

A R T Y K U Ł Y I R O Z P R A W Y

DAMIAN S. PYRKOSZ
University of Rzeszów

CULTURAL AND SOCIAL DIVERSITY
AS AN ECONOMIC RESOURCE

INTRODUCTION

In a world of continuous and rapid change there is nothing but the change itself that seems certain. It has affected all spheres of human life, and has effectively enhanced and contributed to one of the key features of our worldly existence: diversity. This in turn has characterised the natural world since its very beginning, much in the same way as it has for humanity. No other feature seems to better encapsulate the idea of life on our planet, including the people themselves; the idea has been aptly captured by the saying “the beauty of the world lies in its diversity.” Change, however, has always been a vital element and provided incentive to economic development, which physically has been reliant on the world’s natural resources, technological innovation and human capital. Since beauty is rather a part of a qualitative assessment and production, at times when change is yielding not only qualitative but also notable quantitative effects, it is worth asking whether diversity has any significance for pecuniary human activities. In this sense, it is intriguing to observe whether diversity in the cultural and social context—openness to different cultures, religions, sexual orientations and ethnic backgrounds—also plays a role in economic development.

DEFINING THE KEY TERMS

In the human context, *diversity* primarily refers to the social conditioning of each individual, and taking into account the prevalent impact of cultural ramifications it always has to be considered within its cultural context. It is thus formed by individuals and groups from a vast range of demographic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. It intrinsically denotes understanding that each individual, group, society and culture is unique, and recognising those differences. These can follow (but are not limited to) the dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, marital status, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political beliefs, or ideologies. Diversity therefore includes knowledge of the above aspects that are different from our own or the group we belong to, yet are present in other individuals and groups, and an ability to relate to them. Furthermore, diversity means acknowledging that categories of difference are not always permanent but can also be flexible, respecting individual rights to self-identification, and recognising that no culture is intrinsically superior to another. Therefore, in the axiological sense, the concept of diversity inherently entails acceptance and respect (*Definition for Diversity*).

A number of authors (Hlepas 2013; Nijkamp, Poot 2015; Ager, Brückner 2013; Fearon 2003; Bove, Elia 2017; Docquier *et al.* 2019; Alesina *et al.* 2016) make use of two indexes to represent the level of diversity:

— *fractionalization* is the likelihood that two individuals randomly selected from the population were born in different countries;

— *polarization* demonstrates how far the distribution of the groups in one country is from a bipolar distribution where there are only two groups of equal size (Bove, Elia 2016).

Social diversity defines and refers to the variety of both similar and distinct characteristics that human beings have in common at the personal and group level. Functionally, it is the extent to which a society/community can integrate individuals and groups of dissimilar characteristics compared to those prevalent within a given society/group so that they can enjoy the same rights and responsibilities.

One of the indexes attempting to measure social diversity is the *Global Diversity Index*. The 2019 compilation of the index examined the factors of:

- the level of ethnic diversity
- the number of immigrants
- the number of languages spoken
- the number of religious beliefs

- the number of political parties
- the level of religious freedom
- LGBT rights and freedoms
- the level of personal freedom.¹

The result showed that Benin, a French-speaking country in West Africa, is the most culturally diverse country in the world. It was accompanied by other African countries such as Mozambique, Côte d'Ivoire, Republic of South Africa, Chad and Kenya. Many European countries ranked among the least ethnically diverse, including the UK, France and Italy, with the exception of Belgium which ranked second globally.²

Another attempt to quantify the degree of the world's social diversity was made by Alesina, Devleeschauwer *et al.* (2003). They investigated 650 different ethnic groups across 190 countries using the data from national censuses, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the CIA, Minority Rights Group International, and *Ethnic Groups Worldwide* (Levinson 1998). An ethnicity rating was thereby established for each country. Once again, an African country, Uganda, was found to be the most ethnically mixed country in the world; it is home to more than 40 different indigenous ethnic groups, each of which has its own language, culture and customs. The top 20 most diverse countries are all in Africa, particularly East Africa. At the country level, South Korea came across as the world's most homogenous nation; continentally, Europe proved the most ethnically homogenous.

