreement.[12] It takes approximately 10 minutes to cross the bridge, and the average travel time from the center of Malmö to the center of Copenhagen is 27 minutes by train and 35 minutes by car. Between 2000 and 2010, there were approximately 80 train crossings per day.[13] The cost of crossing the bridge is 12 Euros by train, 5 Euros by bus and between 5 and 53 Euros by car (depending on the number of trips an individual makes a year, and whether the individual has purchased an E-pass or not).[14] While the bridge led to an immediate increase in cross-border traffic between Sweden and Denmark (up 61 percent in the year following the opening of the bridge), traffic flows remained below expectations until 2005 when it began to rapidly increase. In 2007, almost 40 million individuals travelled across the bridge.

Before the bridge opened, the cost of commuting between Denmark and Sweden was high, especially when accounting for the time it took to cross the strait. The Helsingborg-Helsingör ferry line was the predominant mode of transport, and it took approximately 1 hour and 45 minutes

[7] The OB link consists of an 8 kilometer long bridge, a 4 kilometer long artificial island, and a 4 kilometer long tunnel. It is more than three times the length of the Golden Gate Bridge.

[8] The main airport in the region is located just across the sea on the Danish side.

[9] However, the concept of the bridge was discussed already in 1936.

[10] The full cost of the bridge is expected to be recouped by 2023, 4 years ahead of schedule.

[11] While the Swedish side makes up the largest part of the region as measured by surface, more than two-thirds of the inhabits in the region live on the Danish side.

[12] Passport controls were temporarily re-introduced in response to the European refugee crises of 2016. However, this does not coincide with our analysis period.

[13] 2011 marked the completion of a substantial train infrastructure project in Malmö, which increased capacity and made it possible to increase the number of train crossings from 80 to 150 per day.

[14] For bus, see https://global.flixbus.com. For cars, see https://oresundsbron.com/en/prices. For train, see https://sj.se

to go from Malmö to Copenhagen via this ferry line. In addition, there was boat traffic between Malmö and Kastrup, the main airport in the region located just outside of Copenhagen.

Appendix Figure A2 demonstrates that there was an average of 50,000 daily crossings over the strait between Scania and Copenhagen prior to the completion of the bridge. This number had more than doubled 8 years after the opening of the bridge, with approximately 100,000 individuals crossing the strait on any given day. While the boat traffic from Malmö to Kastrup was discontinued following the construction of the bridge, the Helsingborg-Helsingör ferry line (grey bars in Appendix Figure A2) remains an important route for commercial goods trade from Central Europe to Sweden and Norway (Knowles, 2006). This is mainly due to weight regulations on the bridge, the cost of crossing the bridge, resting times for drivers, restrictions on goods that can be transported in the Öresund tunnel, and the shorter distance for individuals traveling between Denmark and non-Scania municipalities of Sweden. After a small decline in the year that the bridge opened, traffic activity on the Helsingborg-Helsingör route remained stable until the financial crisis of 2008.

There were approximately 18,000 individuals who commuted across the strait on a daily basis in 2008, increasing from around 2,500 before the bridge opened (Steenstrup, 2012). Commuting peaked in 2005-2007 due to Danish labor shortage and a significant wage level differential. Commuting activity dropped in the wake of the financial crisis in 2008 and the subsequent recession. The annual contribution from commuters to the Danish economy is estimated at around 740 million Euros in value added (Steenstrup, 2012).

More than 90% of commuters live in Sweden and work in Denmark. A back-of-the-envelope calculation made by *Öresundsbro Konsortiet* suggests that Swedes (family living and working in Sweden) gain an average of USD 6000 per year if starting to work in Denmark due to wage level differences. Danes on the other hand (family living and working in Denmark), gain on average USD 13,000 per year if moving to Sweden, but continuing to work in Denmark, due to a large house price differential (OBK, 2005). Commuters are generally well educated; around 45% have university degrees compared to 35% in the general population. The majority of commuters are male: for every three male commuters there are two female commuters. Finally, for the purpose of our analysis it is important to note that income tax is paid exclusively in country of employment.

3 Data

Our primary data come from population-wide administrative registries at Statistics Sweden. These data provide annual demographic and socioeconomic information on all individuals in Sweden aged 16 through 65, for each year between 1997 and 2014. In our main analysis, we focus on individuals aged 18 or older. Further, we restrict attention to the 1997-2008 period to prevent the financial crisis of 2008 and the subsequent recession from contaminating our results. In auxiliary analyses (Section 5.4) we relax this restriction and use the recession to examine how volatile the efficiency and equity effects are to regional economic shocks.

The socioeconomic data from Statistics Sweden include detailed information on educational attainment, employment, and earnings; all of which we use as outcome variables when examining how the OB affected individual labor market outcomes. The demographic data include detailed information on municipality of residence, family composition, immigration status, and county of birth. The municipality of residence is critical for identifying treatment and control units; the family composition information enables us to explore effect heterogeneity by family status; and the immigration status as well as the county of birth are important for several of our robustness and sensitivity analyses described in the next section.

Crucial to our analysis is the ability to observe the cross-border labor market activity of Swedes. The official data registries of Statistics Sweden only contain information on individual labor market activity within the country, and data on labor market involvement (earnings and employment) in Denmark is therefore not included. However, through an agreement between the governments of Sweden and Denmark, a separate database on cross-border commuting was established in 2009. This data contain detailed individual-level information on all labor market activities of Swedes in Denmark between 1997 and 2014, including information on employment and earnings as well as on which industry and sector the individual has been active in.[15] By linking this data to our primary data from Statistics Sweden through unique individual identifiers, we are able to construct a novel data set with detailed information on all Swedes and their employment histories in Denmark and Sweden over a large number of years. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to use these data for the purpose of applied microeconomic research.

Our core outcomes consist of wages and employment in Sweden and Denmark. Our wage measures come from administrative tax records in both Denmark and Sweden and includes total yearly wages in each of these countries. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. We include individuals with zero wages in our main analysis. With respect to employment, we define individuals as employed in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark, as employed in Sweden if they have positive wages from Sweden, and as employed in both countries if they have positive wages from both countries.

In addition to our core outcomes, we also examine the probability of receiving unemployment benefit from the Swedish government, and the probability of holding more than one job. Unemployment benefits are provided to individuals who do not currently have a job, but are actively looking for one and are registered with the governments unemployment bureau. While we focus on the probability of obtaining unemployment benefits in this paper, our results are robust to examining this variable in levels as well.

In addition to examining the above outcomes for all individuals close to the bridge, we also perform a number of auxiliary analyses in which we split the sample based on the education level

[15]The cross-country data cooperation was discontinued in 2015 due to disagreements concerning data protection regulations, and is therefore no longer updated. While the database still exists, it may be eliminated in the future due to said data protection disagreements between Sweden and Denmark.

and family composition of the individuals. We define low-educated individuals as those with no more than a high school degree, and high-educated individuals as those with more than a high school degree. In terms of education specialization, we follow Statistic Swedens broad education classification system and divide high-educated individuals into eight mutually exclusive education specializations: pedagogy and teacher education; humanities and arts; social science, law and public administration; natural science, math and information technology; technology - industry and manufacturing; farming, land science and animal science; health and social care; and services. With respect to family composition, we look separately at married couples and at individuals who have at least one child under the age of 18 still living at home.

In our main analysis, we compare individuals residing in Malmö with individuals residing in non-Scania border municipalities (see Appendix Figure A3). Appendix Table A1 provides summary statistics on treatment and control individuals in the year prior to the opening of the bridge, using all variables discussed above. Looking across the columns in Appendix Table A1, individuals in Malmö are less likely to be employed, earn slightly less, are more likely to be foreign-born, and are less likely to be married and have children. Appendix Table A1 also provide summary statistics of all individuals in Sweden. As shown in the table, individuals in Sweden as a whole are very similar to those in our main control group. It is worth noting that our identification strategy—a difference-in-difference design—does not require that our treatment group is similar to our control group on observable characteristics.

4 Identification Strategy

To examine how the Öresund bridge affects efficiency and equity in Malmö, we rely on a difference-in-difference approach that compares the labor market outcomes of individuals in Malmö with the labor market outcomes of individuals in other municipalities and cities of Sweden. In our main analysis, the control group consists of all municipalities in the counties bordering Scania; Appendix Figure A3 provides a visual illustration.

