

## **Different Teachers, Different Peers: The Magnitude of Student Sorting Within Schools**

Demetra Kalogrides\*  
Stanford University  
[dkalo@stanford.edu](mailto:dkalo@stanford.edu)  
(650)724-3698  
520 Galvez Mall Drive  
CERAS, Room 521  
Stanford, CA 94305

Susanna Loeb  
Stanford University  
[sloeb@stanford.edu](mailto:sloeb@stanford.edu)  
(650)736-1258  
520 Galvez Mall Drive  
CERAS, Room 524  
Stanford, CA 94305

\*Corresponding author

November 2012

## **Abstract**

Although many prior studies have examined racial and ethnic segregation between schools, few have examined the extent to which students from different backgrounds are sorted across classrooms within the same school. In this study we use administrative data from three large urban school districts to examine student sorting within schools. Our data allow us to link students to each of their teachers and to identify students' classmates. We find differences in the average achievement levels, the racial composition, and the socioeconomic composition of classrooms within schools. This sorting occurs even in self-contained elementary school classrooms and is much larger than would be expected if students were assigned to classrooms randomly. Much, but not all, of the racial and socioeconomic sorting we document is accounted for by differences in achievement, particularly at the high school level. Classrooms with the largest composition of low-achieving, minority and poor students are also more likely to have novice teachers and students with behavioral and attendance problems. The process of sorting students by their achievement level has the consequence of exposing minority and poor students to lower quality teachers and less-resourced classmates.

## **Introduction**

Large urban school districts serve increasingly diverse student bodies. Though many studies have described racial segregation between schools and the causes and consequences of such segregation, far fewer studies have examined the extent to which students are sorted across classrooms within schools by race or family income or achievement. Attendance at the same schools does not ensure that students from different backgrounds will share classrooms or have equivalent educational experiences (Meier, Stewart, & England, 1990; Mickelson, 2002; Orfield, 1975).

In this study we examine patterns of sorting across classrooms in three large urban school districts. We also investigate the extent to which patterns of within school segregation vary across grade levels. We find evidence of considerable sorting by student race and poverty status across classrooms at all grade levels, some, but not all, of which is accounted for by differences in prior achievement. We also find that students are sorted by their prior achievement across classrooms within schools, even in self-contained elementary school classrooms. Classes made up of lower achieving students tend to have more poor and minority students, more students with attendance and behavioral problems, and less experienced teachers. Given the evidence suggesting that teachers and peers can affect student outcomes (Burke & Sass, 2009; Figlio, 2007; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004), the within school sorting we document is likely to exacerbate inequalities.

### **Research on Within School Segregation**

Researchers and policy makers have long been aware of racial segregation across classrooms within schools. Some researchers have described this type of within school sorting as one of several “second generation” segregation problems that result in non-equivalent

educational experiences for minority and white students attending the same schools (Meier, et al., 1990; Mickelson, 2002; Orfield, 1975). Much of the research on within-school sorting has focused on formal tracking at the high school level. Given the relationship between prior achievement and student demographic characteristics, tracking tends to contribute to within school segregation by race and socioeconomic status (Gamoran, 1992b; Samuel R. Lucas & Berends, 2002; Mickelson, 2001; Oakes, 1985; Oakes & Guiton, 1995). Formal tracking, however, is not the only source of within-school segregation; thus, studies of tracking do not shed light on the full picture of segregation, especially because they largely have relied on examinations of track placements in a small number of high schools (Mickelson, 2001; Oakes, 1985) or in national data that include only a few sampled students per school (Gamoran, 1992b; Samuel R. Lucas & Berends, 2002).

Studying segregation within schools is complicated by extensive data requirements—including information on students' classroom assignments within schools. A few key studies have examined within school racial segregation using data from a large number of schools and students (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2002; Conger, 2005; Morgan & McPartland, 1981). Morgan and McPartland (1981) study classroom segregation using data collected in 1976 by the office of Civil Rights. Their data include information about classroom enrollments for 18 randomly sampled classrooms in each of more than 40,000 schools. This paper remains the only national study of classroom segregation to date. More recently, Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor (2002) and Conger (2005) conducted similar analyses in North Carolina and New York. The results of these three studies are similar: classroom segregation is higher in high schools and middle schools than in elementary schools; segregation among schools is larger than segregation within schools; and black students tend to be more segregated from white students than are

Hispanic students from white students. Conger (2005) also found that the segregation of immigrants within New York City schools is equal to their segregation across schools.

We build on prior research in a number of ways. First, the tracking literature focuses on within-school sorting only at the high school level. We also examine sorting at the elementary school and middle school level. Second, while a few studies in the segregation literature have compared levels of racial segregation within schools at different grade levels, they have not explored segregation by other characteristics such as poverty or test performance as we do (Clotfelter, et al., 2002; Conger, 2005; Morgan & McPartland, 1981). Third, while some studies in the tracking literature find that minority students are less likely to be enrolled in high track courses even after controlling for prior achievement levels, the segregation literature has not examined the extent to which segregation by race reflects segregation by achievement. Since we have rich longitudinal data on students with multiple years of test scores in both math and reading, we are able to provide more robust controls for prior achievement. This analysis allows us to see whether minority and poor students have more minority, poor or lower achieving classmates than their counterparts at their school who have similar levels of prior achievement.

### **Mechanisms Contributing to Within-School Sorting**

The sorting of students by prior achievement, race, or socioeconomic status to different classrooms within schools may result from a variety of formal and informal processes. The processes that contribute to sorting at the middle and high school levels, where tracking is more common, may differ in from the processes that contribute to sorting in elementary schools which generally lack differentiated curricula.

In a tracked system students are, at least in part, assigned to classrooms based on prior achievement. Prior to the 1970s, secondary students were often assigned to mutually exclusive and overarching programs such as vocational, general or academic tracks (Hallinan, 1994; Samuel R. Lucas & Berends, 2002). In more recent decades, tracking systems have become less deterministic and the same student may enroll in courses of different levels in different subjects (Samuel Roundfield Lucas, 1999). Given that tracking decisions are largely (though not entirely) related to students' prior achievement levels (Gamoran, 1992a; Oakes & Guiton, 1995), tracking systems create considerable variation in average achievement across classrooms. The bulk of the research suggests that achievement is the main factor influencing track placements, though race and socioeconomic status also play some role (Alexander & McDill, 1976; Gamoran, 1992a; Gamoran & Berends, 1987; Kilgore, 1991; Oakes & Guiton, 1995). Parent demands for courses, teacher recommendations, or peer influences on students' decisions can put pressure on schools to admit students to courses they may not normally be placed in based on the schools' formal assignment criteria (Kilgore, 1991; Oakes & Guiton, 1995; Useem, 1991).