With regard to the USA, a measure focusing on social discrepancies, the *Diversity Index* (DI) (Reese-Cassa 2014), primarily captures the racial and ethnic diversity of a society/community/group within a geographic area in a single value (ranging from 0 to 100). In other words,

¹ The above elements were divided into four overarching categories: cultural diversity, religious diversity, political diversity, and freedom for diversity. Every country was scored (out of 5) across each of the sub-categories. A total score for the overarching category (out of 5) was established, and then the 4 overarching scores for each country were added up to get their final score (out of 20), which was used to rank the countries. Where countries tied for total score, the personal freedom score determined their position. All in all, the index was used to determine diversity in 125 countries (*Global Diversity Index* 2019).

² Benin's top position is primarily due to the country currently being home to 56 different languages; French is the main language, and there are around 42 different African ethnic groups, each of which settled in the country at a different time, that call Benin home. Other countries' positions: 23—Sweden; 24—Australia; 25—USA; 26—Czech Republic; 40—Norway; 43—UK; 44—Germany; 47—France; 54—Hungary; 63—Argentina; 64—Italy; 85—China; 96—Ukraine; 102—Afghanistan; 103—Poland; 104—Romania; 119—Russia; 125—Egypt (*Ibidem*).

it expresses the probability of any individuals chosen at random in the area having different racial or ethnic backgrounds. Over the last 40 years, the United States has seen dramatic changes in racial and ethnic compositions triggered predominantly by remarkable growth in the Hispanic population,³ together with significant shifts in domestic births.⁴ However, the most evident changes in diversity can be seen through a generational lens, where among many other processes the steady increase in marriages across racial and ethnic lines is pushing the rate of diversification for the next generation. Effectively, they are all contributing to an increasing rate of diversification in American society.⁵

Cultural diversity is the quality of diversity in culture contradicting monoculture and cultural homogenization. It is commonly treated as representing the variety of human societies/cultures in a specific region or in the world. With the many distinct societies that have emerged around the globe differing markedly from each other, the most apparent cultural differences existing between people are language, customs, traditions, types of social organization, concepts of morality, religious beliefs, and attitude to the environment. As with the notion of social diversity, cultural diversity is intrinsically rooted in respect and how various cultures recognise each other's differences.

One cannot consider the idea of cultural diversity without understanding the concept of culture itself. There is no single and commonly recognised definition thereof. To cite just two out of the vast spectrum, culture refers to "the totality of learned, socially transmitted customs, knowledge, material objects, and behaviour. It includes the ideas, values, and artifacts [...] of groups of people" (Schaefer 2016: 51). A recognised and venerable definition holds that culture is a "[...] complex whole

³ In 1970, Hispanics accounted for 4.7% of the population. In 2014, Hispanics represented 17.5% of the population, and by 2019 the figure had risen to 19%. Hispanic population growth accounted for half of all population growth in the first decade of the 21st century (Reese-Cassa 2014: 1).

⁴ They have become the primary source of diversification, since more than half of all children born in the US are in minorities defined as any race/ethnicity other than non-Hispanic white. Minorities thereby accounted for 30.9% of the population in 2000, and by 2019 they made up 40.4% of the population. Effectively, that reduces the majority (non-Hispanic whites) share of the population from 69% to less than 60%. At this pace, the transition to a *majority-minority* population is expected around 2040 (*Ibidem*).

⁵ The 2014 DI by generation was: 73% for Generation Z/Zoomers (1997–2012); 70% for Generation Y/Millennials (1981–1996); 65% for Generation X (1965–1980); as little as 48% for Baby Boomers/Me Generation (1946–1964); and only 47% for the Silent Generation/Lucky Few (1928–1945) (*Ibidem*: 2).

which includes knowledge, belief, arts, morals, laws, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Tylor 1958: 1). Despite the many decades between them, both definitions emphasise the impact of culture on people: it is what forms us, forms our identity and influences our behaviour, and is our *way of being* in a broad sense.

With regard to the environment, cultural diversity could be compared to biological diversity. Just as the vibrant human environment generates multiple forms of worldview and behaviour, giving rise to cultural diversity, so too the natural environment creates a variety of species and lifeforms, in other words biological diversity. Both reflect the enormous will to live, and could therefore be synonymous with life (and beauty) itself. In this sense, biodiversity is considered vital to the long-term survival of life on Earth, just as cultural diversity is critical to the long-term survival of humanity. This position was adopted by UNESCO in the *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, asserting that “cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature” (2001: 4).⁶

Cultural diversity is difficult to quantify. Nevertheless, some indication of the extent of cultural diversity in society is the number of languages spoken in a particular region or in the world as a whole. David Crystal suggested that, on average, one language is falling into disuse every two weeks. He calculated that if this rate of language death were to continue, then by the year 2100 more than 90% of the languages currently spoken in the world will have gone extinct (Crystal 2000).

