

IS THERE “WHITE FLIGHT” INTO PRIVATE SCHOOLS? EVIDENCE FROM THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY

Robert W. Fairlie and Alexandra M. Resch*

Abstract—Using a recently released confidential data set from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), we find some evidence of “white flight” from public schools into private schools partly in response to minority schoolchildren. We also examine whether white flight is from all minorities or only from certain minority groups, delineated by race or income. We find that white families are fleeing public schools with large concentrations of poor minority schoolchildren. In addition, the clearest flight appears to occur from poor black schoolchildren. The results for white flight from Asians and Hispanics are less clear.

I. Introduction

IN *One America in the 21st Century: Forging a New Future*, President Clinton's advisory board on race argues that racial integration in the nation's schools is “essential to provide all students with a complete educational experience” (p. 63). The advisory board continues by providing a list of benefits that “accrue to all students and society” from diversity in the schools. This sentiment is not new; previous presidential commissions have also stressed the importance of school integration. The most notable, perhaps, was the Kerner Commission, assembled by Lyndon B. Johnson. The *Kerner Report*, which was released thirty years prior to *One America in the 21st Century*, stated:

We support integration as the priority education strategy because it is essential to the future of American society. We have seen in this last summer's disorders the consequences of racial isolation, at all levels, and of attitudes toward race, on both sides, produced by three centuries of myth, ignorance and bias. It is indispensable that opportunities for interaction between the races be expanded. The problems of this society will not be solved unless and until our children are brought into a common encounter and encouraged to forge a more viable design of life (p. 438).

Both of these reports, however, failed to address a potentially serious and often overlooked threat to school integration: the fleeing of white children from public schools into private schools. In particular, to the extent that this “white

flight” is a response to the presence of minority schoolchildren, it may pose an especially important and vexing problem for the nation's public schools.

Although several recent studies examine whether the choice between private and public school is influenced by the racial composition of the local student population, no consensus appears to exist in the literature on whether white flight exists. Conlon and Kimenyi (1991), Lankford, Lee, and Wyckoff (1995), and Lankford and Wyckoff (1997) provide evidence of white flight from minorities or blacks. In contrast, Buddin, Cordes, and Kirby (1998) find that the probability of attending private school among all students is insensitive to the minority share of public schools at both the elementary and secondary level, and Figlio and Stone (1999) find that the private school probability among all tenth-graders is insensitive to the minority share of the population. In addition, Lankford and Wyckoff (1992) find that white children are more likely to attend public high school when these schools have larger concentrations of black students.¹

Another important question is whether white flight occurs from specific minority groups, delineated by race or income. Most previous studies of white flight examine whether the probability of attending private school is influenced by the minority or black share of the local population. One exception is Conlon and Kimenyi (1991), who test for and find evidence of white flight from poor blacks, but not from non-poor blacks using 1980 Census data for Mississippi.² Their study, however, does not examine whether white flight exists from other minority groups. We might expect that white families react differently to minority schoolchildren based on their race and income.

We also know very little about the underlying causes of white flight. Previous studies speculate as to what may explain white flight. For example, Conlon and Kimenyi (1991, p. 16) list “irrational prejudice,” “characteristics of poor black children which white parents fear or dislike,” and “poor management of schools with poor black students, either because of the attitudes of administrators, or greater political passivity of low-income parents” as possible explanations for white flight from poor blacks. Lankford and Wyckoff (1997) suggest that white flight may be due to prejudice, the use of the racial composition of a school as a signal of academic quality, and/or assumptions about the

¹ They find a negative relationship, however, for public elementary students.

² In a related study, Betts and Fairlie (1998) find evidence of flight among native-born whites from immigrant schoolchildren at the secondary level.

Received for publication January 12, 2000. Revision accepted for publication January 5, 2001.

* University of California–Santa Cruz and Joint Center for Poverty Research (Northwestern University/University of Chicago), and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, respectively.

The views expressed here are solely the responsibility of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Spencer Foundation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or any other person associated with the Federal Reserve System. We thank Chris Jepsen, Rebecca London, and seminar participants at the fall 2000 meetings of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management for helpful comments and suggestions. Bill Koch provided excellent research assistance. Robert Fairlie acknowledges partial funding from the Spencer Foundation.

preferences of minority schoolchildren and their parents. None of the studies in the literature, however, investigate these potential explanations.

In this paper, we contribute to the white flight literature by using data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) and a recently released confidential data set from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). This special release, unlike the standard restricted-use version of the NELS, allows us to identify the exact residential location of all members of the NELS.³ The NELS is an exceptionally rich data source providing information on many student and parental characteristics, including detailed geographical location, religious affiliation, school characteristics, and racial attitudes, that are not available in other sources, such as the Census or Current Population Survey. We use these data to examine whether whites are choosing to attend private schools in response to the presence of minority schoolchildren in the public schools. In particular, we want to test the hypothesis that whites are more likely to opt out of the public school system when their local schools have larger concentrations of minorities, all else equal. An important question that we address is whether white flight is from all minorities or only some groups based on race or income. Finally, we explore the question of whether racism against minority schoolchildren contributes to white flight.

II. Data

We use data from the NELS and a recently released confidential data set from the NCES. The NELS follows a national sample of American youths who were enrolled in the eighth grade in 1988 at two-year intervals.⁴ In this analysis, we use data from the 1988 base year and the 1990 first follow-up. These two years of data allow us to examine the determinants of attending private school at both the eighth- and tenth-grade levels.

The data include detailed information on the student and his/her family. In addition to measures of family income and parental education, we use information on religion and racial attitudes, which are not available in most other national data sources. We also append school and community characteristics from various sources to these individual-level data. As previously noted, the restricted-use version of NELS that has been available for several years does not allow one to identify the residential location of respondents below the state level. Although the restricted-use version

³ The standard restricted-use version of the NELS contains information on only the student's state of residence and the location of attended public schools. Therefore, it has been impossible to identify the exact residential locations of all respondents. The recently released data set that we use, however, contains demographic data from the 1990 Census at the ZIP code level for each student in the NELS. With permission from the NCES, we used data from the 1990 Census STF 3B Files and a special matching routine to identify each respondent's residential ZIP code.

⁴ These students were drawn from a sample of approximately 1,000 schools. See Huang et al. (1996) for more details on the NELS.

TABLE 1.—PRIVATE SCHOOL RATES BY RACE

	Eighth Grade (1987–1988)		Tenth Grade (1989–1990)	
	Rate	N	Rate	N
White, non-Hispanic	13.2%	16317	11.2%	11537
Minority	9.2%	8006	8.7%	4593
Black	7.1%	3009	6.9%	1517
Asian	16.5%	1527	17.3%	1030
Hispanic	9.5%	3171	8.4%	1901

NOTE: The private school rate is the fraction of school children enrolled in private school. All private school rates are calculated using sample weights provided by the NELS.

identifies the public schools attended by NELS respondents, it does not identify private schools. This information, however, would be less useful because many private school students are likely to attend schools outside of their immediate residential area.