The formal assignment of students to different courses that are vertically differentiated (i.e., via a tracking system) is only one of several processes that could induce variation across classrooms in achievement levels and demographics. When making class assignment decisions, school administrators may be influenced by pressures from parents and teachers. Such pressures could create variation across classrooms even in elementary schools where there is no formal differentiation of the curriculum.

Prior research suggests that middle and upper class parents often intervene in the class assignment to ensure that their child is taught by a teacher whom they believe to be desirable (Lareau 1987; 2000). Advantaged parents are more likely to be involved in their child's

education and spend time at their school (Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1991, 1992). They therefore are likely to have better information about teachers than parents with lower incomes or education levels. Lareau (1987) found that middle class mothers in her study of elementary school students knew the names and academic reputations of most of the teachers in the school as well as the academic ability of other students in their child's class. In contrast, working class parents have limited information about most aspects of their child's experience at school (Lareau, 1987, 2000, 2002). Middle class parents may be able to use this information to request the most desirable classes for their children. School administrators may feel pressure to meet the demands of the parents of higher achieving or middle class students for fear of losing these students to other schools or districts (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2005). Such a pattern may result in the concentration of higher achieving and higher-income students in classrooms with higher quality teachers.

Teacher preferences for certain classrooms may further influence school administrators' decisions about course assignments. This influence is especially relevant when teachers have alternative employment options in other schools, which may be the case for particularly effective or experienced teachers. In most cases, organizations prefer to retain their most effective employees and will often offer benefits in an effort to do so (Abelson & Baysinger, 1984). Rewarding effective employees may be challenging in schools, given rigidities of salary schedules and limited vertical differentiation of jobs. In lieu of salary increases or promotions, principals may give their best teachers the most desirable class assignments as a retention strategy. Principals may also feel pressure from senior teachers to assign them the students and courses they desire (Carey & Farris, 1994; Finley, 1984). These types of class assignment

processes could contribute to differential assignment of lower achieving students to lower quality teachers and peers even in elementary schools.

### **Data**

To examine student sorting we use data from administrative files on all students in three large urban school districts, whose identities we will leave anonymous: one from the Southeast (District 1), one from the Midwest (District 2) and one from the West (District 3). Data from District 1 and District 2 are available from the 2003-04 to 2009-10 school years, while data from District 3 are available from 2001-02 to 2009-10. District 1 enrolls about 350,000 students in 550 schools; District 2 enrolls about 82,000 students in 214 schools; and District 3 enrolls about 55,000 students in 117 schools. All three districts are predominately minority, enrolling large concentrations of students from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds.

The data include test score and basic demographic information for all students, course-level data that links students to each of their teachers and classmates in each year, and a staff-level file with information on all district employees. The student data include race, gender, subsidized lunch eligibility, number of times absent that year, and whether the student was suspended in each year (not available for District 3). Each district provided us with reading and math achievement test scores for all tested students. In each district, we standardize students' test scores to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one within each grade and school-year.

In addition to having student-level data, we also have demographic information on all staff in each district which we link to the student records via course-level identifiers. We combine this information to construct a dataset for each district with one observation for each student in each year with student characteristics and test scores, characteristics of students' teachers, and characteristics of students' classmates. For middle and high school students (who are enrolled in multiple courses), we use the teacher and classmate characteristics for their math

course. If they are enrolled in multiple math courses in a given year, we randomly select one of their courses. The characteristics of students' classmates (e.g., percent minority, average prior test scores) are computed by excluding the focal student from the class averages.

The districts that we examine are large and diverse. Between 9 and 14 percent of students are white in each district; the majority of students in District 1 are Hispanic (61 percent); the majority of students in District 2 are black (57 percent); and the majority of students in District 3 are Asian or other race/ethnicities (56 percent). The three districts also have high concentrations of poor students with 53, 64, and 39 percent of students, respectively, eligible for free lunch. Eight percent of students in District 1 were chronically absent during our sample period, compared to 23 percent in District 2 and 18 percent in District 3. Nineteen percent of students in District 1 had a novice teacher (first or second year), compared to 12 percent in the second district and four percent in the third.

### **Methods**

We first examine the extent to which students from different backgrounds are assigned to classrooms with different types of teachers and peers. We start descriptively using the dissimilarity index to compute segregation between schools and between classrooms. The black-white dissimilarity index measures departures from evenness by taking the average absolute difference of each school's black population from the district's black population, weighted by the enrollment of each school. The dissimilarity index may range from 0 to 1 and can be interpreted as the proportion of black students that would have to change schools to be evenly distributed across the district (James & Taeuber, 1985). We compare segregation that occurs between schools to that which occurs between classrooms.

The dissimilarity index measures the extent of sorting but does not provide direct measures of the attributes of students' teachers and peers. For this description we model classroom characteristics as a function of student characteristics including race/ethnicity, poverty, and whether a student was in the top or bottom quartile of the achievement distribution in the prior year. All models also include a school by grade by year fixed effect which allows us to compare differences in teacher or class characteristics among students attending the same school and grade in a given year. For example, in a model where the outcome is whether or not the class is taught by a novice teacher, the coefficient on free lunch eligibility would show the difference in the probability of having a novice teacher among free lunch and non-free lunch eligible students attending the same school and grade in a given year.

The extent of student sorting is likely to vary across grade levels; therefore, we estimate models separately for elementary school (grades K-5) and middle and high school (grades 6-12). For comparison purposes, we also estimate the models without the school-by-grade fixed effect. Models that exclude the fixed effect show, for example, the overall difference between all black and white students in the district in the percentage of students' classmates who are black. Much of this overall difference, however, is due to sorting between schools. By adding the school by grade by year fixed effect we isolate the difference between black and white students who attend the same grade and the same school and compare the magnitude of that difference to the magnitude of the overall difference.

Our next set of analyses asks whether prior achievement differences across students explain differences in teacher and peer characteristics within grades and schools. Poor students as well as black and Hispanic students might be concentrated in classrooms with other poor or similar-race or similar-ethnicity students or with low achieving students because they themselves

have lower achievement. We take a variety of approaches to evaluating the role of achievement differences in contributing to within school sorting by student race and free lunch eligibility. First, building on the regression models above we control for students' prior year test scores in both math and reading. Models with controls for prior achievement show whether students of different race and poverty status but with the same prior achievement are assigned different types of classrooms.