A linguistic criterion, the Ethno-Linguistic Fractionalization (ELF) Index, was also used to account for cultural diversity. As Okediji (2011, cited in Hlepas 2013: 4) observes, the concept was established in the 1960s in an attempt to verify the number of ethno-linguistic groups in the world population. Taylor and Hudson (1972, cited *ibidem*) used the data to compute an ELF Index, based on linguistic groupings, which was to become the most commonly used measure of cultural diversity. Another term, *cultural fractionalization*, is an approach measuring similarity between languages and giving a value between “1” (i.e., the population speaks two or more unrelated languages) and “0” (i.e., the entire population speaks the same language). This index of cultural diversity is biased towards linguistic differences as opposed to genetic diversity and other differences.

⁶ Furthermore, it asserted that the conservation of indigenous cultures may be as important to humankind as the conservation of species and ecosystems is to life in general.

In a 2013 study of cultural diversity by Gören (2013), the level of cultural diversity in over 180 countries was determined by juxtaposing data on ethnicity and race with a measure related to the similarity of languages spoken by major ethnic or racial groups.⁷ In this way an index (ranging from 0 to 1) was calculated: higher values indicated greater cultural diversity and lower values less cultural diversity. The study's findings revealed the African countries of Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria, Togo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to be the world's most culturally diverse countries. The principal reason for these and other African countries to naturally top any diversity index is their multitude of tribal groups and languages. Canada was the only western country to rank in the top 20 most diverse countries.⁸

As for cultural diversity in the USA, it turns out that some states enjoy greater diversity than others. A study by WalletHub, a personal finance social network, collected data from all the states to establish where there had been the highest rate of idea and identity exchanges, and which state populations were comparatively more homogenous. A comparison of six key diversity types, including socio-economic, cultural, economic, household, religious and political diversity, found that the most culturally diverse US states are California, Nevada, Hawaii, Texas and Florida, whereas the least culturally diverse are West Virginia, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire and Kentucky (*Most & Least Diverse States...*).

Finally, *economic resources* (factors of production) are the inputs responsible for producing things or providing services. Economic resources are limited in supply and are in demand. Typically, we distinguish four kinds: land, labour, capital, and entrepreneurship. Economic resources can be divided into human resources (labour and management), and nonhuman resources (land, capital goods, financial resources and technology).

CULTURAL AND SOCIAL DIVERSITY V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The question regarding the impact of cultural and social diversity on economic growth and development has already been addressed by

⁷ Gören's hypothesis was that groups speaking the same or highly similar languages should also have similar cultural values.

⁸ The USA ranked close to the middle, proving slightly more diverse than Russia but a little less than Spain. Among the world's least diverse countries were Argentina, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Rwanda and Uruguay (*Ibidem*).

many researchers. However, the issue is relatively new, and has only been on the research agenda for about two decades. By no means does an explicit answer emerge from the various studies, since the data collected in the process reveal diverse findings. On the one hand, a number of authors indicate an adverse correlation between socio-cultural diversity and economic development. More specifically:

— Robert Putnam, in his seminal paper *E Pluribus Unum* (2006), argues that ethnic diversity undermines stable social networks and leads to the destruction of social capital in a variety of ways: it undermines communication, and is detrimental to social inter- and intragroup solidarity and social norms (such as reciprocity, trust, and worthiness). As a result, diversity brings increased social isolation (the *hunkering down* hypothesis);

— ethnic, linguistic and religious differences can generate social barriers to communication that can reduce productivity (VanAlstine, Cox, Roden 2013): a diversity of languages raises transaction costs and results in public policies hindering growth (Barro 1999); barriers to communication and lack of trust can prevent the mutually beneficial exchange of ideas (Grafton, Knowles, Owen 2004). In fact, communicating ideas in linguistically homogenous communities may have positive effects, stimulating faster technological development and economic growth;