To identify residential locations, we use a recently released data set from the NCES that contains 1990 Census demographic data at the ZIP code level for each NELS respondent. This data set, however, does not identify actual ZIP codes. With permission from the NCES, we use data from the 1990 Census STF 3B Files to match to this data set, and thus identify each student's ZIP code. The ZIP codes are used to calculate distances to private schools and to identify each student's county of residence.⁵ The latter, however, is not straightforward because many ZIP codes cross county boundaries. We therefore use the following algorithm to identify the county of residence. First, we eliminate counties in which the ZIP code captures only nonresidential parts of that county. This step allows us to assign a unique county of residence to approximately 90% of our total sample. Second, for the remaining public school students, we use the county of the student's school. Third, for the remaining private school students, we use the county that represents the largest fraction of the total population for that ZIP code.

In our main analysis sample, we include only white children who are currently enrolled in school. We do not differentiate between religious and secular private schools because both are alternatives to public schooling and the key question in this study is whether white children choose to opt out of the public school system in response to a large concentration of minority schoolchildren. We are motivated by how this affects the resulting racial composition of the public schools and are less concerned with the type of private school that these students attend.

III. Results

A. Racial Differences in Private School Rates

Racial groups differ markedly in their average propensities to attend private school. In table 1, we report private school rates by race for eighth-grade students in 1987–1988

⁵ After identifying the county of residence, we identify the student's PMSA by using the county-based definitions of PMSAs provided on the 1994 USA Counties CD-ROM.

and tenth-grade students in 1989–1990. The private school rate is defined as the fraction of all schoolchildren enrolled in private school. All estimates are weighted so that they are representative of the U.S. population of eighth- and tenth-graders in 1987–1988 and 1989–1990, respectively.⁶

The estimates indicate that white schoolchildren are substantially more likely to attend private school than are minority schoolchildren. Slightly more than 13% of white eighth-graders and 11% of white eleventh-graders attend private school. In contrast, 9.2% of minority eighth-graders and 8.7% of minority tenth-graders attend private school. These disparities in private school rates suggest that if white flight from minority schoolchildren exists, it should be, on average, from public schools into private schools.

In table 1, we also report private school rates for blacks, Asians, and Hispanics. The estimates indicate that Asians have higher probabilities of attending private school than do whites. Nearly one in six Asian students attends private school. In comparison, private school rates among black and Hispanic students are low. Only 7.1% and 6.9% of black eighth- and tenth-graders, respectively, attend private school. The Hispanic private school rates are 9.5% and 8.4%. These estimates imply that black and Hispanic schoolchildren are over-represented in public schools and under-represented in private schools, whereas Asian schoolchildren are overrepresented in private schools and under-represented in public schools. These results have implications for the likely direction of white flight (if it exists) from each minority group.

B. Are Private Schools “Whiter” Than Public Schools?

The estimates reported in table 1 provide evidence of lower concentrations of minorities in the private school system than in the public school system overall. These estimates, however, do not indicate whether the public schools that whites attend are less “white” than the average private school or than the average private school attended by whites. This would provide additional suggestive evidence on the likely direction of white flight. Fortunately, the detailed information in the NELS allows us to explore this question. In particular, we use information provided in the NELS on the percentage of eighth- or tenth-graders in the student's school that is minority (as reported by the student's school).

In figures 1 and 2, we report the distribution of minority percentages among whites attending public schools, all students attending private schools, and whites attending private schools.⁷ In both grades, private schools have lower minority representations than the public schools attended by

whites. The private schools that whites attend are also substantially less likely to have large concentrations of minorities than are the public schools that whites attend. This finding is consistent with the likely direction of white flight being from public schools into private schools.

C. Is There White Flight from Minority Schoolchildren?

To test the white flight hypothesis, we first create and estimate a reduced-form equation for private school attendance. We assume that private school attendance is determined by an unobserved latent variable,

$$Y_i^* = X_i'\beta + \epsilon_i,$$

where X_i includes student, parental, school, and geographical area characteristics, and ϵ_i is the disturbance term. Only the dichotomous variable, Y_i , is observed, however. It equals 1 if $Y_i^* \geq 0$ (denoting private school attendance) and equals 0 otherwise (denoting public school attendance). If we take ϵ_i to be normally distributed, the assumptions imply that the data are described by a probit model. Although the normality assumption should be taken only as an approximation, the probit model provides a useful descriptive model for the binary event that a student attends private school.

A complication arises, however, in the use of a standard probit regression because the NELS includes an oversample of private school students. To correct for this problem, we use a choice-based sampling maximum likelihood estimator (CBSMLE).⁸ The likelihood function for this estimator is weighted to account for the oversample of ones for the dependent variable. Observations in which $Y = 0$ and $Y = 1$ are given weights of P^W/P^U and $(1 - P^W)/(1 - P^U)$, respectively, where P^W is the private school rate calculated using sample weights provided by the NELS and P^U is the unweighted private school rate.

We estimate several probit regressions for the probability of attending private school using a sample of white, non-Hispanic students. In addition to measures of student, parental, school and geographical area characteristics, we include the minority share of the school-age population in the regressions. The coefficient on this variable provides an estimate of whether the private/public school choices of white schoolchildren are sensitive to the presence of minority schoolchildren.


We measure the minority share of the population at both the county and PMSA levels. The main advantage to using the county-level measure is that it captures a smaller geographical area, and is thus less likely to suffer from problems associated with aggregating heterogeneous areas. However, using the county-level measure has a few disadvantages. The first of these is particularly important. Suppose that whites respond to high concentrations of minorities not by enrolling their children in private school, but

⁶ Figlio and Stone (1999) compare private school rates by various student characteristics from the 1989–1990 NELS to the 1990 Census 1% sample and find similar estimates.

⁷ The eighth-grade sample sizes for these groups are 12,343, 5,029, and 3,896, respectively. The tenth-grade sample sizes are 9,566, 2,260, and 1,818.

⁸ See Amemiya (1985) for more details.

FIGURE 1.—MINORITY COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY NELS STUDENTS (EIGHTH GRADE)



instead by moving to other neighborhoods in which the public schools have fewer minority students. This may cause an upward bias on the coefficient estimate for the minority proportion of the population if we focus on narrow geographical areas such as counties. Specifically, any movement from high-minority school districts to low-minority school districts increases the private school rate in the sending district and decreases the private school rate in the receiving district, thus implying a larger positive correlation between the private school rate and the minority share. In contrast, by using PMSAs, we greatly reduce this problem because these areas typically encompass many neighborhoods.⁹

A second but related rationale for using PMSAs concerns the endogeneity of households' location more generally. The influence of educational resources on residential location decisions is likely to be much stronger across school dis-

tricts or counties than across metropolitan areas. In other words, families are more likely to move between districts or counties within a PMSA as a result of variations in school quality than they are to move between PMSAs. Moves between PMSAs are likely to be influenced mainly by factors apart from schooling, such as the availability of jobs or the presence of family members. This suggests that the simultaneity of location decisions and school sector choices poses less of a problem when the unit of analysis is the PMSA than when it is a smaller geographical area, such as a county.


The third justification for using PMSAs as the unit of analysis is that they more accurately represent markets for private schools than do counties or school districts. Certainly, many families send their children across county lines to private schools.

Taking these arguments into consideration, we estimate separate regressions using PMSA- and county-level measures of the minority share of the school-age population.¹⁰

⁹ It would also be interesting to examine whether white families move to alternative school districts or counties in response to minority schoolchildren. However, it is difficult to distinguish between whether the locational choices of whites are determined by the presence of minorities in the public schools or by the presence of minorities in the neighborhood. These issues are beyond the scope of this paper.