Schools have more information about students' ability levels than a single test score (i.e., multiple years of test scores, course grades, teacher evaluations, etc.), and are likely to use this information when making assignment decisions. Measurement error in a single year's test score makes them imperfect measures of student ability. We therefore adjust for measurement error in prior test scores by instrumenting for the prior year's score using the twice lagged score, thus using only variation in test scores that is persistent across the two tests. This helps adjust for mean reversion which may otherwise bias our estimates. As a final way of controlling for achievement differences, we control for (high school) students' cumulative grade point average. Our full model examines whether students who attend the same school and have the same grades and prior test scores are assigned to different types of teachers and classmates.

## **Results**

Table 1 describes sorting between schools and classrooms using the dissimilarity index. The table shows the total segregation between classrooms—this is equal to the across and within school segregation combined. Using black-non black segregation as an example, the dissimilarity index is interpreted as the proportion of black students that would have to change schools or classrooms to make blacks and non-blacks evenly distributed across all schools or classrooms. Table 1 reveals a few key findings. First, consistent with prior research, overall racial/ethnic

segregation is relatively high in all three districts, ranging from around .50 to .70 depending on the grade-level (Clotfelter, et al., 2002; Conger, 2005). Students are less segregated by poverty status with levels of segregation ranging from .30 to .50. Segregation by achievement is quite high in all three districts, particularly in high schools where it ranges from .70 to .90. For example, in District 3 87 percent of low achieving high school students would have to change classrooms to make low achieving and high achieving students evenly distributed across all classrooms. Levels of achievement segregation are lower in elementary schools than in high schools but still at .60 or higher in all three districts. Second, segregation varies across grades. In particular, overall segregation levels tend to decline across grades, driven by lower between school segregation at the middle and high school grades relative to the elementary grades. Segregation across schools is higher at the elementary school level because there are a greater number of elementary schools and thus more opportunity for sorting. While overall segregation is smaller in middle and high school than in elementary school, the proportion of segregation that occurs within schools increases across grades. In all grades, the majority of segregation comes from sorting across schools; however, the proportion of sorting that occurs within schools is largest in high schools. Segregation by achievement increases across grades, as between school segregation stays about the same and within school segregation across classrooms increases.

Another way of describing student sorting is to compare the average characteristics of students' classmates. In Table 2a (elementary school students) and Table 2b (middle and high school students) we predict attributes of students' classmates as a function of students' own characteristics. Model 1 examines the black-white, Hispanic-white, poor-non-poor, and high-low prior-achievement gaps in the proportion of black, Hispanic and poor classmates in addition to the average prior year achievement of students' classmates. Model 2 is similar but adds a school-

by-grade-by-year fixed effect so that comparisons are made among students with different characteristics who attend the same grade in the same school. Student race/ethnicity, free-lunch status, and prior year achievement quartile variables are each entered in a separate model so that the differences do not control for other characteristics. The within school model (model 2) is of primary interest and model 1 is shown for comparison.

Students clearly have different classmates. Black and Hispanic students have more same race peers in the district overall and at their school. Black elementary school students have between three and six percent more black classmates and black middle and high school students have six to 10 percent more black classmates than do white students in their grade at their school in a given year. Similarly, poor students have between two and seven percent more poor classmates than non-poor students do in their grade at their school in a given year.

The most striking difference in peer characteristics among different groups of students is differences in peer achievement. Black elementary school students in District 1 have classmates whose average prior achievement is nearly one-fifth of a standard deviation lower than the average achievement of whites' classmates at their school in their grade in that year. In District 3 the difference in average classmate achievement for blacks and whites is about one-tenth of a standard deviation. The differences are even larger in middle and high schools (0.2-0.4 standard deviations), likely due to greater tracking and ability grouping at these grades. We observe similar patterns for Hispanics compared to whites and for poor students compared to non-poor students. Students' prior achievement is also strongly related to their classmates' prior achievement, even in elementary schools. For example, in District 1 the average difference in classmates' prior math achievement is nearly a standard deviation for high versus low scoring students ( $-.424 + .407 = -.831$ ). The difference is between 0.2 or 0.3 standard deviation in District 2

and District 3. The differences are even larger among middle and high school students at between 0.4 and 1.3 standard deviations.

Within school sorting may create inequities in access to the high quality teachers as well as to high-performing peers. We examine the relationship between student characteristics and the probability of having a novice teacher in Table 3, which has a similar structure to Table 2. The results are quite consistent: black and Hispanic students are more likely than white students to have novice teachers both overall and within schools. The differences are larger in the middle and high school grades than in the elementary grades but significant differences are evident across grade levels. In District 1 the probability of having a novice teacher is approximately 10 percent higher for black students than for white students (Model 1). The difference is approximately two percent, a fifth as large, when we include the school-by-grade-by-year fixed effect in Model 2. Similarly, poor students are more likely to have novice teachers, though this relationship is not as consistent within elementary schools; the magnitude is small in all three districts and the point estimates are strongly significant only in the third district.

Low achieving students are more likely to be assigned novice teachers than students in the middle 50 percent of the prior year's achievement distribution, while high achieving students are the least likely. For example, in District 1 the probability of having a novice teacher is about two percent higher for low achieving students and four percent lower for high achieving students within elementary schools. At the middle and high school level, the probability of having a novice teacher is about two percent higher for low achieving students and two to seven percent lower for high achieving students within schools across the three districts.

Though there are many statistically significant differences in the characteristics of the teachers and peers to which minority, poor, and low achieving students are exposed, some

differences could occur even if students were assigned to classrooms randomly. Only a deliberate effort to achieve perfect racial or socioeconomic integration within schools would result in evenly distributed classrooms. A random allocation process is likely to deviate somewhat from a perfectly even distribution (Carrington & Troske, 1997; Conger, 2005) and it is not clear whether the differences shown in Table 2 are larger than what we would expect to find if assignments were random. To investigate this further, we examine how students are distributed across classrooms after randomly assigning them to classrooms via a simulation.

The simulation works as follows: First, we count the number of classrooms that enroll students in a given grade at a school each year. Then we randomly assign students to classes within schools-grades-years. We assign students to the same number of classrooms that are observed and make the classes each have equal size. We repeat the simulation 100 times. After randomly assigning students to classes within school-grade-year groups, we compute characteristics of students' randomly assigned classrooms and then compare the distribution of student characteristics that results from random assignment to the distribution observed in the data. Table 4 shows the results, plotting the 95% confidence interval of the observed estimates, which are obtained by regressing a class characteristic on student characteristics (i.e., race, free lunch eligibility, and quartile of prior year math achievement) and a school-by-year-by-grade fixed effect. We compare these estimates to the estimates derived from the random class assignments, again regressing a class characteristic (from random assignment) on student characteristics and a school-by-year-by-grade fixed effect. We repeat this process for each simulation (100 times) and then average the estimates. The first column shows the 95 percent confidence interval of the observed estimates. For example, in District 1 black students have between 3.5 and 3.7 percent more black classmates than white students at their school. The

second column shows the mean of the simulated estimates and the third column shows the standard deviation of the mean of the simulated estimates.