The labor market effects of the Öresund bridge are likely to vary across years for three reasons. The first is that Swedes may be tied up in long-term employment contracts, such that there is a lag in the supply response to the expansion. The second is that frictions in the labor market may prevent instantaneous matching of Danish employers and potential Swedish employees. The third factor that may influence the time pattern of treatment effects is the local labor market conditions in Copenhagen, which differ from year to year. Our preferred empirical method is therefore to estimate event study models that allow us to nonparametrically identify time-varying treatment effects. Our baseline empirical model can be described by the following equation:

$$Y_{imt} = \alpha + \sum_{t=1997}^{t=2008} [\delta_t(Treat_m)] + X_{mt} + \gamma_t + \rho_m + \phi_c + \varepsilon_{imt}, \quad (1)$$

where Y_{imt} is the outcomes for individual i in municipality m and time t. $Treat_m$ is a dichotomous variable taking the value of one if the individual resides in Malmö, and zero otherwise. The δ_t coefficients nonparametrically trace out pretreatment relative trends (for δ_{1997} to δ_{1999}) as well as time-varying treatment effects (for δ_{2000} to δ_{2008}). In practice, we omit δ_{1999} such that all δ estimates are relative to the year prior to the official opening of the bridge. Standard errors are clustered at the municipality level.

Equation (1) also includes municipality (ρ_m), year (γ_t) and birth year (ϕ_c) fixed effects. The birth year fixed effects control for any systematic differences across cohorts in each calendar year that may be correlated with the labor market expansion and the outcomes that we look at. The municipality fixed effects control for variation in outcomes that are common across birth cohorts within a municipality, and the year fixed effects account for national shocks that impact all birth cohorts in the same year. Given the difference in immigrant share in Malmö compared to the rest of the country (Appendix Table A1), we also control for the fraction of immigrants in each municipality and year. This is included in the vector X_{mt} in Equation (1).

The parameters of interest in Equation (1) are δ_{2000} to δ_{2008}, which trace the effect of the OB on the labor market outcomes of Malmö residents across years. While we show the full set of δ_t coefficients in our figures, we focus on effects eight years after the opening of the bridge (δ_{2008}) in the tables.

Conditional on the fixed effects and controls included in Equation (1), the variation we exploit comes from exposure to the bridge as proxied by living in Malmö over time. The assumptions underlying our identification of δ_{2000} to δ_{2008} are that the opening of the bridge are not correlated with prior trends in outcomes over time in Malmö relative to the control municipalities, and that there are no municipality-specific shocks concurrent with the opening of the bridge that differentially affect individuals in Malmö compared to individuals in the control municipalities.

δ_{1997} to δ_{1999} in Equation (1) explicitly test for pre-treatment relative trends. If the δ_{1997} to δ_{1999} estimates are economically small and statistically indistinguishable from zero, that implies that there likely is no selection on fixed trends over time that bias our results. To further investigate this assumption, we note that even though the Swedish data only can be linked to the Danish registries starting in 1997, our Swedish data begins already in 1995. We use this data to extend the pre-bridge period and test for pre-treatment relative trends starting already in 1995 for certain labor market outcomes (employment status and earnings in Sweden). In Section 5, we discuss the pre-treatment trends for each outcome in detail, and use figures to demonstrate that the outcomes are trending similarly across the treatment (Malmö) and control areas (non-Scania border municipalities) in the years before the bridge opened.

The possible existence of local labor market shocks that occur concurrently with the opening of the bridge and that differentially affect individuals in Malmö compared to individuals in the control municipalities is a threat to identification that is more difficult to examine. However, we

note that the fraction of individuals residing in Sweden and working in Denmark was negligible prior to the bridge, and that no other local policies were implemented in 2000 that could plausible explain the rapid rise of cross-border commuters that we observe.[16] In addition, we perform a number of robustness checks in which we alter the group of control municipalities to ensure that our effects are not dependent on a particular set of control municipalities. Specifically, we study the sensitivity of our results to using the thirty largest labor market regions excluding the Stockholm area,[17] and a synthetic control method based on all municipalities of Sweden (outside of Scania), as control groups.

It is important to note that the regression underlying the results produced by Equation (1) does not condition on pre-bridge municipality of residence, such that the effects we identify are both due to those who already lived in Malmö prior to the bridge opened and those who moved to Malmö following the opening of the bridge. To disentangle which of these groups that are driving our results, we estimate a series of regressions where we condition on the individuals' place of birth. We also explore potential selective migration to Malmö as a function of the bridge.

5 Results

In this section, we present our main findings on the effect of the bridge on both economic efficiency (Section 5.1) as well as equity (Section 5.2). These results are based on estimations of Equation (1), and for each of our outcomes we provide both event study plots as well as tables in which we more parsimoniously summarize the results. In Section 5.3, we document the sensitivity of our main results to the use of alternative control groups. In Section 5.4, we use the financial crisis of 2008 and the subsequent recession to examine how volatile the efficiency and equity effects are to regional economic shocks.

5.1 Efficiency Gains

Cross-Border Commuting. Panel (a) of Figure 1 graphically illustrates the nonparametric Difference-in-Differences estimates before and after the opening of the bridge on the probability of working in Denmark. Each dot is an estimate of relative time parameter δ_t in Equation (1) for the given year. The bars extending from each point show the bounds of the 95% confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. The dashed vertical line marks the opening of the bridge (July 1, 2000).

[16] Although local authorities aim to form an integrated, functional urban region, legal constraints helping to integrate the bi-national labor market were mainly unchanged until 2004 when the two countries agreed on new cross-border commuter taxation regulations.

[17] The labor market outcomes in Malmö and the labor market outcomes in and around Stockholm are on very different trends in our time period, violating the parallel trend assumption required for causal inference based on a difference-in-difference approach. We therefore do not use the Stockholm labor market region as a control region.

Three observations are worth highlighting. First, the probability of working in Denmark is trending similarly across the treatment area (Malmö) and the control areas (non-Scania border municipalities) in the years prior to the opening of the bridge, supporting the parallel trend assumption required for causal inference. Second, the treatment and control areas begin to diverge immediately after the opening of the bridge, with Malmö residents being significantly more likely to work in Denmark already in the first complete post-opening year. Third, the treatment effect grows considerably over time and in 2008 Malmö residents were 5.3 percentage points more likely to work in Denmark than residents in non-Scania border municipalities. The substantial increase in the number of cross-border commuter after 2005 is likely due to an economic boom and a labor supply shortage in Denmark after 2005 (see Appendix Figure A4). The commuting effect in 2008 represents an increase of 1760 percent relative to the pre-opening mean, and is parsimoniously summarized in Column (1) of Panel A in Table 1.

To get a better understanding of where in Denmark Malmö residents began to work, Appendix Figure A5 provides information on the number of Malmö residents working in each of the Danish municipalities in the Öresund region in 1999, 2004 and 2008. As can be seen from the figure, the majority of individuals who work in Denmark choose regions very close to the bridge, such as Tårnby and Copenhagen.

Having established a positive commuting effect of the OB on Malmö residents, a natural next question to ask is whether this effect is offset by a reduction in the probability of Malmö residents working in Sweden, or if these individuals began working in both countries. Panel (b) of Figure 1 examines this question, showing the nonparametric Difference-in-Differences estimates before and after the opening of the bridge on the probability of working in Sweden. The results demonstrate that the probability of working in Sweden declined among Malmö residents following the opening of the bridge, but this decline (approximately 1 percentage point) is much smaller than the increase in Danish employment. Thus, even though the positive commuting effect identified in Panel (a) had a crowd-out effect on employment in Sweden, this crowd-out effect was very small.[18] This becomes apparent when comparing Columns (1) and (2) of Panel A in Table 1.