¹⁰ The NELS sample of eighth-graders resides in 216 different PMSAs and 716 different counties in the United States. The tenth-graders reside in 216 different PMSAs and 669 different counties.

FIGURE 2.—MINORITY COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY NELS STUDENTS (TENTH GRADE)



We first discuss the results for the PMSA-level measure (reported in specifications 1 and 2 of table 2). We estimate separate regressions for our sample of white students in the eighth and tenth grades. In addition to the minority share variable, we include controls for age, sex, religion, parental education, family income, region of the country, distance to the closest private school, private and public school characteristics, poverty rate, and crime rate. (The means of most included variables are reported in the appendix.) The coefficients on the individual-level variables generally have the expected signs. Catholics are more likely to attend private school than are members of other religious groups. The probability of attending private school increases with both the mother's and the father's education level. Finally, higher levels of family income increase the probability of attending private school.

The coefficient estimates on the public school student-to-teacher ratio, public school expenditures per pupil, public school graduation rate, and private school student-to-teacher ratios are generally statistically insignificant. In both specifications, the public school variables are measured at the PMSA level, and the private school student-to-teacher

ratio is measured at the state level.¹¹ The coefficient on the serious crime rate is negative, although statistically significant in only one of the specifications.¹² A priori, we expected this variable to have a positive effect because of the possibility that white families would choose the tighter restrictions or more homogeneous population of students in private schools when high levels of crime exist in the area. In addition, there is evidence in previous studies that higher local crime rates lead to higher probabilities of attending private schools. (See Figlio and Stone (1999) and Betts and Fairlie (1998) for example.) The coefficient on the poverty rate (ages five to seventeen) is statistically insignificant in both specifications.

¹¹ The public school student-to-teacher ratio, expenditures per pupil, and graduation rate variables are from the Common Core of Data (CCD). The state-level private student-to-teacher variable is from the Private School Survey as reported in the 1993 Digest of Education Statistics.

¹² Serious crimes include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft. We obtain these data from the 1994 USA Counties CD-ROM.

TABLE 2.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOL

Explanatory Variables	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth Grade (1)	Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth Grade (3)	Tenth Grade (4)
Born in 1972 or 1973	-0.1091 (0.0430)	-0.0430 (0.0561)	-0.1140 (0.0347)	-0.0400 (0.0508)
Female	-0.0095 (0.0306)	-0.0552 (0.0513)	-0.0078 (0.0316)	-0.0578 (0.0483)
Baptist	-0.0873 (0.1490)	-0.3456 (0.1795)	-0.0529 (0.1358)	-0.2743 (0.1573)
Methodist	-0.2007 (0.1198)	-0.3725 (0.1591)	-0.1391 (0.1177)	-0.3261 (0.1461)
Lutheran	0.0125 (0.1355)	-0.2936 (0.1454)	0.0878 (0.1373)	-0.2945 (0.1458)
Other christian	0.2012 (0.1013)	0.0337 (0.1421)	0.2310 (0.1071)	0.0740 (0.1314)
Catholic	0.7601 (0.1148)	0.3934 (0.1498)	0.7178 (0.1147)	0.3860 (0.1497)
Jewish	0.4317 (0.1726)	0.2220 (0.1979)	0.3432 (0.1682)	0.1293 (0.1911)
Other religion	-0.2203 (0.1339)	-0.2915 (0.1800)	-0.1335 (0.1424)	-0.2085 (0.1674)
Mother graduated from high school	0.4842 (0.0656)	0.2601 (0.1197)	0.4831 (0.0807)	0.2657 (0.1325)
Mother has some college	0.5276 (0.0748)	0.3854 (0.1324)	0.5296 (0.0847)	0.3988 (0.1370)
Mother graduated from college	0.7356 (0.0791)	0.5772 (0.1364)	0.7488 (0.0898)	0.5932 (0.1463)
Father graduated from high school	0.1534 (0.0535)	0.2613 (0.0938)	0.1885 (0.0602)	0.2868 (0.1169)
Father has some college	0.1838 (0.0604)	0.3075 (0.1020)	0.2495 (0.0662)	0.3810 (0.1237)
Father graduated from college	0.4270 (0.0720)	0.6311 (0.1186)	0.4500 (0.0735)	0.6834 (0.1317)
Family income: \$15,000 to \$25,000	0.1427 (0.0791)	0.3566 (0.1035)	0.1810 (0.0747)	0.4353 (0.1046)
Family income: \$25,000 to \$35,000	0.3114 (0.0857)	0.3705 (0.1021)	0.3469 (0.0726)	0.4585 (0.0890)
Family income: \$35,000 to \$50,000	0.3534 (0.0813)	0.4652 (0.0996)	0.4073 (0.0767)	0.5686 (0.0937)
Family income \$50,000 to \$100,000	0.3260 (0.0959)	0.5190 (0.1150)	0.3982 (0.0823)	0.6333 (0.1040)
Family income more than \$100,000	1.1771 (0.1355)	1.4250 (0.1341)	1.2092 (0.1084)	1.5478 (0.1177)
Public school student to teacher ratio	0.0302 (0.0387)	0.1747 (0.0551)	0.0596 (0.0305)	0.1524 (0.0362)
Public school expenditures per pupil (000s)	0.0741 (0.0837)	0.0435 (0.0926)	0.0578 (0.0741)	0.1906 (0.0718)
Public school graduation rate	0.8431 (1.3403)	1.3936 (1.2412)	-0.6242 (0.7737)	0.1411 (1.0011)
Private school student-to-teacher ratio	-0.0228 (0.0518)	-0.0802 (0.0606)	-0.0345 (0.0405)	-0.0924 (0.0447)
Serious crime rate	-7.0664 (3.3321)	-2.4045 (4.2596)	-1.4288 (2.4915)	-1.6915 (3.1561)
Poverty rate (ages 5–17)	1.1201 (1.4078)	-0.4411 (1.7940)	1.5251 (0.8397)	1.4204 (1.1129)
Distance to closest private school (km)	-0.0494 (0.0090)	-0.0467 (0.0088)	-0.0438 (0.0063)	-0.0393 (0.0074)
Distance squared/100	0.0224 (0.0047)	0.0205 (0.0048)	0.0183 (0.0042)	0.0155 (0.0048)
Minority share of population (ages 5–18)	0.2331 (0.6047)	0.5119 (0.7259)	0.8251 (0.4294)	1.2055 (0.5261)
Mean of dependent variable	0.1604	0.1393	0.1238	0.1041
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1956	0.1687	0.1537	0.1259
Sample size	10020	6927	13330	9511

NOTE. (1) The same consists of white, non-Hispanic schoolchildren.

Standard errors are reported in parentheses and are adjusted for including multiple observations per PMSA or county.

All estimates are adjusted for oversample of private school students.

In addition to the reported variables, all specifications include a constant, region dummies, and dummy variables for missing mother's and father's education levels.

The average derivative (or marginal effect) is equal to the adjustment factor multiplied by the coefficient. See text for more details.