— high diversity leads to a reduction in the quality and quantity of public good provision, since different ethnic groups may have divergent preferences in this respect. Increased diversity therefore raises costs and increases inefficiency due to the contending demands of dissimilar groups, effectively lowering the gain from public good consumption (Alesina, La Ferrara 2005), as it is more economical to deal with members of one's own type (Greif 1993);

— cultural diversity can cause social unrest and consequently harm economic development. There are numerous examples supporting this, including situations where ethnic diversity increases the likelihood of conflict and political instability (Easterly, Levine 1997), or exacerbates conflicting interests between groups thereby making societies more vulnerable to fragmentation and unrest (Nijkamp, Poot 2015); ethnically diverse societies tend to have higher rates of corruption (Shleifer, Vishny 1993), cultural variety impedes economic growth since ethnically diversified communities are more susceptible to polarization and unrest (Collier 2000), religious diversity hinders social integration and commonly leads to tension and conflict (Warf and Vincent 2007), and the restriction of religious freedom is accompanied by a reduced sense of well-being and violent social conflict (Grim and Finke 2007).

On the other hand, a significant number of research studies point to a positive relationship between cultural/social diversity and economic prosperity:

— diversity of immigrants in a country contributes positively to levels of economic prosperity. This notion is particularly valid in the case of skilled immigrants in more affluent countries; a study on immigration data from 195 countries (Alesina, Harnoss, Rapoport 2016) showed that increasing the diversity of skilled immigrants by one percentage point raises long-term economic output by about 2%;

— a diverse populace offers a variety of perspectives and opportunities for the exchange of new ideas that can prompt innovation and creativity. Ridley (2010) emphasises a positive historical link between the volume of interaction between diverse individuals and the resourcefulness and rate of cultural change of a population, and calls it *collective intelligence*;

— a blend of ethnically and culturally diversified people pools complementary abilities and experiences which may contribute to an increase in productivity (VanAlstine, Cox, Roden 2013). With respect to this notion, Lazear (1999) found that increased diversity brings innovation by adding the number of ways that groups frame problems that lead to the identification of a wider range of alternative solutions. Similarly, Florida and Tingali (2004) found that a more diverse society leads to a more creative and innovative labour force, which in turn contributes to an increase in competitiveness. Furthermore, higher levels of cultural diversity increase entrepreneurship levels, particularly when coupled with the presence of good institutions (Sobel, Dutta, Roy 2010). All in all, interaction among different cultures promotes competition and the exchange of ideas from different worldviews, which translates into productivity, entrepreneurship and innovation.

However, various studies find the relationship between cultural diversity and economic development more complex than a simple linear relationship:

— Alesina and La Ferrara (2005) found that increases in ethnic diversity correlate with lower growth rates, whereas interaction between diversity and income level is positive. This could be explained on the grounds of fractionalization, which has more of an adverse effect on lower levels of income. Contrastingly, advanced and complex societies will take greater advantage of the potential benefits of diversity, as they will be in a better position to make use of the variety of skills and perspectives that come with a diverse populace;

— underdeveloped countries are negatively affected by religious diversity, whereas developed countries are positively affected, since highly

developed countries with strong institutions that protect personal and property rights are better conditioned to alleviate the costs and take advantage of the benefits of diversity (VanAlstine, Cox, Roden 2013).⁹

In an attempt to demonstrate the historical role of cultural diversity for economic development, Ashraf and Galor (2011) conducted a study into the impact of geographic isolation, proximity and cultural diversity on economic development from pre-industrial times to the modern era. They examined the *Great Divergence* in economic development.¹⁰ During the Industrial Revolution, Europe and the New World achieved a rate of economic development that far outpaced the rest of the world.¹¹ Their findings show that diversity increases economic development, while homogeneity hinders it. In this respect they are generally in parallel with the findings of others who have dealt with the same idea of the determinants of the European miracle. The most seminal and remarkable was Max Weber (1905), who credited this situation to the *Protestant ethic* and its emphasis on thrift and hard work, while consistently stimulating entrepreneurship and productivity. Other researchers stressed the role of distinctive cultural norms and values that favoured individual effort, freedom, and the spirit of enterprise.¹² Ashraf and Galor take these factors and arguments seriously, yet argue that it was the comparative openness towards other cultures that actually gave Europe and the New World their economic dominance.¹³ Their findings manifestly corroborate the notion that cultural diversity and geographic openness play a critical role in

⁹ This refers to the bottom three quartiles of development for underdeveloped countries, and the top quartile for developed ones.