Given the size of the labor market expansion, it is likely that not only Malmö residents increased their commuting to Denmark, but also that individuals in areas just outside of Malmö experienced an increase in commuting opportunities. To explore this question, we estimate Equation (1) separately for each municipality in the county of Scania (again compared to non-Scania border municipalities). The results from this exercise are provided in Figure 2, which shows the estimate of relative time parameter π_{2008} in Equation (1) for each of the municipalities in Scania. This figure demonstrates that distance to the bridge was a key factor for the employment flows to

[18]There are alternative explanations for the increased Danish employment that we will carefully study in subsequent subsections, including extensive margin employment responses, intensive margin employment (multiple jobs) responses, and whether the bridge changed the inflow and outflow of people to Malmö such that the composition of the work force in Malmö changed.

Denmark: While areas close to Malmö saw increases in employment in Denmark of 2.3–3.2 percentage points (compared to 5.3 in Malmö), the estimates are lower further away from the bridge and in areas without direct transport links to Malmö. In the municipalities furthest from Malmö, but still within the borders of Scania, there was no effect on the probability to work in Denmark.[19]

Wages. The identified cross-border commuting effects shown in Panels (a) and (b) of Figure 1 suggest that the bridge likely led to an increase in the average wage of Malmö residents; would commuters not have benefited financially from transitioning to work in Denmark, it is highly unlikely that we would have seen any cross-border commuting effects. Panels (c) through (e) of Figure 1 explore this question in detail, graphically depicting the nonparametric Difference-in-Differences estimates before and after the opening of the bridge on the wage from employment in Denmark (c), wage from employment in Sweden (d), and the total wage from employment in both countries (e) for all Malmö residents. The effects eight years after the opening of the bridge are parsimoniously summarized in Columns (3) through (5) of Panel A in Table 1.

Looking across the panels in Figure 1, the dynamics of the wage effects are very similar to the cross-border commuting effects. First, there is no indication of relative trends in outcomes across individuals in our treatment and control groups prior to the opening of the bridge. Second, the treatment and control areas begin to diverge relatively quickly after the opening of the bridge, with a statistically significant positive effect on wages from Danish employers starting in 2001 (the first full post-opening year), and a statistically significant negative effect on wages from Swedish employers starting in 2003. Third, the effects grow substantially over time, and in 2008 the average wage from employment in Denmark had increased by over 3000 percent compared to a very low pre-bridge mean of 821 SEK ($91) among Malmö residents. The average wage from employment in Sweden, on the other hand, declined by 3 percent during the same period compared to a pre-bridge mean of 137,000 SEK. Finally, the magnitude of the positive effect on the wage from employment in Denmark is significantly larger than the negative effect on the wage from employment in Sweden, such that the net effect of the bridge on the individual wages of Malmö residents is large and positive. In terms of magnitude, the total wage increased by almost 15 percent compared to pre-bridge mean of 138,267 SEK.[20] This is a substantial average increase in the wages of Malmö residents compared to the wages of individuals residing in areas not affected by the bridge. Hence, these findings illustrate that the bridge, which expanded local labor market opportunities, led to large efficiency gains, on average, for residents of Malmö.[21]

[19] Appendix Figure A6 provides information on which Danish municipalities in the Öresund region individuals living in Scania work in both before and after the opening of the bridge.

[20] We obtain similar results when we use log wage as the outcome, the effect size is 0.153 (0.013)

[21] While we do not have data on labor market outcomes in Denmark prior to 1997, we do have information on labor market outcomes in Sweden starting already in 1995. We exploit this data and extend the pre-opening period with two years for the outcomes that look at the probability of working in Sweden and wages earned in Sweden. We perform this analysis to ensure that there are no relative pre-treatment trends in outcomes prior to the start of our analysis period. The results from this exercise are shown in Appendix Figure A7, and provide additional support for the parallel trend assumption required for causal inference.

Extensive and intensive margin responses. Panels (a) and (b) of Figure 1 reveal that the positive commuting effect of the OB on Malmö residents is not fully offset by a reduction in the probability of working in Sweden. To better understand the drivers of the increased employment in Denmark, we therefore probe the data further and examine both extensive as well as intensive margin employment effects. The results from this exercise are presented in Panel A of Table 2.

With respect to extensive margin effects, Column (1) shows that there is a substantial increase in the probability of working among Malmö residents compared to the control group as a function of the bridge opening, with an effect size of 3.6 percentage points in 2008. In other words, the opening of the bridge led to an increase on the extensive margin of employment among individuals in Malmö. Consistent with this extensive margin employment response, Column (3) shows an economically meaningful and statistically significant reduction in unemployment insurance take-up among individuals in Malmö. Column (2) studies the joint probability of employment and not receiving unemployment insurance, and shows that most of the increased extensive margin effect is due to substitution from unemployment insurance into employment.

We construct two proxy variables to capture the intensive margin response. The first is the probability of earning above mean annual SEK wage, which we consider a crude proxy for full time work. The second is the probability of having multiple jobs.[22] The results from estimating Equation (1) using these proxies as dependent variables are shown in Columns (4) and (5) of Panel A in Table 2. These results demonstrate that the bridge led to statistically significant and economically meaningful intensive margin effects as well. Specifically, Column (4) shows that the probability of earning more than the mean annual SEK wage increased by 6.4 percentage points following the opening of the bridge. This effect represents a 12 percent increase relative to the pre-bridge mean. Column (5) shows that there is no effect on the probability of holding multiple jobs, suggesting that people substitute from lower paid jobs in Sweden to higher paid jobs in Denmark on the intensive margin.

Selective migration and commuters vs. non-commuters. The results presented above do not condition on where the individuals lived prior to the opening of the bridge. Those effects may therefore be driven both by individuals who lived in Malmö prior to the bridge opening, and by individuals who moved to Malmö following the opening of the bridge.

To understand how much of the above effects are driven by individuals moving into Malmö rather than by individuals who already lived in Malmö prior to the bridge, we begin by restricting our sample to migrants and estimate an augmented version of Equation (1). In this specification, we compare the demographic characteristics of in-migrants to the demographic characteristics of out-migrants in Malmö over time relative to that same difference in our control areas. This specification is thus akin to a triple difference specification, and allows us to identify the change in the net flow of individuals in Malmö compared to our control areas as a function of the bridge opening. Results

[22]Note that we know the number of employers in Sweden but not in Denmark. This is thus best interpreted as a lower bound of the total number of employers.

from this exercise are provided in Figure 3. We present results separately for males and females, as we will start to show different patterns for males and females in effects on commuting and total wages starting in the next section.

Panels (a) through (d) of Figure 3 study a set of core demographic characteristics to see if there was a change in the type of individuals moving into Malmö following the opening of the OB. The characteristics we look at are age (a), education (b), the probability of having children (c) and the probability of being married (d). The results demonstrate that the composition of the population in Malmö changes after the bridge opens. Specifically, the population gets slightly younger and more educated, and Malmö residents are less likely to have children. There is no clear pattern with respect to the probability of being married. Interestingly, the changes in net flows are very similar for males and females. This suggests that compositional changes cannot explain the gender-specific results that we will discuss in Section 5.2.

In addition to examining the composition of individuals moving in to and out from Malmö, we also look at the effect of the bridge on net migration. Results from this exercise are shown in Panel (e) of Figure 3, and are obtained by estimating our baseline Equation (1) using a categorical variable which takes the value of -1 if the individual moves out of the municipality in the given year, 0 if the individual remains in the municipality, and 1 if the individual moves in to the municipality in the given year, as our dependent variable. The results indicate a short-run reduction in the number of individuals moving to Malmö compared to our control municipalities following the opening of the bridge. However, this effect disappears in the long run.[23]

The above analysis suggests that the employment and earnings effects identified in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 are unlikely to be driven exclusively by individuals migrating to Malmö in the aftermath of the bridge. To explore this question in greater detail, we restrict our treatment group to individuals who were born in Scania and re-estimate Equation (1) for our core outcomes.[24] The results from this analysis are shown in Figure 4 (Panels (a) and (b)). We find that individuals born in Scania start commuting to Denmark right after the opening of the bridge while we estimate a positive effect on cross-border commuting for individuals born outside of Scania from 2003 onwards. In the long run, there is no differential effect of the bridge on Scania natives compared to non-Scania natives. These findings suggest that the identified efficiency gain are shared approximately equally between locals and newer migrants to the region.