The results for the distance to the closest private school are noteworthy. We create this variable by first identifying the longitude and latitude of all ZIP codes in the United States. For each NELS respondent, we then calculate the distance to every private school with at least 100 students and include the closest distance and its square in the probit regressions.¹³ As expected, we find that the distance to the closest private school has a negative (for almost its entire range in the sample) and statistically significant effect on the probability of attending private school.¹⁴

¹³ We thank Todd Elder for providing a Matlab program that calculates the distance between any two points given their longitude and latitude. A Fortran version of the program is available at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Geodetic Survey FTP site (ftp://ftp.ngs.noaa.gov/pub/pcsoft/for_inv.3d/source/inverse.for). Private school ZIP codes are obtained from original records of the 1989–1990 Private School Survey. We obtained a special listing from Steve Broughman at the NCES.

¹⁴ Lankford and Wycoff (1997) find a negative effect of distance on the private/public school choices of elementary school students in upstate New York.

We now turn to the results for the minority share of the school-age population.¹⁵ To create the minority share, we group blacks, Asians, American Indians, and Hispanics.¹⁶ The coefficient estimate on this variable in specification 1 is positive, but not statistically significant. Using the tenth

¹⁵ This variable is obtained from the Census STF 3C files. We define the school-age population as ages five to eighteen in both specifications. We also estimate probit regressions in which we measure the minority share for ages five through fourteen using the eighth-grade sample and the minority share for ages fourteen to eighteen using the tenth-grade sample. The coefficient estimates are very similar to the reported estimates (due to the high degree of collinearity between the measures). We argue that the entire age range is a more appropriate measure because white parents may simply use the race of all children in the local area to make inferences about the racial composition of the public schools.

¹⁶ The Census STF 3C files include separate population counts by racial group (that is, white, black, American Indian, Asian, and other) and by Hispanic origin. We include Hispanics, but do not include children of "other" race in our definition of minorities. Estimates from 1990 Census microdata indicate that 45% of Hispanics report "other" race and 97% of "other" race report being of Hispanic origin. In our definition of minority, there exists some double counting of Hispanic blacks, American Indians, and Asians, but only 2.8%, 1.1%, and 0.8% of Hispanics report these races, respectively.

grade sample, the coefficient estimate on the minority share is similar in magnitude and remains statistically insignificant.

We also estimate probit regressions that include county-level measures of the minority share, public school student-to-teacher ratio, public school expenditures per pupil, public school graduation rate, poverty rate, and crime rate (reported in specifications 3 and 4). The number of observations used in these regressions increases appreciably because many NELS respondents live in counties that are located outside of PMSAs. The coefficient estimates on many of these controls are generally similar to those in the PMSA-level regressions.

Using the county-level measure of the minority share, the coefficient estimates are notably larger.¹⁷ The coefficient estimate using the tenth-grade sample is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The coefficient estimate using the eighth-grade sample has a p -value of 0.055. In both specifications, the point estimates imply nontrivial effects. For example, an increase of ten percentage points in the minority share increases the probability of private school attendance by 0.013 among eighth-graders and 0.015 among tenth-graders.¹⁸ The average private school attendance probability is 0.124 for eighth-graders and 0.104 for tenth-graders.

As a check of the robustness of our results, we estimate three additional sets of regressions. First, we investigate whether there is evidence of threshold or “tipping” points in the response to the minority share (Clotfelter, 1976). We plot private school rates by detailed categories of the minority share for each of our samples. Interestingly, these graphs reveal patterns that are best described as positive linear functions. There is, however, a slight increase in the private school rate when the minority share is 15% or higher. To examine this possible tipping point, we include a dummy variable for minority shares of 15% or higher. The coefficient estimates on this dummy variable are positive, but statistically insignificant in all specifications. They range from 0.1094 to 0.2649. The coefficients on the linear term remain positive, but are smaller in magnitude than those reported in table 2. Although alternative thresholds may provide evidence supporting the white flight hypothesis, we do not experiment further along these lines. We are concerned that thresholds are created somewhat arbitrarily and without any theoretical guidance. Thus, we return to our original specification, which can be viewed as an approximation to the actual relationship.

¹⁷ We also estimate probit regressions that include county-level measures, but use the more urban sample of specifications 1 and 2. The eighth- and tenth-grade coefficients on the minority share are 0.5475 and 0.8097, respectively.

¹⁸ These estimates are calculated by multiplying the coefficient estimate by the average derivative adjustment factor reported at the bottom of table 2. The average derivative adjustment factor is $\sum \beta_s(X_i \beta) / N$, where β_s is the coefficient on the minority share and ϕ is the normal probability density function. The effect of a one-unit increase in any of the independent variables on the private school probability can be estimated by multiplying the coefficient on that variable by the average derivative adjustment factor.

We also estimate probit regressions that do not include the distance variables. The minority share coefficients in all four specifications are larger than those reported in table 2. Finally, we estimate additional tenth-grade probit regressions that include eighth-grade test scores. The coefficient estimates on the minority share do not differ substantially from those reported in specifications 2 and 4.

D. Transitions from Private to Public School

Another empirical approach to examining the white flight hypothesis is to identify the determinants of transitions between the private and public school systems. In particular, the finding that the minority share increases the probability that a student switches from public to private school or decreases the probability that a student switches from private to public school is consistent with the white flight hypothesis. The NELS contains observations for the same students in both the eighth and tenth grades. We examine whether the minority share of the school-age population affects the probability that a student switches from private school in the eighth grade to public school in the tenth grade. We would also like to examine the determinants of transitions from public school in eighth grade to private school in tenth grade; however, there are only 54 out of 8,872 public eighth-graders making this transition.

We estimate several probits for the probability of a transition from private to public school. The dependent variable in these probit regressions equals 1 if the student switches from a private school in eighth grade to a public school in tenth grade and equals 0 if the student remains in a private school in both grades. Results are reported in specifications 1 and 3 of table 3. We include the same independent variables as those included in the probits reported in table 2.

As expected, many of the coefficients have the opposite sign as those reported in table 2. For example, the estimates indicate that the probability of a transition from private to public school decreases with family income and the father's education. This is consistent with the positive coefficients found in the cross-sectional regressions. The effect of the mother's education, however, is less consistent across the approaches. Turning to the results for the minority share of the school-age population, we find large, negative, but statistically insignificant coefficient estimates for the PMSA- and county-level measures. The lack of statistical significance, however, may be due to small sample sizes.