¹⁰ The Great Divergence, or European miracle, is the socioeconomic shift in which the Western world overcame pre-modern growth constraints and emerged during the 19th century as the most powerful and wealthy world civilization.

¹¹ "The gap in per capita GDP between the richest regions of the world and the poorest increased from a modest 3 to 1 ratio in 1820, to an astounding 18 to 1 ratio in 2000" (Maddison 2001, cited in Ashraf, Galor 2011: 1).

¹² Douglas North and Robert Thomas (1973) argued that it was the institutions that had been built in the process of construction of democratic capitalism, with their inherent respect for individual property rights, that accelerated the rate of technological innovation and economic development. By contrast, Jared Diamond (1997) stressed the geographical factors and identified the source of the West's unprecedented economic development in the easy access to raw materials, plentiful rainfall, mild climate and lower disease rate.

¹³ They measure "openness" in terms of greater or lesser geographical isolation. For that purpose, they develop a *Geographical Isolation Index*, with reference to the travel time to 139 Old World capital cities. In this way, firstly the effect of geographic isolation on cultural diversity is identified, and secondly, the effects of geographic isolation are related to the level of economic development from the 19th century until 1960.

economic development. The results of the study also lead Ashraf and Galor (2011) to formulate three major conclusions that succinctly encapsulate the role of cultural diversity in economic development:

— in pre-industrial times, i.e., the agricultural age, geographic isolation played a positive role in economic development, but with the onset of industrialization it became a significant burden. “Societies that were geographically less vulnerable to cultural diffusion benefited from enhanced assimilation, lower cultural diversity, and more intense accumulation of society-specific human capital. Thus, they operated more efficiently with respect to their production-possibility frontiers and flourished in the technological paradigm that characterized the agricultural stage of development. The lack of cultural diffusion and its manifestation in cultural rigidity, however, diminished the ability of these societies to adapt to a new technological paradigm, which delayed their industrialization and, hence, their take-off to a state of sustained economic growth” (*Ibidem*: 2);

— geographical isolation has had a detrimental effect on the level of social diversity; societies that were geographically isolated in pre-industrial times remain less culturally diverse today;

— cultural diversity contributed positively to economic development throughout the process of industrialisation, from its beginning through to modern times.

As a relevant case study addressing the issue of relationship between level of cultural/social diversity and economic development, we refer to a study of historical data (Ager and Brückner 2013) which examined the effects that within-county changes in the cultural composition of the US population, caused by the large inflow of immigrants into the US from 1870 to 1920, had on output growth. The first main finding is that increases in cultural fractionalization led to significant growth in output per capita during the 1870–1920 period. More precisely, one percentage point increase in counties’ cultural fractionalization increased output per capita by up to 2%. As in a study by Alesina and La Ferrara (2005), Ager and Brückner (2013) also demonstrate that within-county increases in cultural fractionalization were linked to significant within-county increases in the occupational diversity of workers. Their second main finding was that increases in cultural polarization had a significant negative effect on output per capita, and one percentage point increase in cultural polarization caused a decrease in output per capita by up to 3%. In line with other earlier research findings linking polarization to voracious redistribution (Tornell, Lane 1999; Lane, Tornell 1996), a large

government sector and distortionary taxation (Azzimonti 2011), as well as violent conflict (Esteban, Ray 1999, 2011a,b; Montalvo, Reynal-Querol 2005a,b), Ager and Brückner (2013) show that during the 1870–1920 period increases in polarization led to a significant increase in the tax quote and the number of public sector employees.

CONCLUSIONS

The body of evidence predominantly suggests that there is a positive link between social/cultural diversity and economic growth and development. In this sense, the role of diversity, particularly with regard to culture and society, seems decisive for one more reason in the process of economic development. As the logic of the market is built on achieving comparative advantage, it inevitably necessitates the usage of all available resources—primarily economic, but also cultural, social, political and any other.¹⁴ In this way, countries and societies, as well as companies and individuals, can and should make use of the variety of cultural attributes thus made available, and treat them as an extra resource that could make a difference in the competitive and globalized world.