As discussed above, the results presented in Figure 1 are average effects across all Malmö residents. Are these wage effects isolated to individuals in Malmö who choose to commute to Denmark, or do individuals who reside in Malmö but choose not to commute to Denmark also

[23] Appendix Figure A8 describe the in-migrants to Malmö move from and out-migrants from Malmö move to from 1998 to 2008. Municipalities bordering Scania refers to the municipalities in our main control group. Large cities not bordering Scania refers to the ten largest non-Scania non-bordering municipalities of Sweden.

[24] Note that we have information on county of birth, not municipality of birth. We are therefore unable to restrict the sample to individuals born in Malmö. However, restricting our sample to individuals born in Scania allows us to rule out the possibility that individuals are moving from our control municipalities to our treatment municipality.

benefit from the bridge through general equilibrium and spillover effects (e.g. through higher wage offers provided by Swedish firms in order to retain workers in Malmö, or through new possibilities to sell services across the strait)?[25] Results obtained from estimating Equation (1) seperately for commuters and non-commuters are presented in the Panels (c) and (d) of Figure 4. The results show that while the total wage effect is much larger for cross-border commuters, there is also a gain for non-commuters. This suggests that on average all Malmö residents, including those who choose not to commute to Denmark, are positively affected by the opening of the bridge.

5.2 Equity Concerns

Gender inequality. The results in Section 5.1 demonstrate that the opening of the bridge led to statistically significant and economically meaningful efficiency gains for individuals who resided close to the bridge on the Swedish side. However, these gains may not be equally distributed across workers. Specifically, high-educated workers and men are more likely to commute long distances for the same type of jobs than low-educated workers and women (see, e.g., Le Barbanchon, Rathelot, and Roulet, 2019). Thus, gaining access to a larger labor market might have substantial implications for income inequality and the gender wage gap.

To examine these questions in detail, we estimate Equation (1) for our core outcomes separately for males and females. The results from this analysis are graphically presented in Figure 5, and parsimoniously summarized in Panels B and C of Table 1. Looking across the columns in Table 1, there are large differences in effects across genders. With respect to commuting, there is a 6 percentage point increase in the probability of working in Denmark among males. The magnitude of this effect is approximately 40 percent larger than the effect among women, who experience a 4 percentage point increase in the probability of working in Denmark. However, as a percentage of the pre-bridge mean, the gender-specific effects are relatively similar as females were much less likely to work in Denmark than males before the opening of the bridge. Concerning total wages, males experience a gain of around 27,000 SEK per year ($ 3,000), while females enjoy an increase of approximately 12,000 SEK ($ 1,333). The difference in effect size is close to 80 percent, and even as a percentage of the pre-bridge mean, males benefit much more from the labor market expansion than females. Specifically, as a percentage of the pre-bridge mean, males enjoy a 16 percent increase in total wage, while females experience a 10 percent increase.

Having identified significant gender differences in the labor market effects induced by the bridge, we probe the data further and examine if the gender differences in labor market effects also depend on the education levels of men and women. To do this, we stratify our sample based on whether the individual has more than a high school degree (high-educated) or a high school degree or less (low-educated), and reestimate Equation (1) separately for males and females by education level. The

[25] Note that commuting is endogenous, such that we have to interpret these findings carefully. However, since there is likely negative selection into the group that chooses not to commute, we believe that these results are of independent interest.

results from this analysis are graphically presented in Figure 5, and parsimoniously summarized in Table 3.

The results provided in Table 3 demonstrate that both high- and low-educated individuals increase their commuting to Denmark following the opening of the bridge. However, the increase is substantially larger for high-educated individuals, with coefficient estimates that are approximately 50 percent larger than those for low-educated individuals. In addition, the effects are much larger for men conditional on educational level than for women. The differences between high- and low-educated males and females become even more apparent when examining the effect on total wage: total wage increases substantially more for high-educated men than for high-educated women (the difference in effect size is approximately 62 percent), and total wages do not increase at all for low-educated men and women.

To disentangle the source of the difference in effect size among high-educated men and women, Table 4 provides results on the probability of working in Denmark, and total wage, by broad educational specialization.[26] These results allow us to understand whether the identified gender differences are mainly driven by educational segregation, or whether men - irrespective of educational specialization - benefit more. Table 4 shows that the largest total wage effect is for men in natural sciences, math and information technology, and that the smallest total wage effect is for women and men in services. Interestingly, there is large variation in the gender difference in total wage effects across all education specializations, and there are large differences in the number of people specializing in the different fields. For example, in natural sciences, math and information technology, men benefit 10 times more than women; in social sciences, law and public administration men benefit 3 times more; and in farming and land sciences women benefit 2 times more than men.

Within-couple inequality. The gender differences in effects identified above suggest that the opening of the bridge may have had an impact on the within-couple gender wage gap as well. To explore this question, we restrict our sample to married couples and estimate Equation (1) using the couple difference in commuting probability and total wage as dependent variables.

The results from this exercise are depicted graphically in Figure 6 and parsimoniously summarized in Panel A of Table 5. Looking across the columns in Panel A of Table 5, the within-couple gaps in commuting and total wages show an even starker picture of gender inequality than the results identified in the previous subsection. Specifically, eight years after the opening of the bridge, the within-household gender gap in the probability of working in Denmark is 11 percent relative to the pre-bridge mean of 0.002, and the within-household gender gap in total wages has increased by more than 34 percent relative to the pre-bridge mean. This large increase in the within-couple gender gap suggests that the new labor market access, despite representing a clear efficiency gain for the average individual in Malmö, had a big impact on the gender wage gap— both across- and

[26]Note that these results are conditional on the individuals having earned a college degree.

within-households.

In Panels B and C of Table 5, we explore if the existence of children in the household has an impact on the within-couple wage gap, stratifying the sample based on whether the couple had at least one child under the age of 18 living with them or not. Comparing the results in Panels B and C, we see that the within-couple inequality in cross-border commuting is substantially larger if the couple has children. Among couples without children, the gender gap in cross-border commuting is relatively small. This suggests that young children represent a key reason for the lower probability of cross-border commuting among mothers. The effect heterogeneity in cross-border commuting with respect to couples with and without children also translates into a large difference in the total wage effect: the within-couple gender gap in total wages is 40 percent larger among couples with children compared to couples without children. Yet, it is important to emphasize that there also is a substantial increase in the within-couple gender wage gap in households without young children. Hence, the presence of children is not the only factor underlying the effect of the OB on the within-couple gender wage gap. Additional factors, such as differences in total wage effects across education specializations, are important channels as well.

Within-gender inequality. In addition to differentially affecting men and women, it is likely that the opening of the Öresund Bridge had a differential impact on within-gender income inequality. This is especially the case given the results in Tables 3 and 4, which reveal substantial variation in commuting and wage effects across education levels and education specializations among both men and women.

To examine the within-gender distributional effects of the bridge opening, we estimate Equation (1) separately for males and females using a battery of conventional inequality measures as dependent variables: the 50/10 ratio, the 90/50 ratio, the 90/10 ratio, the interquartile range, the standard deviation, and the Gini coefficient. The results are displayed in Panels A and B of Table 6. The estimates provide strong and consistent evidence of increased within-gender inequality due to the opening of the bridge across the entire wage distribution. The one exception is the 50/10 ratio for females, for which we do not find a statistically significant or economically meaningful effect. This suggests that the within-gender inequality among women is primarily driven by individuals in the upper half of the distribution, while it is driven by individuals across the entire distribution among men.[27]

5.3 Robustness

The results in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 have all been obtained through estimation of Equation (1) using individuals in non-Scania border municipalities as our control group. We acknowledge that

[27] Another way to examine the distributional impact of the bridge opening is to estimate unconditional quantile regressions for men and women, using total wage as the dependent variable. Results from this exercise are provided in Appendix Figure A9, and these results confirm the main findings in this section.

several alternative control groups can be used for the purpose of our analysis. In this section, we demonstrate the sensitivity of our results to two such alternatives.