The results consistently show few differences in classmate characteristics between white and black, white and Hispanic, free lunch and not free lunch and low achieving versus higher achieving students within schools when students are assigned to classes randomly. For example, the observed data show that black elementary school students have about 4 percent more black classmates than white students in their grade and at their school. The mean of the simulated estimates, by contrast, is essentially 0. Similarly, black elementary school students have classmates whose prior year math achievement is about .12 standard deviations lower than the classmates of white students at their school whereas the simulated estimates show no difference. Thus, the differences we see in the districts are unlikely to be due to random sorting.

The next stage of our analysis adds controls for prior achievement to the models shown in Tables 2 and 3. The goal of this analysis is to understand the extent to which racial/ethnic and socioeconomic differences in prior achievement contribute to the differences in teacher and classmate characteristics observed for poor, minority and low-achieving students. In Table 5, Model 1 we include controls for students' prior year reading and math test scores, in Model 2 we instrument for prior math test scores using the twice lagged math score, and in Model 3 we control for middle and high school students' cumulative grade point averages.

Including controls for prior achievement explains much of the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic differences in the probability of having a novice teacher, especially among elementary school students. The probability of having a novice teacher is higher for black and Hispanic middle and high school students relative to white students after controlling for prior

achievement but the differences in the probability are less than one percent. The same is true for the difference between poor and non-poor students.

Controlling for prior achievement, however, does little to change the relationship between student race and the proportion of black classmates. Even after controlling for prior achievement and grade point average, black middle and high school students still have one to five percent more black classmates than similar scoring white students in their grade. The differences are smaller in elementary school than in middle/high school, but they are statistically significant in all grades. The bottom panel of Table 5 shows the relationship between student race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status and average classmate achievement. Often, minority and poor students are in classrooms with lower achieving peers even after controlling for their own prior achievement. The differences are larger in grades six through 12 than in elementary school.

### **Discussion**

In this paper we studied the pattern of school sorting within schools in three large urban districts. We examined the relationship between student characteristics and the characteristics of teachers and classmates. Descriptively, we found that segregation among schools is larger than segregation within schools but some level of sorting across classrooms within schools occurs at all grade levels, particularly in high school. These findings support similar analyses conducted in other large urban school districts (Clotfelter, et al., 2002; Conger, 2005). Minority, poor and low achieving students are more likely to be in classes taught by novice teachers and to have lower achieving and less advantaged classmates compared to white and non-poor students in their grade at their school. These patterns are found both at the elementary school level and at the middle/high school level. Racial/ethnic and socioeconomic differences in prior achievement do not entirely explain the inequality in teacher and peer characteristics we document.

Our data do not allow us to investigate all of the possible mechanisms that may generate differences in student characteristics across classrooms within schools. Prior achievement does explain some of the difference in teacher experience and classmate characteristics for minority and poor students relative to white and non-poor students. Interestingly, this is true both at the elementary and at the middle/high school levels. The elementary school classrooms included in our data are self-contained with one teacher--- these are the types of contexts where we would not necessarily expect prior achievement differences across classrooms. However, low achieving students in elementary schools are more likely to have novice teachers and to have low achieving, poor and minority classmates. In analysis not presented here we also find that low achieving students also have more classmates with attendance and disciplinary problems. We are not certain as to why this is the case. Prior research suggests that principals may feel pressure from parents and teachers when making class assignments. In particular, the preferences of middle class parents to have their children in classes with more experienced or effective teachers and better students and the preferences of senior teachers to teach high achieving students could contribute to the patterns we document at the elementary school level. The same processes may also be at work at the middle/high school levels, though class assignments in the higher grades are more complex given the differentiation of the curriculum.

Though we cannot be certain of the causes of the sorting we document, some of the patterns we document could have implications for inequality, though the evidence on this is not entirely clear. Grouping students in classrooms by ability (or by race and socioeconomic status) might have significant impacts on student achievement but this depends on the magnitude of peer influences (Burke & Sass, 2009; Epple, Newlon, & Romano, 2002). Rigorous studies on the effects of tracking on student achievement find no evidence that tracking hurts lower ability

students (Duflo, Dupas, & Kremer, 2011; Figlio & Page, 2002). This lack of an effect could be because peer effects are actually smaller than often assumed (Burke & Sass, 2009) or because teachers are better able to tailor the curriculum to students' ability levels in tracked classrooms. At the same time, however, there is fairly clear evidence that having more delinquent peers (which may be correlated with peer achievement levels as well) has negative effects on achievement (Figlio, 2007) and our results (not shown) show that low-achieving, poor and minority students are in classrooms with more peers who were suspended in the prior year.

While it is unclear whether sorting to different peers influences within school achievement gaps, we think that there is clear evidence from prior studies that the assignment of novice teachers to disadvantaged and low-achieving students is not an ideal practice and likely has negative consequences for equity. Although student learning gains do not necessarily increase linearly with teacher experience, novice teachers are, on average, less effective at raising student achievement compared to their more experienced peers (Rockoff, 2004). Consequently, given their higher likelihood of receiving an inexperienced teacher, the achievement of black, Hispanic, low-income and initially low-achieving students is likely to suffer as a result of the patterns of assignment we document.