From a methodological point of view, the above analysis also demonstrates that the problems we face are complex, frequently far more so than they seem, and hence require a brand new and integrated inter- and multidisciplinary approach. There are no easy explanations or solutions. The old matrix of sectoral understanding and cure-all remedies has gone with the wind of omnipresent change. This also applies to the established systems of wealth accumulation, allocation and distribution (i.e. capitalism, communism, and the so called *the third way*) and a search for viable alternatives to them. As it was aptly emphasized by Ralf Dahredorf, “In an open world, there are not just two or three ways but an indefinite number. The question—how to create wealth and social cohesion in free societies—may be the same everywhere, since it results from largely global conditions. The answers, however, are manifold. There are many capitalisms, not just that of the Chicago school of economics; there are many democracies, not just that of Westminster. Diversity is not

¹⁴ However, diversity is by no means limited to the above ideas of culture, ethnicity or society. In more culturally/ethnically homogenous countries it may be more useful to consider it in terms of, among others, age. Diversification of each company’s staff with regard to age is undoubtedly an important element of management strategies. It is also a key element of the company’s organizational culture, and as such may, if used properly, become a source of competitive advantage.

an optional byproduct of high culture; it is at the very heart of a world that has abandoned the need for closed, encompassing systems” (1999: 15).

Diversity is in the eye of development. This is particularly true with regard to culture and society, and becomes even more obvious when looking at problems of economic development, which can no longer be assessed solely in quantitative terms of loss or profit. Human-centered development imposes qualitative standards in which cultural and social diversity become the key elements of economic development. Without such an inclusive perspective, we can neither understand nor manage our problems; we cannot manage to survive.

REFERENCES

- Ager Philipp, Brückner Markus, 2013, *Cultural Diversity and Economic Growth: Evidence from the US during the Age of Mass Migration*, “European Economic Review,” Vol. 64: 76–97.
- Alesina Alberto, Devleeschauwer Arnaud, Easterly William, Kurlat Sergio, Wacziarg Romain, 2003, *Fractionalization*, “Journal of Economic Growth,” Vol. 8, Issue 2: 155–194.
- Alesina Alberto, Harnoss Johann, Rapoport Hillel, 2016, *Birthplace Diversity and Economic Prosperity*, “Journal of Economic Growth,” Vol. 21, Issue 2: 101–138.
- Alesina Alberto, La Ferrara Eliana, 2000, *Participants in Heterogeneous Communities*, “Quarterly Journal of Economics,” Vol. 115, Issue 3: 847–904.
- Alesina Alberto, La Ferrara Eliana, 2005, *Ethnic Diversity and Economic Performance*, “Journal of Economic Literature,” Vol. 43, No. 3: 762–800.
- Ashraf Quamrul, Galor Oded, 2011, *Cultural Diversity, Geographical Isolation, and the Origin of the Wealth of Nations*, NBER Working Papers 17640, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Azzimonti Marina, 2011, *Barriers to Investment in Polarized Societies*, “American Economic Review,” Vol. 101, Issue 5: 2182–2204.
- Barro Robert J., 1999, *Determinants of Democracy*, “Journal of Political Economy,” Vol. 107, No. S6: S158–S183.
- Bove Vincenzo, Elia Leandro, 2016, *Cultural Heterogeneity and Economic Development*, “The Centre for Economic Policy Research,” (<https://voxeu.org/article/diversity-and-economic-development> [1.11.2020]).
- Bove Vincenzo, Elia Leandro, 2017, *Migration, Diversity, and Economic Growth*, “World Development,” Vol. 89, Issue C: 227–239.
- Collier Paul, 2000, *Ethnicity, Politics, and Economic Performance*, “Economics and Politics,” Vol. 12, Issue 3: 225–245.
- Crystal David, 2000, *Language Death*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Definition for Diversity*, Queensborough Community College, City University of New York, (<https://www.qcc.cuny.edu/diversity/definition.html> [17.10.2020]).
- Dahrendorf Ralf, 1999, *The Third Way and Liberty*, “Foreign Affairs,” Vol. 78, Issue 5: 13–17.
- Diamond Jared, 1997, *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*, W. W. Norton & Co., New York.