By conditioning on private school enrollment in the eighth grade, our sample sizes decrease substantially from those used in table 2. The PMSA-level sample has 1,750 observations, and the county-level has 1,872 observations. The smaller sample sizes, however, are partially due to the large percentage of NELS respondents with missing values for family income and religion. To increase our sample sizes for the transition probits, we include these observations and add dummy variables for missing family income and

TABLE 3.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF SWITCHING FROM PRIVATE TO PUBLIC SCHOOL

Explanatory Variables	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth to Tenth Grade (1)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (3)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (4)
Born in 1972 or 1973	0.0860 (0.1235)	0.1004 (0.1083)	0.0569 (0.1066)	0.0679 (0.0982)
Female	0.1390 (0.0950)	0.1802 (0.0875)	0.1206 (0.0898)	0.1654 (0.0834)
Baptist	1.0027 (0.5921)	0.9443 (0.5904)	0.8351 (0.6060)	0.8070 (0.5935)
Methodist	1.0632 (0.5674)	0.9274 (0.5596)	0.9699 (0.5775)	0.8435 (0.5679)
Lutheran	0.7562 (0.5014)	0.6868 (0.4936)	0.7319 (0.5681)	0.6388 (0.5570)
Other christian	0.6097 (0.5511)	0.5535 (0.5435)	0.5394 (0.5725)	0.4734 (0.5595)
Catholic	0.8012 (0.5355)	0.7114 (0.5281)	0.8109 (0.5685)	0.7248 (0.5564)
Jewish	0.6435 (0.6307)	0.6132 (0.6404)	0.6133 (0.5983)	0.5702 (0.5882)
Other religion	0.4778 (0.6635)	0.4677 (0.6525)	0.2951 (0.6879)	0.2879 (0.6735)
Mother graduated from high school	0.7523 (0.3025)	0.3741 (0.3128)	0.4757 (0.2584)	0.2024 (0.2200)
Mother had some college	0.6327 (0.2923)	0.2808 (0.2844)	0.3777 (0.2445)	0.1295 (0.2109)
Mother graduated from college	0.5648 (0.3072)	0.1690 (0.2938)	0.2443 (0.2595)	-0.0399 (0.2218)
Father graduated from high school	-0.2896 (0.1789)	-0.2876 (0.1470)	-0.1686 (0.1922)	-0.2010 (0.1529)
Father has some college	-0.4731 (0.1955)	-0.4485 (0.1542)	-0.3525 (0.2108)	-0.3720 (0.1584)
Father graduated from college	-0.7116 (0.2057)	-0.6757 (0.1672)	-0.6221 (0.2218)	-0.6285 (0.1758)
Family income: \$15,000 to \$25,000	-0.3643 (0.2597)	-0.3707 (0.2514)	-0.4849 (0.2421)	-0.4552 (0.2396)
Family income: \$25,000 to \$35,000	-0.1468 (0.2066)	-0.1068 (0.1970)	-0.2666 (0.1720)	-0.2062 (0.1677)
Family income: \$35,000 to \$50,000	-0.2720 (0.2229)	-0.2355 (0.2169)	-0.4090 (0.1906)	-0.3476 (0.1898)
Family income: \$50,000 to \$100,000	-0.3768 (0.2451)	-0.3043 (0.2327)	-0.5658 (0.1977)	-0.4712 (0.1931)
Family income more than \$100,000	-0.8048 (0.2439)	-0.7333 (0.2307)	-0.9940 (0.2116)	-0.9086 (0.2036)
Public school student-to-teacher ratio	-0.1932 (0.0734)	-0.1794 (0.0719)	-0.1867 (0.0597)	-0.1746 (0.0573)
Public school expenditures per pupil (000s)	0.1771 (0.1706)	0.1605 (0.1615)	-0.0371 (0.1090)	-0.0261 (0.0959)
Public school graduation rate	2.5418 (3.3385)	3.0537 (3.2317)	1.7227 (1.3849)	1.9380 (1.3597)
Private school student-to-teacher ratio	0.1247 (0.1073)	0.0988 (0.0997)	0.1487 (0.0854)	0.1294 (0.0802)
Serious crime rate	-8.9731 (6.3852)	-7.7699 (6.4488)	0.4218 (3.7102)	0.7523 (3.6595)
Poverty rate (ages 5–17)	5.0750 (3.3272)	6.4642 (3.1577)	0.8113 (1.6753)	1.6628 (1.6690)
Distance to closest private school (km)	-0.0372 (0.0282)	-0.0514 (0.0281)	-0.0241 (0.0261)	-0.0347 (0.0248)
Distance squared/100	0.2543 (0.1574)	0.3050 (0.1524)	0.1162 (0.1201)	0.1514 (0.1075)
Minority share of population (ages 5–18)	-1.5909 (1.0360)	-2.0018 (0.9462)	-0.9888 (0.7462)	-1.4431 (0.7133)
Mean of dependent variable	0.2331	0.2292	0.2521	0.2467
Avg. derivative adj. variable	0.2477	0.2487	0.2519	0.2524
Sample size	1750	2129	1872	2262

The dependent variable equals 1 if the student attends a private school in eighth grade and a public school in tenth grade and equals 0 if the student attends a private school in both eighth and tenth grade. Specifications 2 and 4 include dummy variables for missing religion and family income. See notes to table 2.

religion. Results are reported in specifications 2 and 4. At both the PMSA and county level, the coefficients are larger in absolute value and are now statistically significant. Furthermore, the coefficients imply substantial effects. An increase of ten percentage points in the minority share decreases the probability of switching from private school in eighth grade to public school in tenth grade by 0.036 to 0.050. The average private-to-public school transition probability is 0.25.

To summarize, the results provide some evidence supporting the white flight hypothesis. We find that the minority share of the school-age population measured at the county level has a positive and statistically significant effect on the probability of private school attendance among whites. We also find that the minority share (measured at either the PMSA or county level) has a negative and statistically significant effect on the probability of switching from private school in the eighth grade to public school in the tenth grade.

E. Are Whites Fleeing from Specific Minority Groups?

Using data from Mississippi, Conlon and Kimenyi (1991) find evidence of white flight from poor blacks, but not from

non-poor blacks. This finding suggests that white families may react differently to poor and non-poor minorities. It also raises the question of whether whites are fleeing from all minorities or only some racial groups. Whites may dislike or have concerns over the peer group effects of some minority groups more than others.

In table 4, we report estimates from several probit regressions for the probability of private school attendance that include different measures of minority population shares. For brevity, we do not report coefficient estimates for the control variables. We first estimate probit regressions that include the black, Asian, and Hispanic shares of the school-age population (reported in panel I).¹⁹ Using the PMSA-level measures, the coefficients on the black share are large and positive, but statistically insignificant. The coefficients using the county-level measures, however, are statistically significant. These coefficients imply that the increase in the

¹⁹ We do not include a separate variable for the American Indian share of the population because this group represents a very small fraction of the population in most PMSAs and counties. We should also note that there is some overlap between the Hispanic share and the black and Asian shares. As reported previously, however, this overlap is very small.

TABLE 4.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOL

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth Grade (1)	Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth Grade (3)	Tenth Grade (4)
(i) Black share	0.7715 (0.8133)	1.0845 (0.9295)	1.5486 (0.5339)	1.9814 (0.6285)
Asian share	3.2584 (0.8829)	5.5721 (1.3308)	3.7950 (0.8620)	5.9267 (1.1704)
Hispanic share	-1.5243 (0.7808)	-2.6992 (1.0216)	-1.0960 (0.5340)	-1.6315 (0.6841)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1924	0.1628	0.1496	0.1196
(ii) Poor minority share	2.4232 (2.9763)	0.6859 (4.3825)	4.0382 (1.7326)	4.7278 (2.0929)
Non-poor minority share	-0.3454 (1.0015)	0.4860 (1.4332)	-0.1302 (0.6637)	0.1623 (0.8995)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1955	0.1687	0.1533	0.1255
(iii) Poor black share	5.0543 (3.0366)	4.2493 (4.7230)	5.6617 (1.8968)	7.1300 (2.2811)
Poor Asian share	7.3300 (8.2049)	2.3629 (11.1185)	14.2715 (6.7675)	11.9438 (8.3603)
Poor Hispanic share	0.9243 (3.8263)	-6.2713 (6.6550)	3.0873 (2.4424)	2.6738 (3.1844)
Non-poor black share	-0.9162 (1.6366)	-0.6748 (2.1540)	0.2764 (0.9014)	0.1270 (1.2087)
Non-poor Asian share	2.5748 (1.0747)	5.9713 (1.7274)	1.9834 (1.2479)	4.7517 (1.6116)
Non-poor Hispanic share	-1.8352 (1.9714)	-0.7914 (2.7234)	-2.3557 (1.4693)	-2.7367 (1.8534)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1921	0.1625	0.1488	0.1190
Mean of dependent variable	0.1604	0.1393	0.1238	0.1041
Sample size	10020	6927	13330	9511

See notes to table 2.