## References

- Abelson, M. A., & Baysinger, B. D. (1984). Optimal and Dysfunctional Turnover: Toward an Organizational Level Model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 331-341.
- Alexander, K. L., & McDill, E. L. (1976). Selection and Allocation within Schools: Some Causes and Consequences of Curriculum Placement. *American Sociological Review*, 41(6), 963-980.
- Burke, M. A., & Sass, T. R. (2009). Classroom Peer Effects and Student Achievement. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Carey, N., & Farris, E. (1994). *Curricular Differentiation in Public High Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics: 95-360.
- Carrington, W. J., & Troske, K. R. (1997). On Measuring Segregation in Samples with Small Units. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 15(4), 1997.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. (2005). Who Teaches Whom? Race and the Distribution of Novice Teachers. *Economics of Education Review*, 24, 377-392.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2002). Segregation and Resegregation in North Carolina's Public School Classrooms. *North Carolina Law Review*, 81, 1463-1512.
- Conger, D. (2005). Within-School Segregation in an Urban School District. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 27(3), 225-244.
- Duflo, E., Dupas, P., & Kremer, M. (2011). Peer Effects, Teacher Incentives, and the Impact of Tracking: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Kenya. *American Economic Review, American Economic Association*, 101(5), 1739-1774.
- Epple, D., Newlon, E., & Romano, R. (2002). Ability Tracking, School Competition and the Distribution of Educational Benefits. *Journal of Public Economics*, 83, 1-48.
- Figlio, D. N. (2007). Boys Named Sue: Disruptive Children and Their Peers. *Education Finance and Policy*, 2, 376-394.
- Figlio, D. N., & Page, M. E. (2002). School Choice and the Distributional Effects of Ability Tracking: Does Separation Increase Inequality? *Journal of Urban Economics*, 51(3), 497-514.
- Finley, M. K. (1984). Teachers and Tracking in a Comprehensive High School. *Sociology of Education*, 57(4), 233-243.
- Gamoran, A. (1992a). Access to Excellence: Assignment to Honors English Classes in the Transition from Middle to High School. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(3), 185-204.
- Gamoran, A. (1992b). The Variable Effects of High School Tracking. *American Sociological Review*, 57(6), 812-828.
- Gamoran, A., & Berends, M. (1987). The Effects of Stratification in Secondary Schools: Synthesis of Survey and Ethnographic Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 57(4), 415-435.
- Hallinan, M. T. (1994). Tracking: From Theory to Practice. Exchange. *Sociology of Education*, 67(2), 79-84.
- James, D. R., & Taeuber, K. E. (1985). Measures of Segregation. *Sociological Methodology*, 14, 1-32.
- Kilgore, S. B. (1991). The Organizational Context of Tracking in Schools. *American Sociological Review*, 56(2), 189-203.
- Lareau, A. (1987). Social Class Differences in Family-School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital. *Sociology of Education*, 60(2), 73-85.

- Lareau, A. (2000). *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lareau, A. (2002). Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families. *American Sociological Review*, 67(5), 747-776.
- Lucas, S. R. (1999). *Tracking Inequality: Stratification and Mobility in American High Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lucas, S. R., & Berends, M. (2002). Sociodemographic Diversity, Correlated Achievement, and De Facto Tracking. *Sociology of Education*, 75(4), 328-348.
- Meier, K. J., Stewart, J., & England, R. E. (1990). *Race, Class, and Education: The Politics of Second-Generation Discrimination*: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mickelson, R. A. (2001). Subverting Swann: First- and Second-Generation Segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 215-252.
- Mickelson, R. A. (2002). The Academic Consequences of Desegregation and Segregation: Evidence from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. Civil Rights Project, Available from <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/the-academic-consequences-of-desegregation-and-segregation-evidence-from-the-charlotte-mecklenburg-schools>.
- Morgan, P. R., & McPartland, J. M. (1981). *The Extent of Classroom Segregation within Desegregated Schools*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University: Center for the Social Organization of Schools
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. V. (2004). How Large Are Teacher Effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(3), 237-257.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., & Guiton, G. (1995). Matchmaking: The Dynamics of High School Tracking Decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 3-33.
- Orfield, G. (1975). How to Make Desegregation Work: The Adaptation of Schools to their Newly-Integrated Student Bodies. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 39(2), 314-340.
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417-458.
- Rockoff, J. (2004). The Impact of Individual Teachers on Student Achievement: Evidence from Panel Data. *American Economic Review*, 94, 247-252.
- Useem, E. (1991). Student Selection into Course Sequences in Mathematics: The Impact of Parental Involvement and School Policies. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 1(3), 231-250.
- Useem, E. (1992). Middle Schools and Math Groups: Parents' Involvement in Children's Placement. *Sociology of Education*, 65(4), 263-279.

**Table 1. Dissimilarity Indices for Segregation Across Schools and Classrooms**

	<b>District 1</b>			<b>District 2</b>			<b>District 3</b>		
	Grades K to 5	Grades 6 to 8	Grades 9 to 12	Grades K to 5	Grades 6 to 8	Grades 9 to 12	Grades K to 5	Grades 6 to 8	Grades 9 to 12
<b><i>Black-Non Black</i></b>									
Total	0.70	0.76	0.60	0.68	0.68	0.52	0.52	0.65	0.59
School	0.69	0.72	0.52	0.65	0.64	0.32	0.46	0.60	0.38
Class	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.04	0.20	0.06	0.06	0.22
Percent Between	98%	94%	86%	97%	94%	61%	88%	91%	64%
Percent Within	2%	6%	14%	3%	6%	39%	12%	9%	36%
<b><i>Hispanic-Non Hispanic</i></b>									
Total	0.74	0.63	0.59	0.71	0.56	0.51	0.54	0.55	0.53
School	0.72	0.58	0.50	0.67	0.53	0.42	0.50	0.51	0.40
Class	0.02	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.13
Percent Between	98%	91%	84%	95%	94%	82%	93%	93%	76%
Percent Within	2%	9%	16%	5%	6%	18%	7%	7%	24%
<b><i>White- Non White</i></b>									
Total	0.64	0.62	0.54	0.63	0.54	0.47	0.52	0.53	0.47
School	0.61	0.52	0.48	0.60	0.45	0.35	0.45	0.43	0.33
Class	0.03	0.10	0.06	0.03	0.10	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.14
Percent Between	95%	83%	89%	96%	82%	75%	86%	80%	71%
Percent Within	5%	17%	11%	4%	18%	25%	14%	20%	29%
<b><i>Free Lunch-Not Free Lunch</i></b>									
Total	0.44	0.49	0.40	0.39	0.43	0.34	0.30	0.35	0.32
School	0.40	0.43	0.36	0.35	0.37	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.22
Class	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.10
Percent Between	92%	87%	88%	92%	86%	78%	87%	76%	68%
Percent Within	8%	13%	12%	8%	14%	22%	13%	24%	32%
<b><i>Low Achieving-High Achieving</i></b>									
Total	0.60	0.77	0.68	0.63	0.89	0.84	0.68	0.86	0.87
School	0.52	0.45	0.56	0.55	0.49	0.55	0.57	0.46	0.61
Class	0.08	0.32	0.12	0.08	0.41	0.29	0.11	0.40	0.27
Percent Between	86%	58%	82%	88%	55%	66%	84%	53%	70%
Percent Within	14%	42%	18%	12%	45%	34%	16%	47%	30%

*Notes:* The dissimilarity indices are computed separately for each grade and each year and the averaged estimates are presented here. The numbers in the tables are interpreted as, for example: 60 percent of low achieving elementary school students in District 1 would have to change classrooms to make low and high achieving students evenly distributed across all classrooms. Eighty-six percent of this segregation comes from sorting among schools, while 14 percent comes from sorting among classrooms within schools.