- Docquier Frédéric, Turati Riccardo, Valette Jérôme, Vasilakis Chrysovalantis, 2019, *Birthplace Diversity and Economic Growth: Evidence from the US States in the Post-World War II Period*, "Journal of Economic Geography," Vol. 20, Issue 2: 321–354.
- Easterly William, Levine Ross, 1997, *Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions*, "Quarterly Journal of Economics," Vol. 112, Issue 4: 1203–1250.
- Esteban Joan, Ray Debraj, 1999, *Conflict and Distribution*, "Journal of Economic Theory," Vol. 87, Issue 2: 379–415.
- Esteban Joan, Ray Debraj, 2011a, *A Model of Ethnic Conflict*, "The Journal of the European Economic Association," Vol. 9, Issue 3: 496–521.
- Esteban Joan, Ray Debraj, 2011b, *Linking Conflict to Inequality and Polarization*, "American Economic Review," Vol. 101, Issue 4: 1345–1374.
- Fearon James D., 2003, *Ethnic and Cultural Diversity by Country*, "Journal of Economic Growth," Vol. 8, No. 2: 195–222.
- Florida Richard, Tingali Irene, 2004, *Europe in the Creative Age*, Carnegie Mellon Software Industry Center, Pittsburgh.
- Global Diversity Index: The Most Diverse Countries in the World*, 29th April 2019, Rickshaw Travel (<https://www.rickshawtravel.co.uk/blog/global-diversity-index-the-most-diverse-countries-in-the-world/> [13.11.2020])
- Gören Erkan, 2013, *Economic Effects of Domestic and Neighbouring Countries' Cultural Diversity*, "Oldenburg Discussion Papers in Economics," No. V-352-13, University of Oldenburg, Department of Economics, Oldenburg.
- Grafton R. Quentin, Knowles Stephen, Owen P. Dorian, 2004, *Total Factor Productivity, per Capita Income and Social Divergence*, "Economic Record," Vol. 80, Issue 250: 302–313.
- Greif Avner, 1993, *Contract Enforceability and Economic Institutions in Early Trade: The Maghribi Traders' Coalition*, "American Economic Review," Vol. 83, No. 3: 525–548.
- Grim Brian J., Finke Roger, 2007, *Religious Persecution in Cross-National Context: Clashing Civilizations or Regulated Economies?*, "American Sociological Review," Vol. 72, No. 4: 633–658.
- Hlepas Nikolaos, 2013, *Cultural Diversity and National Performance*, International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS), Athens, Greece.
- Lane Philip, Tornell Aaron, 1996, *Power, Growth, and the Voracity Effect*, "Journal of Economic Growth," Vol. 1, No. 2: 213–241.
- Lazear Edward, 1999, *Globalisation and the Market for Team-Mates*, "Economic Journal," Vol. 109, Issue 454: C15–C40.
- Levinson David, 1998, *Ethnic Groups Worldwide. A Ready Reference Handbook*, Oryx Press, Phoenix.
- Maddison Angus, 2001, *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, OECD, Paris.
- Montalvo José G., Reynal-Querol Marta, 2005a, *Ethnic Diversity and Economic Development*, "Journal of Development Economics," Vol. 76, Issue 2: 293–323.
- Montalvo José G., Reynal-Querol Marta, 2005b, *Ethnic Polarization, Potential Conflict, and Civil Wars*, "American Economic Review," Vol. 95, Issue 3: 796–816.
- Most & Least Diverse States in America*, 2020, September 9th, WalletHub, (<https://wallethub.com/edu/most-least-diverse-states-in-america/38262> [26.10.2020]).
- Nijkamp Peter, Poot Jacques, 2015, *Cultural Diversity: A Matter of Measurement*, "IZA Discussion Paper" No. 8782, The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn.