All specifications include the same control variables as those included in the specifications reported in table 2.

white private school probability resulting from an increase of ten percentage point, in the black share is 0.023 to 0.024. An increase of one standard deviation in the black share increases the white private school rate by 0.031 to 0.032.

The coefficient estimates on the Asian share of the school-age population are large, positive, and statistically significant. However, the positive coefficient on the Asian share is difficult to interpret. The estimates reported in table 1 indicate that Asians have a higher probability of attending private schools than do whites. The combination of this finding and the positive coefficient may be the result of white flight to Asian schoolchildren instead of from Asian schoolchildren. The estimates imply that the average probability of private school attendance among whites increases by 0.021 to 0.036 from a one-standard-deviation increase in the Asian share.

We also include the Hispanic share of the school-age population in the regressions. The coefficient estimates on this variable are negative and statistically significant in all specifications. The private school probability effects resulting from a one-standard-deviation increase in the Hispanic share range from -0.019 to -0.052. The negative sign on this variable is difficult to interpret. As indicated in table 1, Hispanic schoolchildren are less likely to attend private school than are white schoolchildren.

The coefficient estimates from these regressions provide some evidence of white flight from black schoolchildren. The evidence, however, is less clear for white flight from Asian or Hispanic schoolchildren. To investigate this further, we examine whether the coefficient estimates on the Asian and Hispanic shares are sensitive to a few outliers. Specifically, we estimate probit regressions that exclude the PMSAs or counties with Asian or Hispanic shares that are substantially higher than the rest (which represent less than

1% of the sample).²⁰ The coefficient estimates on the Asian share and Hispanic share do not change substantially after the removal of these observations.

In table 4, we also report estimates from probit regressions in which we distinguish between poor and non-poor minorities. White families may react differently to poor and non-poor minority schoolchildren. In panel II, we report separate coefficient estimates for the minority share of the school-age population that is below the poverty line and the minority share that is above the poverty line.²¹ The results provide evidence that white flight is from poor minorities and not from non-poor minorities. The coefficient estimates on the poor minority share are large and positive in most specifications. In both county-level specifications, they are statistically significant. An increase of ten percentage points in the poor minority share increases the probability of private school attendance by 0.059 to 0.062. The effects of an increase of one standard deviation in the poor minority share are also large, ranging from 0.044 to 0.048. In contrast, the coefficient estimates on the non-poor minority share are small and statistically insignificant in all four specifications.

We also estimate probit regressions that include poor and non-poor black, Asian, and Hispanic population shares. The coefficient estimates on the poor black share are large and positive in all specifications and statistically significant in two specifications. In the county-level specifications, the average private school attendance probability increases by

²⁰ We exclude PMSAs and counties with Asian shares higher than 60% and 35% and Hispanic shares higher than 60% and 70%, respectively.

²¹ We define the school-age population as ages five through seventeen in these regressions due to limitations in the age categories provided in the Census STF 3C files.

TABLE 5.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF SWITCHING FROM PRIVATE TO PUBLIC SCHOOL

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth to Tenth Grade (1)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (3)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (4)
(i) Share	-1.1177 (1.4626)	-1.7690 (1.4163)	-0.7033 (0.9618)	-1.2634 (0.9423)
Asian share	-11.1734 (4.3834)	-10.5996 (4.4133)	-8.6442 (3.1681)	-8.4241 (2.9402)
Hispanic share	3.1761 (1.7190)	2.5258 (1.6822)	2.5685 (1.1948)	1.7722 (1.1370)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.2368	0.2395	0.2421	0.2447
(ii) Poor minority share	13.7497 (7.4350)	9.3100 (7.3121)	-2.3393 (3.7284)	-4.2382 (3.5488)
Non-poor minority share	-5.7272 (1.8974)	-5.1508 (1.8764)	-0.6314 (1.1534)	-0.6788 (1.0491)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.2439	0.2468	0.2515	0.2514
(iii) Poor black share	20.0687 (8.5591)	15.0952 (8.2121)	-3.7678 (3.4660)	-5.9179 (3.3882)
Poor Asian share	-33.6731 (27.7871)	-39.6642 (27.9332)	-2.4928 (13.0748)	-6.6702 (13.2141)
Poor Hispanic share	41.6015 (16.6733)	36.8260 (14.8779)	5.5349 (5.4348)	0.4620 (5.0202)
Non-poor black share	-8.9240 (3.3178)	-8.3405 (3.3170)	1.0142 (1.4091)	0.7947 (1.3670)
Non-poor Asian share	-7.1381 (7.1001)	-5.6283 (6.6239)	-8.9326 (4.0982)	-8.2322 (3.8552)
Non-poor Hispanic share	-9.3684 (5.5735)	-9.1091 (4.9772)	0.4937 (2.6532)	1.4347 (2.4835)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.2274	0.2325	0.2394	0.2420
Mean of dependent variable	0.2331	0.2292	0.2521	0.2467
Sample size	1750	2129	1872	2262

See notes to table 3.

All specifications include the same control variables as those included in the specifications in table 3.

0.084 to 0.085 from a ten-percentage point increase in the poor black share and by 0.051 to 0.053 from a one-standard-deviation increase in the poor black share. The coefficients on the non-poor black share are much smaller and statistically insignificant, suggesting that white flight is not from non-poor blacks. This finding is consistent with the finding by Conlon and Kimenyi (1991) of white flight from poor blacks, but not from non-poor blacks in Mississippi in 1980.

The coefficient estimate on the poor Asian share is positive in all specifications, but statistically significant in only one. In this specification, the point estimate implies that an increase of one standard deviation in the poor Asian share increases the white private school rate by 0.018. The coefficient estimate on the non-poor Asian share is positive and statistically significant in two of the specifications. In these specifications, a one-standard-deviation increase in the non-poor Asian share increases the private school attendance probability by 0.017 to 0.033. Overall, we are cautious in interpreting these results due to the variability of coefficient estimates and small average values for the poor and non-poor Asian shares. The results, however, indicate that the positive effect of the total Asian share on the probability of attending private school is not being driven solely by the effects of poor or non-poor Asians.

The results for the poor and non-poor Hispanic shares are also difficult to interpret. We find both negative and positive (but always insignificant) coefficients on the poor Hispanic share. In contrast, the coefficient estimates on the non-poor Hispanic share are negative in all specifications. They are not statistically significant in any of the specifications. Unfortunately, these results do not shed light on the puzzling finding of a negative and statistically significant coefficient on the Hispanic share in panel I.

The results reported in table 4 provide evidence that white families are fleeing public schools with large concen-

trations of poor minority schoolchildren. In addition, the strongest flight appears to be from poor black schoolchildren. The results for white flight from Asians and Hispanics are less clear.