First, we use individuals in the 30 largest cities in Sweden as our control group, excluding the Stockholm labor market area.[28] One can argue that these cities, although they represent a much more geographically diverse group than the municipalities in our main control group, may be more comparable to Malmö in terms of population size. Second, we use a synthetic control method based on all municipalities of Sweden outside of Scania.[29]

The results from estimating Equation (1) for our core outcomes using these alternative control groups are provided in Appendix Figure A10. Looking across the panels of Appendix Figure A10, the commuting as well as the total wage effects of the bridge opening are very similar when using these alternative control groups compared to when using our main control group. This is true not only with respect to the magnitude of the effects, but also in terms of the lack of relative pre-treatment trends in outcomes prior to the opening. This suggests that the results in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 are not driven by the specific choice of non-Scania border municipalities as our control group.

5.4 Extension

Effect Volatility with Respect to Economic Shocks. For our main results, we restricted the analysis to the period 1997-2008 to prevent the financial crises in 2008 and the subsequent recession from affecting the results. In this section, we extend the time window to study effects also after the financial crisis to learn how a regional economic shock might counteract the initial effects of labor market expansions. Panel (a) of Figure 7 suggests that the effect on commuting starts decreasing in 2009 compared to the peak in 2008, for both males and females. Panel (b) of Figure 7 suggests that the effect on total wage follows a similar pattern, with the effect starting to decrease in 2009 for both males and females. However, although the effects are substantially lower than the peak year of 2008, the effects are still positive and average wages are not falling back to pre-bridge levels by 2014.

Interestingly, Panels (a) and (b) of Figure 7 suggest that the decrease in the effect on both commuting and total wage is almost identical across genders, such that the within-household gender gap may have been unaffected by the economic downturn. This is supported by Panels (c) and (d) of Figure 7, which show that the within-couple gender commuting and wage gap remained constant during the economic downturn. These results demonstrate that not only do men benefit more from

[28] We exclude the Stockholm area as the labor market outcomes in Malmö and the labor market outcomes in the Stockholm area are on very different trends prior to the opening of the bridge, violating the parallel trend assumption required for causal inference based on a Difference-in-Differences approach. We therefore do not use the Stockholm labor market region as a control region.

[29] The synthetic control has been chosen based on trends in the following observable characteristics prior to the opening of the bridge: population size, average age, fraction married, fraction immigrants, fraction with at least some college education, average number of children, employment status and gender balance.

new labor market opportunities than their wives, but they are also able to maintain this relative benefit when these opportunities diminish. These asymmetric effects might have important policy implications.

6 Conclusion

Recent decades have seen a substantial increase in the size of local labor markets across the globe, and advances in transportation infrastructure represent one of the main drivers behind this observed phenomenon. Yet, a lack of exogenous variation in individuals' access to larger labor markets has prevented a comprehensive analysis on the effects of this labor market development on economic efficiency and equity. This limits our ability to understand how current labor market developments interact with certain government objectives such as economic growth and equality.

In this paper, we exploit the opening of the Öresund bridge as an exogenous change in access to a larger labor market. This bridge connects two of the largest metropolitan areas in Scandinavia, and the opening of the bridge represented a substantial increase in the labor market opportunities available to Swedes. Our results show that the bridge led to substantial increases in commuting and wages of Swedes residing close to the bridge. In terms of magnitude, individuals close to the bridge experienced a 16 percent increase in their wages eight years after the opening of the bridge. This provides strong evidence of an efficiency gain for individuals in Malmö due to the expansion of the local labor market.

In terms of equity, we find that the wage effects are largest for high-educated men and smallest for low-educated women. This differential impact across skill groups and across genders led to an increase in both across- and within-household wage inequality. These differential effects are driven not only by differences in the propensity to commute, but also by occupational segregation. Specifically, women are more likely to work in the service sector where the gains from the labor market expansion are smaller, while men are more likely to have business and STEM-related occupations with much higher returns to commuting.

The effects identified in this paper are important for understanding obstacles to income equality and the closing of the gender wage gap. Even though the bridge led to an increase in economic efficiency among Swedes residing close to the bridge, these efficiency gains vary greatly across individuals depending on their tradeoffs between commuting and wages. Le Barbanchon, Rathelot, and Roulet (2019) show that men and women have different reservation wages for commuting after a job loss, which is consistent with our finding that men are more likely to take advantage of the new opportunities in Denmark.

In terms of policy implications, our results highlight the importance of understanding the tradeoffs between efficiency and equity when deciding on infrastructure projects.[30] It should be noted

[30] A few example of proposed (but not implemented) bridges in the US includes the Long Island Sound Link between New York and Connecticut and the Southern Crossing in San Francisco.

that our paper speaks to how infrastructure projects that substantially expand labor market and commuting opportunities affect economic efficiency and equity. Other large-scale infrastructure projects that connect regions or integrate labor markets include the development of high-speed train connections that allow people to commute longer distances between metropolitan labor markets (e.g. TGV, Thalys, ICE in Europe or the Shinkansen in Japan), or the opening of bridges and tunnels that provide direct links between labor markets (e.g. the Gotthard Base Tunnel and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge). The effects of infrastructure projects that improve transportation links between suburbs and city centers might, however, may produce efficiency and equity effects different from those identified in this paper, as such projects often aim to lower commuting time for already existing commuting routes rather than encourage new commuting behavior.

References

Alvaredo, F., L. Chancel, T. Piketty, E. Saez, and G. Zucman (2018): *World inequality report 2018*. Belknap Press.

Armenter, R., M. Koren, and D. K. Nagyy (2014): "Bridges," Discussion paper, Working Paper.

Banerjee, A., E. Duflo, and N. Qian (2012): "On the Road: Access to Transportation Infrastructure and Economic Growth in China," Discussion paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Beerli, A., J. Ruffner, M. Siegenthaler, and G. Peri (2018): "The Abolition of Immigration Restrictions and the Performance of Firms and Workers: Evidence from Switzerland," Discussion paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Blau, F. D., and L. M. Kahn (2007): "The gender pay gap: Have women gone as far as they can?," *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 7–23.

Donaldson, D. (2018): "Railroads of the Raj: Estimating the Impact of Transportation Infrastructure," *American Economic Review*, 108, 899–934.

Dustmann, C., U. Schönberg, and J. Stuhler (2017): "Labor supply shocks, native wages, and the adjustment of local employment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(1), 435–483.

Gibbons, S., T. Lyytikäinen, H. G. Overman, and R. Sanchis-Guarner (2019): "New road infrastructure: the effects on firms," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 110, 35–50.

Goldin, C. (2014): "A Grand Gender Convergence: Its Last Chapter," *American Economic Review*, 104(4), 1091–1119.

Greenstone, M., R. Hornbeck, and E. Moretti (2010): "Identifying Agglomeration Spillovers: Evidence from Winners and Losers of Large Plant Openings," *Journal of Political Economy*, 118, 536–598.

Heuermann, D. F., and J. F. Schmieder (2018): "The effect of infrastructure on worker mobility: evidence from high-speed rail expansion in Germany," *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19(2), 335–372.

Kleven, H., C. Landais, J. Posch, A. Steinhauer, and J. Zweimüller (2019): "Child Penalties Across Countries: Evidence and Explanations," Discussion paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Knowles, R. D. (2006): "Transport Impacts of the Øresund (Copenhagen to Malmö) Fixed Link," *Geography*, 91(3), 227–240.

Le Barbanchon, T., R. Rathelot, and A. Roulet (2019): "Gender Differences in Job Search: Trading off Commute Against Wage," Discussion paper, Working Paper.

Michaels, G. (2008): "The Effect of Trade on the Demand for Skill: Evidence from the Interstate Highway System," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90, 683–701.

OBK (2005): *Ekonomiska Fordelar med att bo och arbeta pa olika delar av Oresund*. Oresundsbro Konsortiet.

Steenstrup, B. (2012): *Oresund Trends 2012*. CS-Grafisk A/S.

7 Tables and Figures



(a) Working in Denmark



(b) Working in Sweden



(c) Wage Denmark



(d) Wage Sweden



(e) Total Wage

Figure 1: Effect of the Bride Opening on Cross-Border Commuting and Wages

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark, Sweden, or both. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark and as working in Sweden if they have positive wages from Sweden.