- North Douglass C., Thomas Robert P., 1973, *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Okediji Tade O., 2011, *Social Fragmentation and Economic Growth: Evidence from Developing Countries*, "Journal of Institutional Economics," Vol. 7, Issue 1: 77–104.
- Putnam Robert D., 2006, *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture*, "Scandinavian Political Studies," Vol. 30, Issue 2: 137–174.
- Reese-Cassal Kyle, 2014, *2014/2019 Esri Diversity Index. An Esri White Paper*, Esri, Redlands, California.
- Ridley Matt, 2010, *Humans: Why They Triumphed*, "The Wall Street Journal," May 22: W1.
- Schaefer Richard T., 2016, *Sociology: A Brief Introduction*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Shleifer Andrei, Vishny Robert W., 1993, *Corruption*, "Quarterly Journal of Economics," Vol. 108, No. 3: 599–617.
- Sobel Russell, Dutta Nabamita, Roy Sanjukta, 2010, *Does Cultural Diversity Increase the Rate of Entrepreneurship?*, "Review of Austrian Economics," Vol. 23, Issue 3: 269–286.
- Taylor Charles L., Hudson Michael C., 1972, *The World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Tornell Aaron, Lane Phillip R., 1999, *The Voracity Effect*, "American Economic Review," Vol. 89, Issue 1: 22–46.
- Tylor Edward B., 1958, *The Origins of Culture*, Harper & Brothers, New York, NY, (originally 1871).
- Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, Adopted by the 31st Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, Paris, 2 November 2001 (http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/5_Cultural_Diversity_EN.pdf [15.10.2020]).
- VanAlstine Jason, Cox Steven R., Roden Dianne M., 2013, *The Costs and Benefits of Diversity: Are Religious Differences Most Important?*, "Journal of Global Business Issues," Vol. 7, Issue 2: 9–20.
- VanAlstine Jason, Cox Steven R., Roden Dianne M., 2015, *Cultural Diversity in the United States and Its Impact on Human Development*, "Journal of the Indiana Academy of the Social Sciences," Vol. 18, Issue 1, Article 10: 125–143.
- Warf Barney, Vincent Peter, 2007, *Religious Diversity across the Globe: A Geographic Exploration*, "Social and Cultural Geography," Vol. 8, Issue 4: 597–613.
- Weber Max, 1905 (1930), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Allen & Unwin, London.

Abstract

The paper seeks to identify the role of cultural and social diversity in economic development. It starts by defining the terms that are critical to the analysis, including diversity, fractionalization, polarization, social diversity, cultural diversity and economic resources, as well as providing the most significant indexes thereof. The main body of the paper interprets the notions of cultural and social diversity in terms of being a valuable economic resource. Furthermore, it collects a vast body of literature to demonstrate the relationship between the cultural/social diversity and economic development with regard to adverse or

positive impact on the latter. In regard to the negative impact of diversity, the paper identifies it in the area of social communication, social capital and networks, as it effectively causes a decrease in productivity and increase in social conflict and isolation. The positive link is demonstrated with examples in the areas of innovation, creativity, usage of complementary abilities and experiences, and their role in increasing productivity. The paper refers to numerous data sources, studies and indexes illustrating how the economic systems of various countries perform in the context of the paper's subject-matter.

key words: society, culture, ethnicity, economic development, resource, fractionalization, polarization

RÓŻNORODNOŚĆ KULTUROWA I SPOŁECZNA JAKO ZASÓB EKONOMICZNY

Damian S. Pyrkosz
(Uniwersytet Rzeszowski)

Abstrakt

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie roli, jaką pełni różnorodność kulturowa i społeczna w rozwoju ekonomicznym. Na wstępie zostają zdefiniowane pojęcia kluczowe dla dalszej analizy, takie jak różnorodność, frakcjonalizacja, polaryzacja, różnorodność społeczna, różnorodność kulturowa i zasób ekonomiczny, zostają też przedstawione główne wskaźniki powyższych zjawisk. Część zasadnicza artykułu dotyczy różnorodności kulturowej i społecznej jako cennego zasobu ekonomicznego. W tym celu autor nawiązuje do bogatej literatury przedmiotu, która ukazuje zarówno pozytywny, jak i negatywny wpływ różnorodności kulturowej i społecznej na rozwój gospodarczy. Negatywny wpływ został zidentyfikowany w obszarach społecznej komunikacji, kapitału oraz sieci powiązań, ponieważ w powyższych sferach różnorodność powoduje obniżenie produktywności oraz wzrost społecznych konfliktów i izolacji. Pozytywny wpływ różnorodności na rozwój gospodarczy został potwierdzony przykładami innowacyjności, kreatywności oraz wykorzystania niekonwencjonalnych umiejętności i doświadczeń do zwiększania produktywności. Artykuł zawiera odwołania do wielu źródeł danych, przeprowadzonych badań i wskaźników, które ukazują efektywność działania systemów ekonomicznych w krajach o różnym stopniu zroźnicowania społecznego i kulturowego.

słowa kluczowe: społeczeństwo, kultura, etniczność, rozwój ekonomiczny, zasób, frakcjonalizacja, polaryzacja