We now turn to a discussion of the results from a similar set of probit regressions for the probability of switching from private school in eighth grade to public school in tenth grade. Estimates are reported in table 5. In panel I, we find that the signs of the coefficients on the black, Asian, and Hispanic shares are consistent with those reported in table 4. The black and Asian shares have negative coefficients, and the Hispanic share has a positive coefficient. All of the Asian share coefficients are statistically significant, whereas only two of the Hispanic share coefficients and none of the black share coefficients are significant.

The results reported in panel II are somewhat of a puzzle. Using the PMSA-level measures, the poor minority share and non-poor minority share coefficients have the opposite signs as expected based on the results reported in table 4. In contrast, however, the negative coefficients on the poor minority share using the county-level measures are consistent with the findings reported in table 4.

In the final set of probit regressions reported in table 5, most of the coefficient estimates have the opposite sign as those reported in table 4. However, only a few of the coefficients are statistically significant. It is important to keep in mind that these samples condition on enrollment in a private school in the eighth grade. Thus, the sample sizes are considerably smaller than those used in table 4.

Overall, the private/public school transition probit results are generally consistent with the results for the probability of private school attendance. As expected, most of the coefficients had the opposite sign as those reported in table 4. The main difference in results was that very few of the transition coefficients are statistically significant.

TABLE 6.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOL

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth Grade (1)	Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth Grade (3)	Tenth Grade (4)
(i) Feel it is okay to make racist remarks	-0.0308 (0.1121)	-0.0429 (0.1257)	-0.0857 (0.0887)	-0.0161 (0.1005)
Minority share	0.3632 (0.6625)	0.4690 (0.7371)	0.9704 (0.4796)	1.1860 (0.5336)
Minority share * racist remarks	0.1398 (0.2885)	0.2612 (0.3393)	0.1737 (0.2453)	0.1242 (0.2705)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1710	0.1688	0.1292	0.1260
(ii) Feel it is okay to make racist remarks	-0.1573 (0.1129)	-0.0694 (0.1334)	-0.1596 (0.0793)	-0.0420 (0.0903)
Black share	1.4758 (0.7670)	2.3050 (0.8863)	2.0450 (0.5594)	2.6182 (0.6312)
Black share * racist remarks	0.8651 (0.5600)	0.5007 (0.6489)	0.6526 (0.3661)	0.2933 (0.3812)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.1697	0.1665	0.1269	0.1228
Mean of dependent variable	0.1337	0.1396	0.1003	0.1043
Sample size	7063	6901	9736	9472

See notes to table 2.

F. Is Racism Driving White Flight?

As noted in the introduction, we know very little about the causes of white flight. In this section, we examine an important potential explanation: racism. Some white parents may simply have a distaste for their children being in the same classrooms or schools as minority schoolchildren, thus increasing the probability that they send their children to less integrated private schools.

The NELS contains a variable that may help us explore this hypothesis. Students were asked the following question on the tenth-grade survey: “How often do you feel it is ‘OK’ for you to make racist remarks?”²² Respondents were allowed to choose one of the following responses: (i) “Often”, (ii) “Sometimes”, (iii) “Rarely”, and (iv) “Never.” Approximately 85% of our sample of white tenth-graders reported “Never.”²³ We use the remaining 15% to create a “racist remarks” dummy variable. We then interact this dummy variable with the minority share of the school-age population variable. We add these two variables to the specifications reported in table 2. Although much caution is warranted here, a positive coefficient estimate on the interaction variable provides some suggestive evidence that white flight is partly driven by personal prejudice.

We report probit estimates in panel I of table 6. In all four specifications, the coefficient estimate on the interaction variable is positive. None of the coefficients, however, are statistically significant. Although these coefficients are not statistically significant, it is useful to examine their size. They imply that an increase of ten percentage points in the minority share increases the probability of attending private school among white students who feel that is okay to make racist remarks by an additional 0.002 to 0.004. These added effects are small relative to the total effect of the minority share on the probability of attending private school.

²² The parents are likely to make the school sector choice, but we expect that a child's response to this question partly reflects his/her parents' attitudes towards race.

²³ In our sample, 1.8%, 3.1%, and 10.6% reported “Often,” “Sometimes,” and “Rarely,” respectively.

We also estimate probit regressions that include an interaction between the racist variable and the black share of the school-age population. We find evidence of white flight from black schoolchildren and suspect that racism towards blacks may be especially strong. Estimates are reported in panel II of table 6. Again, we find positive coefficients on the interaction variable in all specifications. Although none of these coefficients are statistically significant at the 0.05 level, the coefficient in specification 3 is statistically significant at the 0.10 level. This coefficient estimate implies that an increase of ten percentage points in the minority share increases the white private school rate by an additional 0.008.

In table 7, we report similar estimates from probit regressions for the probability of a transition from private to public school that include the racist interaction variable. As expected, the coefficient estimates on the racist/minority share interaction variable are negative in all specifications. In contrast, however, the coefficients on the racist/black share interaction variable are positive. None of these coefficients is statistically significant.

Clearly, it is a difficult task to identify the part of white flight that is due to personal prejudice. Our goal here is much more modest. We find some very limited evidence of a higher level of white flight among whites who are less opposed to making racist comments than among other whites. This result suggests that racism or personal prejudice may play a role in white flight. We should note, however, that we find evidence of flight among whites who feel that it is never okay to make racist remarks. If we assume that personal prejudice does not play a role in this group's school sector decision (which may be entirely unreasonable), then other factors are largely responsible for white flight.

IV. Conclusions

Using NELS data, we find some evidence of white flight to private schools from minority schoolchildren. In probit regressions for the probability of attending private school

TABLE 7.—PROBIT REGRESSIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF SWITCHING FROM PRIVATE TO PUBLIC SCHOOL

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth to Tenth Grade (1)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (3)	Eighth to Tenth Grade (4)
(i) Feel it is okay to make racist remarks	-0.0103 (0.2669)	0.0354 (0.2329)	-0.0978 (0.2141)	-0.0197 (0.1995)
Minority share	-1.5059 (1.0388)	-1.9398 (0.9494)	-0.9579 (0.7506)	-1.3904 (0.7206)
Minority share * racist remarks	-0.3823 (0.7955)	-0.4808 (0.6587)	-0.0943 (0.5455)	-0.2720 (0.5060)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.2455	0.2463	0.2501	0.2505
(ii) Feel it is okay to make racist remarks	-0.3030 (0.2477)	-0.1771 (0.2209)	-0.2516 (0.1820)	-0.1693 (0.1698)
Black share	-3.0214 (1.4229)	-3.4403 (1.3429)	-1.9851 (0.9458)	-2.2289 (0.8966)
Black share * racist remarks	0.9010 (1.1540)	0.3245 (1.0066)	0.5339 (0.6651)	0.2538 (0.6330)
Avg. derivative adj. factor	0.2431	0.2444	0.2477	0.2488
Mean of dependent variable	0.2311	0.2271	0.2503	0.2447
Sample size	1722	2092	1842	2223

See notes to table 3.

among whites, we find statistically significant coefficients on the minority share of the school-age population using county-level measures. Using PMSA-level measures, we find smaller positive coefficients that are not statistically significant. We also estimate probit regressions for the probability of switching from private school in the eighth grade to public school in the tenth grade and find negative and statistically significant coefficients on the minority share.