**Table 2a. Classmate Characteristics by Student Characteristics {Grades K-5}**

	<u>District 1</u>		<u>District 2</u>		<u>District 3</u>	
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>Proportion of Black Classmates</b>						
Black	0.558 *** (0.001)	0.036 *** (0.000)	0.523 *** (0.001)	0.006 *** (0.001)	0.267 *** (0.001)	0.035 *** (0.001)
Hispanic	-0.012 *** (0.001)	-0.006 *** (0.000)	-0.125 *** (0.001)	-0.037 *** (0.001)	-0.003 * (0.001)	-0.036 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.184 *** (0.001)	0.003 *** (0.000)	0.147 *** (0.001)	0.002 *** (0.000)	0.046 *** (0.001)	0.002 *** (0.000)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.106 *** (0.002)	0.006 *** (0.000)	0.132 *** (0.004)	0.004 *** (0.001)	0.086 *** (0.001)	0.016 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.103 *** (0.002)	-0.011 *** (0.000)	-0.092 *** (0.004)	-0.004 *** (0.001)	-0.044 *** (0.002)	-0.005 *** (0.001)
<b>Proportion of Hispanic Classmates</b>						
Black	-0.322 *** (0.001)	-0.019 *** (0.001)	-0.141 *** (0.001)	-0.014 *** (0.001)	0.022 *** (0.002)	-0.028 *** (0.002)
Hispanic	0.200 *** (0.001)	0.025 *** (0.000)	0.456 *** (0.001)	0.055 *** (0.001)	0.387 *** (0.002)	0.159 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.078 *** (0.001)	0.008 *** (0.000)	0.040 *** (0.001)	0.001 ** (0.000)	0.091 *** (0.001)	0.019 *** (0.001)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.062 *** (0.002)	0.002 *** (0.001)	-0.065 *** (0.003)	-0.009 *** (0.001)	0.115 *** (0.002)	0.033 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.031 *** (0.002)	-0.012 *** (0.001)	-0.009 ** (0.003)	0.004 *** (0.001)	-0.092 *** (0.002)	-0.021 *** (0.001)
<b>Proportion of F/R Lunch Classmates</b>						
Black	0.404 *** (0.001)	0.027 *** (0.001)	0.281 *** (0.001)	0.008 *** (0.001)	0.234 *** (0.002)	0.017 *** (0.001)
Hispanic	0.204 *** (0.001)	0.024 *** (0.000)	0.263 *** (0.001)	0.007 *** (0.001)	0.245 *** (0.002)	0.034 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.265 *** (0.001)	0.018 *** (0.000)	0.203 *** (0.001)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	0.196 *** (0.001)	0.001 * (0.001)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.123 *** (0.001)	0.028 *** (0.001)	0.069 *** (0.002)	0.003 *** (0.001)	0.098 *** (0.002)	0.019 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.148 *** (0.001)	-0.046 *** (0.001)	-0.096 *** (0.002)	-0.003 *** (0.001)	-0.067 *** (0.002)	-0.009 *** (0.001)
<b>Average Prior (Standardized) Math Score of Classmates</b>						
Black	-0.612 *** (0.005)	-0.126 *** (0.005)	-0.483 *** (0.006)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.520 *** (0.007)	-0.073 *** (0.005)
Hispanic	-0.295 *** (0.005)	-0.090 *** (0.004)	-0.248 *** (0.006)	0.041 *** (0.004)	-0.463 *** (0.007)	-0.093 *** (0.005)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.387 *** (0.003)	-0.111 *** (0.002)	-0.271 *** (0.004)	-0.007 ** (0.003)	-0.241 *** (0.004)	-0.040 *** (0.003)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.531 *** (0.003)	-0.240 *** (0.003)	-0.260 *** (0.005)	-0.038 *** (0.003)	-0.458 *** (0.004)	-0.156 *** (0.003)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.505 *** (0.003)	0.319 *** (0.003)	0.291 *** (0.005)	0.013 *** (0.003)	0.339 *** (0.004)	0.089 *** (0.003)
School-Year-Grade FE	---	X	---	X	---	X

Notes: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001 The outcomes are noted by the text within the gray headings. Student race/ethnicity, free lunch status, and prior achievement are entered in separate models. White is the omitted racial/ethnic group. A variable for other race students is also included in the model but excluded from the table. Students who scored in the middle 50 percent of the achievement distribution in the prior year are the omitted group for the prior achievement measure. Classroom averages are computed by excluding student *i* from the mean.

**Table 2b. Classmate Characteristics by Student Characteristics (Grades 6-12)**

	<b>District 1</b>		<b>District 2</b>		<b>District 3</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Proportion of Black Classmates</b>						
Black	0.438 *** (0.001)	0.049 *** (0.000)	0.362 *** (0.002)	0.064 *** (0.001)	0.192 *** (0.001)	0.093 *** (0.001)
Hispanic	-0.022 *** (0.001)	0.012 *** (0.000)	-0.101 *** (0.003)	-0.010 *** (0.002)	0.049 *** (0.001)	0.006 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.106 *** (0.001)	0.011 *** (0.000)	0.083 *** (0.002)	0.013 *** (0.001)	0.030 *** (0.001)	0.006 *** (0.001)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.118 *** (0.001)	0.027 *** (0.000)	0.110 *** (0.003)	0.008 *** (0.001)	0.105 *** (0.001)	0.064 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.106 *** (0.001)	-0.040 *** (0.000)	-0.149 *** (0.003)	-0.048 *** (0.001)	-0.066 *** (0.001)	-0.040 *** (0.001)
<b>Proportion of Hispanic Classmates</b>						
Black	-0.250 *** (0.001)	-0.007 *** (0.000)	-0.100 *** (0.002)	-0.013 *** (0.001)	0.090 *** (0.002)	0.020 *** (0.001)
Hispanic	0.176 *** (0.001)	0.017 *** (0.000)	0.292 *** (0.002)	0.061 *** (0.001)	0.256 *** (0.002)	0.090 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.029 *** (0.001)	0.005 *** (0.000)	0.019 *** (0.001)	0.002 * (0.001)	0.057 *** (0.001)	0.014 *** (0.001)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.072 *** (0.001)	-0.006 *** (0.000)	-0.043 *** (0.003)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.123 *** (0.001)	0.056 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.005 *** (0.001)	-0.013 *** (0.000)	0.005 + (0.002)	-0.002 + (0.001)	-0.115 *** (0.001)	-0.057 *** (0.001)
<b>Proportion of F/R Lunch Classmates</b>						
Black	0.264 *** (0.001)	0.046 *** (0.001)	0.185 *** (0.002)	0.030 *** (0.001)	0.150 *** (0.002)	0.035 *** (0.001)
Hispanic	0.150 *** (0.001)	0.031 *** (0.000)	0.181 *** (0.002)	0.022 *** (0.001)	0.162 *** (0.002)	0.040 *** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.191 *** (0.000)	0.028 *** (0.000)	0.139 *** (0.001)	0.003 *** (0.001)	0.122 *** (0.001)	0.028 *** (0.001)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.130 *** (0.001)	0.050 *** (0.000)	0.085 *** (0.002)	0.012 *** (0.001)	0.102 *** (0.001)	0.052 *** (0.001)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.159 *** (0.001)	-0.080 *** (0.000)	-0.143 *** (0.002)	-0.030 *** (0.001)	-0.109 *** (0.001)	-0.050 *** (0.001)
<b>Average Prior (Standardized) Math Score of Classmates</b>						
Black	-0.662 *** (0.003)	-0.291 *** (0.003)	-0.527 *** (0.006)	-0.162 *** (0.005)	-0.836 *** (0.008)	-0.400 *** (0.006)
Hispanic	-0.328 *** (0.003)	-0.162 *** (0.002)	-0.303 *** (0.007)	-0.093 *** (0.006)	-0.776 *** (0.007)	-0.341 *** (0.006)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.378 *** (0.002)	-0.174 *** (0.002)	-0.321 *** (0.004)	-0.060 *** (0.003)	-0.331 *** (0.004)	-0.130 *** (0.003)
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-0.810 *** (0.002)	-0.677 *** (0.002)	-0.338 *** (0.006)	-0.114 *** (0.004)	-0.637 *** (0.004)	-0.431 *** (0.004)
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score	0.755 *** (0.002)	0.628 *** (0.001)	0.492 *** (0.005)	0.192 *** (0.004)	0.925 *** (0.004)	0.646 *** (0.003)
School by Grade by Year Fixed Effect	---	X	---	X	---	X