(a) Working in Denmark

Figure 2: Spillover Effects Across Scania

Notes: This figure shows a heat map of the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The numbers represent the δ_2008 estimate from Equation (1) and are obtained by estimating Equation (1) separately for each of the municipalities on the map and the control municipalities. Sample includes all individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. The outcome variable is the probability of working in Denmark. This variable takes the value of 1 if the individual had a positive wage from Denmark in the given year, and 0 otherwise.



(a) Age



(b) Education



(c) Children



(d) Married



(e) Net migration

Figure 3: Selective Sorting into Malmö

Notes:This figure shows the authors' estimation of a modified version of Equation (1) using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The sample is based on all individuals aged 18 through 65 who lived in Malmö or in one of the control municipalities in a given year. The sample is further restricted to individuals who lived in a different municipality in the previous year (i.e. inmigrants) and individuals who live in a different municipality in the next year (i.e. outmigrants). The estimating equation underlying Panels (a) through (d) is akin to a triple difference, in which the first difference comes from that between Malmö and the control group, the second difference comes from that over time, and the third difference comes from that between inmigrants and outmigrants. The estimates should therefore be interpreted as the difference in the characteristics of the individuals moving in to the municipality relative to the characteristics of the individuals moving out from the municipality. The estimating equation underlying Panel (e) is based on the original version of Equation (1) as described in the text, with the outcome variable taking the value of 1 if the individual moved into the municipality in a given year, -1 if the individual moved out from the municipality in a given year, and 0 otherwise. The dots represent interactions of the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) with a dummy for being an inmigrant, for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. All estimates include municipality, year, municipality-by-inmigrant, and year-by-inmigrant fixed effects. With respect to the outcome variables shown in the figure, children is a dummy variable for having a child and education is an indicator variable for having more than a high school degree.



(a) Total Wage, Born in Scania



(b) Total Wage, Not Born in Scania



(c) Total Wage, Commuters



(d) Total Wage, Non-Commuters

Figure 4: Effect of the Bride Opening for Residents vs. Non-residents and Commuters vs. Non-Commuters

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample is stratified based on whether the individual was born in Scania (Panel (a)), was not born in Scania (Panel (b)), commuted to Denmark (Panel (c)), or did not commute to Denmark (Panel (d)). Sample includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation.



(a) Working in Denmark

(b) Total Wage

(c) Working in Denmark

(d) Total Wage

Figure 5: Effect of the Bride Opening by Gender and Education

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample includes all individual between the ages of 25 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. The 25 year age cutoff differs from the 18 year age cutoff in the main analysis, and is chosen because this represents the age at which the majority of individuals have completed their education. Low educated individuals are defined as individuals with no more than a high school degree, and high educated individuals are defined as individuals with more than a high school degree. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation.



(a) Working in Denmark

(b) Total Wage

Figure 6: Within-Household Effects of the Bride Opening

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample includes all married couples living together and who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Total wage measures the difference in wage between the husband and wife. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with a zero wage gap are included in the estimation. Working in Denmark measured the difference in the probability of working in Denmark between the husband and the wife. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark.



(a) Working in Denmark, by Gender

(b) Total Wage, by Gender

(c) Working in Denmark, Within-Household

(d) Total Wage, Within-Household

Figure 7: Effects of the Bride Opening and an Economic Downturn

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2014 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation.

Table 1: Effect of the Bride Opening on Cross-Border Commuting and Wages

	Working in Denmark	Working in Sweden	Wage in Denmark	Wage in Sweden	Wage Total
Panel A: Men and Women Pooled					
Malmo Resident	0.053***	-0.009*	25.142***	-4.478*	20.664***
	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.294)	(2.163)	(2.098)
Mean	0.003	0.794	0.821	137.446	138.267
Observations	6375370	6375370	6375370	6375370	6375370
Panel B: Men					
Malmo Resident	0.061***	-0.003	33.019***	-5.346*	27.673***
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.522)	(2.727)	(2.665)
Mean	0.004	0.796	1.214	164.133	165.347
Observations	3237882	3237882	3237882	3237882	3237882
Panel C: Women					
Malmo Resident	0.044***	-0.015***	16.956***	-4.618**	12.338***
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.179)	(1.802)	(1.745)
Mean	0.002	0.791	0.417	109.990	110.407
Observations	3137488	3137488	3137488	3137488	3137488

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark, Sweden, or both. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark and as working in Sweden if they have positive wages from Sweden. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Table 2: Effect of the Bride Opening on the Extensive and Intensive Employment Margin

	Employment Extensive Margin	Employment — No UI	Unemployment Insurance	Above Mean Annual SEK Wage	Multiple Jobs
Panel A: Men and Women Pooled					
Malmo Resident	0.036***	0.033***	-0.018***	0.064***	-0.002
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.002)
Mean	0.795	0.805	0.152	0.502	0.224
Observations	6375370	5633173	6375370	6375370	6375370
Panel B: Men					
Malmo Resident	0.050***	0.044***	-0.037***	0.074***	0.013***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.003)
Mean	0.799	0.813	0.130	0.580	0.234
Observations	3237882	2911371	3237882	3237882	3237882
Panel C: Women					
Malmo Resident	0.020***	0.020***	0.002	0.049***	-0.019***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Mean	0.792	0.795	0.174	0.422	0.210
Observations	3137488	2721802	3137488	3137488	3137488

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Extensive margin employment is equal to 1 if the individual worked in any of the countries in the given year, and 0 otherwise. Unemployment insurance is equal to 1 if the individual received unemployment benefits from the Swedish government in the given year, and 0 otherwise. Above mean annual SEK wage is equal to 1 if the individual received a wage greater than the average wage in Sweden during the given year, and 0 otherwise. Multiple jobs is equal to 1 if the individual received wage from more than one employer in the given year, and 0 otherwise. While we have information on the number of employers in Sweden, we do not have this information for Denmark, such that this outcome represents a lower bound of the probability of holding multiple jobs. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Table 3: Effect of the Bride Opening by Gender and Education Level

	High-Educated		*Low-Educated*	
	Working in Denmark	Total Wage	Working in Denmark	Total Wage
Panel A: Men				
Malmo Resident	0.066***	43.934***	0.035***	3.193
	(0.002)	(5.593)	(0.001)	(2.032)
Mean	0.006	233.844	0.003	146.452
Observations	798910	798910	1931306	1931306
Panel B: Women				
Malmo Resident	0.040***	16.019***	0.026***	-0.244
	(0.001)	(2.863)	(0.001)	(1.653)
Mean	0.003	153.629	0.001	96.489
Observations	898650	898650	1750200	1750200

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample includes all individual between the ages of 25 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. The 25 year age cutoff differs from the 18 year age cutoff in the main analysis, and is chosen because this represents the age at which the majority of individuals have completed their education. Low educated individuals are defined as individuals with no more than a high school degree, and high educated individuals are defined as individuals with more than a high school degree. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Table 4: Effect of the Bride Opening by Education Specialization

	Working in Denmark		*Total Wage*	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Pedagogy and TeacherEd.	0.035***	0.016***	16.660***	6.087***
[Males=92,880]	(0.001)	(0.000)	(2.449)	(1.170)
[Females=265,841]				
Humanities and Arts	0.045***	0.047***	18.460***	11.503***
[Males=72,517]	(0.001)	(0.000)	(2.743)	(1.756)
[Females=91,463]				
SocSci, Law and PublicAdm.	0.067***	0.042***	44.221***	13.894***
[Males=349,765]	(0.003)	(0.002)	(6.873)	(3.208)
[Females=549,707]				
NatSci, Math and InfTech.	0.106***	0.067***	60.360***	5.999
[Males=63,298]	(0.002)	(0.001)	(7.762)	(6.082)
[Females=41,499]				
TechInd and Manufacturing	0.040***	0.043***	23.744***	30.778***
[Males=994,986]	(0.001)	(0.001)	(3.919)	(4.961)
[Females=124,865]				
Farming, LandSci and AnimalSci	0.029***	0.039***	8.403***	17.184***
[Males=73,502]	(0.001)	(0.001)	(2.149)	(3.607)
[Females=20,693]				
Health and SocCare	0.039***	0.023***	15.166***	7.680***
[Males=106,395]	(0.001)	(0.000)	(3.326)	(1.752)
[Females=619,949]				
Services	0.057***	0.038***	-1.477	-1.778
[Males=157,870]	(0.002)	(0.001)	(3.081)	(1.702)
[Females=175,015]				