Following Conlon and Kimenyi's (1991) finding of white flight from poor blacks, but not from non-poor blacks, in Mississippi, we extend our analysis to explore whether white flight exists from specific racial or racial/income groups. Our results provide evidence that white families are fleeing public schools with large concentrations of poor minority schoolchildren. In addition, the clearest flight appears to be from poor black schoolchildren. We find large, positive coefficients in all specifications and statistically significant coefficients in the county-level specifications for the probability of attending private school. The results for white flight from Asians and Hispanics are less clear.

Using a measure of racial attitudes available in the NELS, we find some suggestive evidence that racism toward minority schoolchildren may contribute to white flight. Unfortunately, the subjectivity of the question and the imprecision of the coefficient estimates do not allow us to draw strong conclusions from these results. It is possible that a larger sample size would provide statistical significance or a less subjective question would elicit a more accurate measure of racial attitudes. In the end, however, we do not have a definitive answer as to the underlying causes of white flight. From a policy perspective, this is unfortunate because a better understanding of whether white flight from minority schoolchildren is driven by racism, concerns about peer group effects, or signals of school quality would contribute

greatly to the debates over the potential effects of private school vouchers, increased public school choice, and busing on the racial composition of the nation's schools.

REFERENCES

- Amemiya, Takeshi, *Advanced Econometrics* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1985)
- Betts, Julian R., and Robert W. Fairlie, "Does Immigration Induce Native Flight from Public Schools into Private Schools?," Public Policy Institute of California working paper (1998).
- The Board, *One America in the 21st Century: Forging a New Future: The President's Initiative on Race, the Advisory Board's Report to the President* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998).
- Buddin, Richard J., Joseph J. Cordes, and Sheila Nataraj Kirby, "School Choice in California: Who Chooses Private Schools?," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 44:1 (1998), 110-134.
- Clotfelter, Charles T., "School Desegregation, 'Tipping,' and Private School Enrollment," *Journal of Human Resources* 22 (Winter 1976), 29-50.
- Conlon, John R., and Mwangi S. Kimenyi, "Attitudes towards Race and Poverty in the Demand for Private Education: The Case of Mississippi," *Review of Black Political Economy* 20:2 (1991), 5-22.
- Figlio, David N., and Joe A. Stone, "Can Public Policy Affect Private-School Cream Skimming?," University of Florida and University of Oregon working paper (1999).
- Huang, Gary, Sameena Salvucci, Samuel Peng, and Jeffrey Owings, "National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues" National Center for Education Statistics working paper no. 96-03 (1996).
- Lankford, Hamilton, and James Wyckoff, "Primary and Secondary School Choice Among Public and Religious Alternatives," *Economics of Education Review* 11:4 (1992), 317-337.
- , "The Effect of School Choice and Residential Location on the Racial Segregation of Elementary Students," State University of New York-Albany working paper (1997).
- Lankford, Hamilton, E. S. Lee, and James Wyckoff, "An Analysis of Elementary and Secondary School Choice," *Journal of Urban Economics* 38:2 (1995), 236-251.
- National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics—1993*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993).
- United States Kerner Commission, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968).

APPENDIX

TABLE A1.—MEANS OF SELECTED VARIABLES

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth Grade (1)	Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth Grade (3)	Tenth Grade (4)
Baptist	0.1735	0.1633	0.2014	0.1915
Methodist	0.0949	0.1053	0.1030	0.1118
Lutheran	0.0757	0.0784	0.0862	0.0924
Other christian	0.2346	0.2401	0.2384	0.2414
Catholic	0.3377	0.3303	0.2932	0.2870
Jewish	0.0300	0.0332	0.0223	0.0241
Other religion	0.0298	0.0277	0.0325	0.0303
Mother graduated from high school	0.2934	0.2932	0.3052	0.3082
Mother has some college	0.4127	0.4174	0.4092	0.4120
Mother graduated from college	0.2011	0.2160	0.1815	0.1949
Father graduated from high school	0.2207	0.2217	0.2427	0.2491
Father has some college	0.3450	0.3548	0.3402	0.3462
Father graduated from college	0.3065	0.3191	0.2731	0.2834
Family income: \$15,000 to \$25,000	0.1490	0.1419	0.1702	0.1642
Family income: \$25,000 to \$35,000	0.1887	0.1938	0.2002	0.2087
Family income: \$35,000 to \$50,000	0.2546	0.2655	0.2400	0.2510
Family income: \$50,000 to \$100,000	0.2456	0.2609	0.2112	0.2230
Family income more than \$100,000	0.0554	0.0564	0.0453	0.0456
Public school student-teacher ratio	17.8568	17.3768	17.5796	17.1058
Public school expenditures per pupil	5.2791	5.2948	5.0558	5.0616
Public school graduation rate	0.9296	0.9382	0.9310	0.9358
Private school student-teacher ratio	14.6029	14.6339	14.5561	14.5391
Serious crime rate	0.0584	0.0593	0.0473	0.0473
Poverty rate (ages 5–17)	0.1554	0.1531	0.1594	0.1558
Dist. to closest private school (km)	4.0423	4.2710	9.8854	10.5785
Minority share of population	0.2794	0.2706	0.2177	0.2024
Black share	0.1520	0.1465	0.1161	0.1060
Asian share	0.0305	0.0295	0.0231	0.0217
Hispanic share	0.0903	0.0880	0.0700	0.0663
Poor minority share	0.0907	0.0874	0.0722	0.0666
Non-poor minority share	0.1872	0.1817	0.1443	0.1344
Poor black share	0.0562	0.0540	0.0445	0.0406
Poor Asian share	0.0053	0.0051	0.0039	0.0035
Poor Hispanic share	0.0272	0.0264	0.0210	0.0197
Non-poor black share	0.0945	0.0912	0.0707	0.0644
Non-poor Asian share	0.0252	0.0244	0.0193	0.0182
Non-poor Hispanic share	0.0629	0.0615	0.0487	0.0462
Sample size	10020	6927	13330	9511

Samples are the same as those used in table 2.

TABLE A2.—MEANS OF SELECTED VARIABLES

	Specification			
	PMSA Level		County Level	
	Eighth Grade (1)	Tenth Grade (2)	Eighth Grade (3)	Tenth Grade (4)
Minority share	0.2890	0.2921	0.3097	0.8082
Black share	0.1639	0.1643	0.1826	0.1801
Asian share	0.0389	0.0390	0.0406	0.0406
Hispanic share	0.0821	0.0848	0.0822	0.0834
Poor minority share	0.0937	0.0950	0.1079	0.1063
Non-poor minority share	0.1938	0.1955	0.2013	0.2012
Poor black share	0.0632	0.0627	0.0752	0.0731
Poor Asian share	0.0061	0.0061	0.0072	0.0069
Poor Hispanic share	0.0232	0.0250	0.0242	0.0240
Non-poor black share	0.0996	0.1004	0.1070	0.1065
Non-poor Asian share	0.0328	0.0329	0.0336	0.0338
Non-poor Hispanic share	0.0587	0.0595	0.0579	0.0582
Sample size	1750	2129	1872	2262

Samples are the same as those in table 3.