Notes: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001 The outcomes are noted by the text within the gray headings. Student race/ethnicity, free lunch status, and prior achievement are entered in separate models. White is the omitted racial/ethnic group. A variable for other race students is also included in the model but excluded from the table. Students who scored in the middle 50 percent of the achievement distribution in the prior year are the omitted group for the prior achievement measure. Classmate characteristics for middle/high school students refers to the attributes of students' peers in their math classes. Classroom averages are computed by excluding student *i* from the mean.

**Table 3. Probability of Having a Novice Teacher by Student Characteristics {Linear Probability}**

	<u>District 1</u>		<u>District 2</u>		<u>District 3</u>							
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>						
<b><i>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (K-5)</i></b>												
Black	0.108 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.023 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.029 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.006 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	0.019 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.003 (0.001)	*
Hispanic	0.028 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.009 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.047 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.008 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	0.009 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.047 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.014 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)		0.004 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	**
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score in Prior Year	0.038 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	0.020 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.008 (0.003)	* (0.003)	0.007 (0.002)	** (0.002)	0.016 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.006 (0.001)	***
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score in Prior Year	-0.066 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.047 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.004 (0.003)		-0.006 (0.002)	* (0.002)	-0.005 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	
<b><i>MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS (6-10)</i></b>												
Black	0.088 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.026 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.004 (0.004)		0.015 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	0.050 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.018 (0.002)	***
Hispanic	0.020 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.016 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.001 (0.004)		0.004 (0.003)		0.041 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.012 (0.002)	***
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.035 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.011 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.008 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.005 (0.002)	* (0.002)	0.013 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score in Prior Year	0.045 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.027 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.014 (0.004)	** (0.004)	0.012 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	0.033 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.016 (0.001)	***
Top Quartile of Prior Math Score in Prior Year	-0.075 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.062 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.012 (0.004)	** (0.004)	-0.022 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.026 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.011 (0.001)	***
School by Grade by Year Fixed Effect	---		X		---		X		---		X	

Notes: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001 Student race/ethnicity, free lunch status, and prior achievement are entered in separate models. Teacher experience refers to the classroom teacher for elementary school students and to students' math teachers for high school students. White is the omitted racial/ethnic group. A variable for other race students is also included in the model but excluded from the table. Students who scored in the middle 50 percent of the achievement distribution in the prior year are the omitted group for the prior achievement measure.

**Table 4. Comparing Differences in Classmate Characteristics in Students' Observed and Randomly Assigned (Simulated) Classrooms**

	Elementary School Grades			Middle and High School Grades		
	95% CI of Observed Estimate	Mean of Simulated Estimates	SD of Simulated Estimates	95% CI of Observed Estimate	Mean of Simulated Estimates	SD of Simulated Estimates
<b>District 1</b>						
<i>Proportion of Black Classmates</i>						
Black	.035,.037	-0.009	0.001	.048,.05	-0.004	0.001
Hispanic	-.007,-.005	0.000	0.000	.012,.013	0.000	0.000
Eligible for Free Lunch	.003,.004	0.000	0.000	.01,.011	0.000	0.000
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.005,.007	0.000	0.001	.025,.026	0.000	0.000
<i>Proportion of F/R Lunch Classmates</i>						
Black	.026,.028	-0.002	0.001	.044,.046	-0.001	0.001
Hispanic	.023,.025	-0.001	0.000	.03,.032	-0.001	0.000
Eligible for Free Lunch	.018,.019	-0.008	0.000	.027,.028	-0.003	0.000
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.027,.029	-0.001	0.001	.045,.046	0.000	0.000
<i>Average Prior (Standardized) Math Score of Classmates</i>						
Black	-.135,-.117	0.005	0.002	-.301,-.289	0.002	0.001
Hispanic	-.098,-.083	0.002	0.002	-.172,-.163	0.001	0.001
Eligible for Free Lunch	-.115,-.106	0.003	0.001	-.172,-.167	0.001	0.001
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-.245,-.235	0.019	0.002	-.661,-.656	0.006	0.001
<b>District 2</b>						
<i>Proportion of Black Classmates</i>						
Black	.004,.007	-0.013	0.001	.064,.069	-0.009	0.002
Hispanic	-.039,-.036	-0.001	0.001	-.012,-.006	0.000	0.002
Eligible for Free Lunch	.002,.003	-0.001	0.000	.011,.014	-0.001	0.001
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.003,.006	-0.001	0.001	.006,.01	-0.001	0.001
<i>Proportion of F/R Lunch Classmates</i>						
Black	.006,.009	-0.003	0.001	.029,.032	-0.003	0.001
Hispanic	.005,.008	-0.003	0.001	.02,.024	-0.002	0.001
Eligible for Free Lunch	-.002,0	-0.012	0.001	.003,.005	-0.010	0.001
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.001,.004	-0.001	0.001	.01,.013	-0.001	0.001
<i>Average Prior (Standardized) Math Score of Classmates</i>						
Black	-.011,.005	0.012	0.004	-.173,-.155	0.008	0.003
Hispanic	.032,.05	0.007	0.003	-.104,-.084	0.004	0.004
Eligible for Free Lunch	-.012,-.002	0.006	0.002	-.064,-.053	0.003	0.002
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-.044,-.033	0.033	0.002	-.123,-.108	0.033	0.004
<b>District 3</b>						
<i>Proportion of Black Classmates</i>						
Black	.033,.036	-0.018	0.001	.09,.094	-0.001	0.000
Hispanic	-.038,-.035	0.000	0.001	.003,.007	0.000	0.000
Eligible for Free Lunch	.001,.003	-0.001	0.000	.005,.007	0.000	0.000
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.015,.018	-0.003	0.001	.061,.064	0.000	0.000
<i>Proportion of F/R Lunch Classmates</i>						
Black	.015,.019	-0.005	0.001	.031,.036	0.000	0.000
Hispanic	.032,.036	-0.004	0.001	.037,.041	0.000	0.000
Eligible for Free Lunch	0,.002	-0.016	0.001	.026,.028	-0.001	0.000
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	.018,.021	-0.002	0.001	.045,.049	0.000	0.000
<i>Average Prior (Standardized) Math Score of Classmates</i>						
Black	-.084,-.063	0.017	0.003	-.401,-.376	0.001	0.000
Hispanic	-.103,-.084	0.011	0.003	-.347,-.325	0.000	0.000
Eligible for Free Lunch	-.045,-.035	0.006	0.002	-.129,-.117	0.000	0.000
Bottom Quartile of Prior Math Score	-.162,-.151	0.026	0.002	-.423,-.41	0.001	0.000