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows stratified regressions based on the broad education specialization of the individuals, as defined by Statistics Sweden. Individuals with no recorded education specialization are excluded from the table. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample includes all individual between the ages of 25 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. The 25 year age cutoff differs from the 18 year age cutoff in the main analysis, and is chosen because this represents the age at which the majority of individuals have completed their education. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Table 5: Within-Household Effect of the Bride Opening

	Working in Denmark	Total Wage
Panel A: Within-Household Gap		
Malmo Resident	0.021***	27.083***
	(0.001)	(2.984)
Mean	0.002	79.996
Observations	1284219	1284219
Panel B: Within-Household Gap, with Children under 18		
Malmo Resident	0.035***	28.028***
	(0.001)	(3.554)
Mean	0.003	103.596
Observations	349030	349030
Panel C: Within-Household Gap, without Children under 18		
Malmo Resident	0.004***	17.347***
	(0.000)	(2.472)
Mean	0.002	67.028
Observations	655931	655931

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample includes all married couples living together and who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Total wage measures the difference in wage between the husband and wife. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with a zero wage gap are included in the estimation. Working in Denmark measured the difference in the probability of working in Denmark between the husband and the wife. Individuals are defined as working in Denmark if they have positive wages from Denmark. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Table 6: Inequality Effects of the Bride Opening

	50-10	90-50	90-10	IQR	SD	Gini
Panel A: Men						
Malmo Resident	26.043***	16.880***	42.924***	37.473***	79.850***	0.009***
	(2.396)	(3.675)	(5.480)	(3.995)	(5.690)	(0.003)
Mean	172.039	151.621	323.660	223.724	147.712	0.340
Observations	3237882	3237882	3237882	3237882	3237882	3237882
Panel B: Women						
Malmo Resident	-2.228	21.635***	19.408***	26.706***	18.587***	0.017***
	(1.358)	(3.118)	(3.650)	(1.416)	(2.048)	(0.002)
Mean	107.387	123.551	230.937	170.843	97.256	0.354
Observations	3137488	3137488	3137488	3137488	3137488	3137488

Notes: This table shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The table shows 8-year estimates from the full event study model. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. The 50-10 ratio measures the inequality between the middle and the bottom of the wage distribution. The 90-50 ratio measures the inequality between the top and the middle of the wage distribution. The 90-10 ratio measures the inequality between the top and the bottom of the wage distribution. The IQR (interquartile range) measures the difference between the 75th and the 25th percentiles of the wage distribution. The SD (standard deviation) is equal to the square root of the variance and measures the amount of wage dispersion. The Gini is a measure of statistical dispersion, and ranges from 0 to 1 where 1 represents perfect inequality. The outcome means represent the mean in Malmö in the year prior to the bridge opened (1999). Standard errors clustered at the municipality level are shown in parentheses. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** indicates significance at the 5 % level, and *** indicates significance at the 1 % level.

Online Appendix: Not For Publication

Figure A1: Öresund Region

Notes: Visual illustration of the Öresund region. Map has been obtained from Steenstrup (2012).



Figure A2: Traffic over Öresund per Year

Notes: Average daily traffic over Öresund per year. Information obtained from Örestundsinstituttet, which can be accessed via the following link: https://www.oresundsinstituttet.org/fakta-4/

Figure A3: Main Control and Treatment Groups

Notes: Visual illustration of treatment and control groups used for the main analysis. Grey lines denote municipality borders. Red lines denote county borders. Area in orange denotes Malmö municipality. Areas in yellow denote municipalities in the three border counties of Scania: Halland, Kronoberg and Blekinge. In our main analysis, we compare individuals residing in Malmö (organge area) with individuals residing in the non-Scania border municipalities (yellow areas).



(a) GDP per capita

(b) Unemployment rate

Figure A4: Danish Local Labor Market Conditions 1997–2008

Notes: Authors' estimation based on data from Statistics Denmark. This data is publicly available at https://www.dst.dk/en.



Figure A5: Where in Denmark Commuters from Malmö Work

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1999-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The figure shows the number of workers from Malmö that work in each of the Danish municipalities in 1999, 2004 and 2008. Danish municipalities that had less than 11 workers from Malmö in 2008 have been dropped from the figure.



Figure A6: Where in Denmark Commuters from Scania Work

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1999-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The figure shows the number of workers from Scania that work in each of the Danish municipalities in 1999, 2004 and 2008. Danish municipalities that had less than 21 workers from Scania in 2008 have been dropped from the figure.



(a) Work in Sweden

(b) Wage from Sweden

Figure A7: Effect on Wages and Employment in Sweden, Extended Pre-Trends

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1995-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wage in Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation. Individuals are defined as working in Sweden if they have positive wages from Sweden.



(a) Inmigration from

(b) Outmigration to

Figure A8: In- and Out-Migration from Malmö 1998–2008

Notes: Authors' estimation using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. Municipalities bordering Scania refers to the municipalities in our main control group. Large cities not bordering Scania refers to the ten largest non-Scania non-bordering municipalities of Sweden.



(a) Total wage, males

(b) Total wage, females

Figure A9: Quintile Effects

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using RIF regressions and 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Each gender-specific sample is based on approximately 3 million individual-year observations, and includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark and Sweden. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation.



(a) Working in Denmark, Top 30



(b) Total Wage, Top 30



(c) Working in Denmark, Synthetic Control



(d) Total Wage, Synthetic Control

Figure A10: Effect of Bridge Opening, Alternative Control Groups

Notes: This figure shows the authors' estimation of Equation (1) as described in the text using 1997-2008 administrative data from Statistics Sweden and Statistics Denmark. In subfigures (a) and (b), the control group consists of the 30 largest non-Stockholm non-Scania municipalities of Sweden. In subfigures (c) and (d), a syntethic control group based on all non-Scania municipalities in Sweden have been used. The synthetic control has been chosen based on trends in the following observable characteristics prior to the opening of the bridge: population size, average age, fraction married, fraction immigrants, fraction with at least some college education, average number of children, employment status and gender balance. The dots represent the δ_t estimate from Equation (1) for each of the years indicated on the horizontal axis. The bars extending from the dots represent the 95 percent confidence intervals, clustered at the municipality level. Sample is based on approximately 6 million individual-year observations, and includes all individual between the ages of 18 and 65 who resided in one of the treatment and control municipalities during the analysis window. All estimates include municipality, year, and birth cohort fixed effects, as well as a control for immigrant status. Wage includes total yearly wages in Denmark, Sweden, or both. Wages are measured in thousands of SEK, where 1 SEK is approximately USD 0.1. Individuals with zero wages are included in the estimation.

Table A1: Summary Statistics

	Malmo [158,132]	Control Group [357,377]	Remaining Municipalities [4,873,257]
Age	39.450	41.040	40.670
Female	0.501	0.489	0.492
Mobility	0.065	0.048	0.059
Some College	0.283	0.236	0.271
Employed	0.722	0.828	0.816
Total Wage	124.458	144.378	150.018
UI take-up	0.167	0.145	0.139
Children	0.323	0.398	0.377
Immigrant	0.305	0.114	0.154
Married	0.387	0.485	0.440

Notes: Authors' estimation using 1999 administrative data from Statistics Sweden. Sample includes all individuals aged 18 through 65. Control group refers to the municipalities in our main control group. Mobility is defined as the number of times an individual has moved across municipality borders in the past year. Some college is defined as having received at least some university education. Employed is defined as having positive wage from Sweden. Total wage is defined as the combined wage from all employers in Sweden during the year. UI take-up is a dummy variable for receiving unemployment benefits from the Swedish government. Children is an indicator variable taking the value of one if the individual has a child.

Issued in the series Discussion Papers 2018

2018

01/18 January, Øystein Foros, Mai Nguyen-Ones, and **Frode Steen**, "Evidence on consumer behavior and firm performance in gasoline retailing"

02/18 January, **Agnar Sandmo**, "A fundamental externality in the Labour Market? Ragnar Frisch on the socially optimal amount of work"

03/18 February, Pierre Dubois and **Morten Sæthre**, "On the Effect of Parallel Trade on Manufacturers' and Retailers' Profits in the Pharmaceutical Sector"

04/18 March, **Aline Bütikofer**, Julie Riise, and Meghan Skira, "The Impact of Paid Maternity Leave on Maternal Health"

05/18 March, **Kjetil Bjorvatn** and **Bertil Tungodden**, "Empowering the disabled through savings groups: Experimental evidence from Uganda"

06/18 April, Mai Nguyen-Ones and **Frode Steen**, "Measuring Market Power in Gasoline Retailing: A Market- or Station Phenomenon?

07/18 April, **Chang Koo Chi** and Trond Olsen, "Relational incentive contracts and performance"

08/18 April, Björn Bartling, **Alexander W. Cappelen, Mathias Ekström, Erik Ø. Sørensen**, and **Bertil Tungodden**, «Fairness in Winner-Take-All Markets»

09/18 April, **Aline Bütikofer, Sissel Jensen**, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**, «The Role of Parenthood on the Gender Gap among Top Earners»

10/18 May, **Mathias Ekström**, "The (un)compromise effect"

11/18 May, Yilong Xu, **Xiaogeng Xu**, and Steven Tucker, «Ambiguity Attitudes in the Loss Domain: Decisions for Self versus Others»

12/18 June, **Øivind A. Nilsen**, Per Marius Pettersen, and Joakim Bratlie, "Time-Dependency in producers' price adjustments: Evidence from micro panel data"

13/18 June, **Øivind A. Nilsen**, Arvid Raknerud, and Diana-Cristina Iancu, "Public R&D support and firms' performance. A Panel Data Study"

14/18 June, Manudeep Bhuller, **Gordon B. Dahl**, **Katrine V. Løken**, and Magne Mogstad: «Incarceration, Recidivism, and Employment"

15/18 August, Manudeep Bhuller, **Gordon B. Dahl, Katrine V. Løken**, and Magne Mogstad: «Incarceration Spillovers in Criminal and Family Networks"

16/18 August, Pedro Carneiro, Kai Liu, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**: "The Supply of Skill and Endogenous Technical Change: Evidence From a College Expansion Reform"

17/18 August, **Chang Koo Chi**, "An analysis of the two-bidder all-pay auction with common values"

18/18 August, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, Cornelius Cappelen, and **Bertil Tungodden**, "Second-best fairness under limited information: The trade-off between false positives and false negatives"

19/18 September, **Aline Bütikofer, Antonio Dalla Zuanna**, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**: "Breaking the Links: Natural Resource Booms and Intergenerational Mobility"

20/18 September, Juan Pablo Atal, José Ignacio Cuesta, and **Morten Sæthre**, "Quality regulation and competition: Evidence from Pharmaceutical Markets"

21/18 October, Orazio Attanasio, Agnes Kovacs, and **Krisztina M**olnar, "Euler Equations, Subjective Expectations and Income Shocks"

22/18 October, Antonio Mele, **Krisztina Molnár**, and Sergio Santoro, "On the perils of stabilizing prices when agents are learning"

23/18 November, Bjørn-Atle Reme, Helene Lie Røhr, and **Morten Sæthre**, "The Poking Effect: Price Changes, Information, and Inertia in the Market for Mobile Subscriptions"

24/18 November, **Ingrid Hoem Sjursen**, "Accountability and taxation: Experimental evidence"

25/18 November, **Liam Brunt** and Antonio Fidalgo, "Why 1990 international Geary-Khamis dollars cannot be a foundation for reliable long run comparisons of GDP"

26/18 November, **Ola Honningdal Grytten**, "A continuous consumer price index for Norway 1492-2017"

27/18 December, **Liam Brunt** and Antonio Fidalgo, "Feeding the people: grain yields and agricultural expansion in Qing China"

28/18 December, **Kurt R. Brekke**, Chiara Canta, Luigi Siciliani and Odd Rune Straume, "Hospital Competition in the National Health Service: Evidence from a Patient Choice Reform"

29/18 December, Richard Friberg, **Frode Steen** and **Simen A. Ulsaker**, "Hump-shaped cross-price effects and the extensive margin in cross-border shopping"

30/18 December, David Jaume and **Alexander Willén**, "Oh Mother: The Neglected Impact of School Disruptions"

31/18 December, Jesús Crespo Cuaresma, **Gernot Doppelhofer**, Martin Feldkircher and Florian Huber, "Spillovers from US monetary policy: Evidence from a time-varying parameter GVAR model"

32/18 January, **Patrick Bennet** and Amine Ouazad, " Job Displacement, Unemployment, and Crime: Evidence from Danish Microdata and Reforms"

2019

01/19 January, **Aline Bütikofer**, Christopher Cronin, Meghan Skira, "Employment Effects of Healthcare Policy: Evidence from the 2007 FDA Black Box Warning on Antidepressants"

02/19 February, **Ingar Haaland** and Cristopher Roth "Beliefs About Racial Discrimination and Support for Pro-Black Policies "

03/19 February, **Astrid Kunze** and Xingfei Liu, "Universal Childcare for the Youngest and the Maternal Labour Supply"

04/19 February, **Ingvild Almas, Alexander W. Cappelen, Bertil Tungodden**. "Cutthroat capitalism versus cuddly socialism: Are Americans more meritocratic and efficiency-seeking than Scandinavians?"

05/19 February**, Chang Koo Chi**, Kyoung Jin Choi. "Performance Measurement in Agency Models"

06/19 March, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, **Ranveig Falch** and **Bertil Tungodden.** "The Boy Crisis: Experimental Evidence on the Acceptance of Males Falling Behind"

07/19 March, Frode Skjeret, **Frode Steen** and **Timothy G.A Wyndham**. "Paywalls and the demand for online news"

08/19 April, **Ola. H. Grytten** and Viktoriia Koilo. "The Financial Instability Hypothesis and the Financial Crisis in Eastern European Emerging Economies"

09/19 April, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, Johanna Mollerstrom, Bjørn-Atle Reme and **Bertil Tungodden.** "A Meritocratic Origin of Egalitarian Behavior"

10/19 April, **Fanny Landaud**. "From Employment to Engagement? Stable Jobs, Temporary Jobs, and Cohabiting Relationships"

11/19 May, **Ola Honningdal Grytten** and Viktoriia Koilo. "Evidence of the Environmental Kuznets Curve in Emerging Eastern European Economies"

12/19 June. Rune Midjord, Tomás Rodríguez Barraquer, and **Justin Valasek.** "Robust Information Aggregation Through Voting"

13/19 June. Eva M. Berger, **Henning Hermes**, Guenther Koenig, Felix Schmidt, and Daniel Schunk. "Self-regulation Training and Job Search Behavior: A Natural Field Experiment Within an Active Labor Market Program"

14/19 June. **Henning Hermes**, Martin Huschens, Franz Rothlauf and Daniel Schunk. "Motivating Low-Achievers—Relative Performance Feedback in Primary Schools"

15/19 August. Viktoriia Koilo and Ola **Honningdal Grytten.** "The Blue Maritime C luster Crisis Financial Instability and Supply Chain Management Effects"

16/19 Jonas Andersson, Fred Schroyen and Gaute Torsvik. "The impact of international tax information exchange agreements on the use of tax amnesty: evidence from Norway"

17/19 Ingrid Kristine Folgerø, **Torfinn Harding** and Benjamin S. Westby. "Going Fast or Going Green? Evidence from Environmental Speed Limits in Norway"

18/19 Julie Riise, Barton Willage and **Alexander Willén.** "Can Female Doctors Cure the Gender STEMM Gap? Evidence from Randomly Assigned General Practitioners"

19/19 **Aline Bütikofer**, **Katrine V. Løken** and **Alexander Willén.** "Building Bridges and Widening Gaps: Efficiency Gains and Equity Concerns of Labor Market Expansions"

NORGES HANDELSHØYSKOLE
Norwegian School of Economics

Helleveien 30
NO-5045 Bergen
Norway

T +47 55 95 90 00
E nhh.postmottak@nhh.no
W www.nhh.no