Notes: The first and fourth columns show the 95 percent confidence interval of the differences, estimated using students' observed class assignments. These are from the estimates shown in Table 2. The second and fifth columns show the mean differences based on randomly assigning students to classrooms 100 times via a simulation. The third and sixth columns are the standard deviations of the mean differences based on random assignment.

**Table 5. Student Race, Poverty Status and Characteristics of Classrooms, with Controls for Prior Achievement**

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL			MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL				
	1	2		1	2	3		
<b>Outcome: Novice Teacher</b>								
<b>District 1</b>								
Black	0.006 (0.003)	* (0.002)	0.009 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.009 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.009 (0.002)	*** (0.002)
Hispanic	0.002 (0.003)		0.005 (0.002)	** (0.002)	0.005 (0.002)	** (0.002)	0.005 (0.002)	** (0.002)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.010 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	-0.010 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.010 (0.001)	*** (0.001)
<b>District 2</b>								
Black	0.007 (0.005)		0.000 (0.003)		-0.001 (0.004)		0.000 (0.003)	0.000 (0.004)
Hispanic	0.006 (0.005)		-0.007 (0.004)	* (0.004)	-0.010 (0.004)	* (0.004)	-0.007 (0.004)	* (0.004)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.001 (0.003)		0.001 (0.002)		0.003 (0.002)		0.001 (0.002)	0.004 (0.002)
<b>District 3</b>								
Black	-0.000 (0.003)		0.003 (0.003)		0.002 (0.003)		0.003 (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)
Hispanic	0.001 (0.002)		0.006 (0.002)	** (0.002)	0.008 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.006 (0.002)	** (0.002)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.003 (0.001)	* (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	* (0.001)	0.004 (0.001)	** (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	* (0.001)
<b>Outcome: Percentage of Black Classmates</b>								
<b>District 1</b>								
Black	0.029 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.030 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.038 (0.000)	*** (0.001)	0.030 (0.001)	*** (0.001)
Hispanic	0.004 (0.001)	*** (0.000)	0.007 (0.000)	*** (0.000)	0.008 (0.000)	*** (0.000)	0.007 (0.000)	*** (0.000)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.003 (0.000)	*** (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	*** (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	*** (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	*** (0.000)
<b>District 2</b>								
Black	0.010 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.043 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.056 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.045 (0.002)	*** (0.002)
Hispanic	-0.014 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.030 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.028 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.030 (0.002)	*** (0.002)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.003 (0.001)	** (0.001)	0.006 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.007 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.006 (0.001)	*** (0.001)
<b>District 3</b>								
Black	0.028 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	0.036 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	0.044 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	0.036 (0.001)	*** (0.002)
Hispanic	-0.025 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.003 (0.001)	* (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)	*** (0.001)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.003 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)		-0.002 (0.001)	* (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	* (0.001)
<b>Outcome: Prior Achievement of Classmates</b>								
<b>District 1</b>								
Black	-0.019 (0.004)	*** (0.003)	0.005 (0.003)	* (0.003)	-0.029 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	0.005 (0.003)	* (0.003)
Hispanic	-0.015 (0.003)	*** (0.002)	-0.010 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.017 (0.002)	*** (0.002)	-0.010 (0.002)	*** (0.002)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.030 (0.002)	*** (0.001)	-0.025 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.038 (0.001)	*** (0.001)	-0.025 (0.001)	*** (0.001)
<b>District 2</b>								
Black	0.009 (0.006)	+ (0.004)	-0.043 (0.004)	*** (0.005)	-0.068 (0.005)	*** (0.004)	-0.044 (0.004)	*** (0.005)
Hispanic	0.038 (0.006)	*** (0.005)	-0.008 (0.005)	+ (0.005)	-0.024 (0.005)	*** (0.005)	-0.007 (0.005)	*** (0.005)
Eligible for Free Lunch	0.000 (0.003)		-0.012 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.015 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.012 (0.003)	*** (0.003)
<b>District 3</b>								
Black	0.004 (0.006)		-0.010 (0.006)		-0.034 (0.006)	*** (0.006)	-0.010 (0.006)	*** (0.006)
Hispanic	-0.045 (0.006)	*** (0.005)	-0.031 (0.005)	*** (0.005)	-0.047 (0.005)	*** (0.005)	-0.031 (0.005)	*** (0.005)
Eligible for Free Lunch	-0.013 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.011 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.010 (0.003)	*** (0.003)	-0.011 (0.003)	*** (0.003)
School by Grade by Year Fixed Effect	X		X		X		X	
Prior Math and Reading Achievement IV for Prior Math Achievement	X		X		X		X	
Student GPA	---		X		---		X	

Notes: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001 Classroom characteristics for high school students refers to the attributes of students' peers in their math classes. Classroom averages are computed by excluding student *i* from the mean. In the instrumental variables (IV) model we instrument for prior year math test scores using students' twice lagged math score. Grade point average is not available for District 1.