

Primary and Repeat Migration: Comparisons of Hispanic, Black and non-Hispanic White Migration in the United States

By

Michael B. Toney

Email: mtoney@hass.usu.edu

and Edna H. Berry

email: eberry@hass.usu.edu

Population Research Laboratory

Department of Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology

Utah State University

and

John B. Cromartie, Geographer

Economic Research Service

United States Department of Agriculture

Email: JBC@ers.usda.gov

Extended Abstract Submitted for consideration at the 2004 Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America in Boston, MA

Introduction:

Repetitive behavior is widespread in human life. This applies in areas of behaviors that are typically infrequent as well as normative daily routines. Yet, some individuals never engage in some behaviors and individuals who initiate particular behaviors differ in the extent to which the behavior is repeated. In demography, one of the areas in which this general principle applies is between prior migration and subsequent migration with prior migrants being much more likely to migrate again than individual who have never migrated are to make a first migration. A major classification that emerged from this research was between *primary migration* and *repeat migration* with length of residence as a key consideration for prior migrants. Although a rich body of research emerged on this relationship (Goldstein 1954; DaVanzo and Morrison 1981) little recent research has built on this important area of migration research. Also, while there is an extensive body of research on Hispanic immigrants in the United States there is little research that compares the internal migration of Hispanics with non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks. A common note in the early research on primary and repeat migration was the need to examine the extent to which the relationship held across socioeconomic groups and settings. The main purpose of this research is to examine the extent to which Hispanic, Black and White primary and repeat migration rates differ once other migration related variables are controlled. Data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth that began in 1979 are used in the analysis. During the study period the respondents transit the ages during which families and careers are typically launched and when migration rates are high.

In his ground-breaking Norristown study Goldstein (1954) demonstrated that repeated movement by a small number of individuals in successive years accounted for a disproportionately large number of the areas total migration. Subsequent researchers revealed this pattern applied to the nation as a whole and Goldstein (1964) found cross national support for his Norristown study in an analysis of the Danish population register. The key finding in this research was that prior migrants were much more likely to migrate than were people who had never migrated. This distinction led to the separation of the populations into those at risk of a first migration and those at risk of a repeat migration, or primary and repeat migration respectively. One of the first extensions of this research line was referred to as the Cornell Mobility Model (Land 1969; Morrison 1967; Myers, McGinnis and Masnick 1967). The model stipulated that the probability of repeat migration decreases with increases in duration of residence largely due social and economic attachments that tend to form. Because of strong consistent support the relationship between duration and migration was referred to as the *axiom of cumulative inertia*.

Another important contribution was a study showing that the relationship between duration of residence and migration applied to all age groups (Morrison 1967). However, the form of the relationship varied by age. For example, young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 with short durations were about twenty times as likely to make a repeat migration as were young adults at long durations of residence. The oldest age group, ages 65 and over, also had higher migration rates at short durations but their rates

were only four times higher than the rates for this age group at long durations. Morrison (1967) placed his study in the context of migration differentials and points to a likelihood for duration specific migration rates to vary between social and economic groupings. In his examination of the extent to which the relationship between duration of residence and migration held in Mexico, Land (1967) stressed the need for research on the relationship between prior migration and subsequent migration with a broad variety of populations.

There is an extensive body of research on Black migration and comparisons of the migration of Blacks and Whites in the United States (Long 1988; Newbold 1997). Still, there is a gap in research comparing Blacks and Whites with respect to primary and repeat migration and an apparent absence of research on the primary and repeat migration of Hispanics in the United States. Early research suggests that there might be differences between race and ethnic groups. For instance, research based on the first national survey data on duration of residence showed a higher percentage of Whites than other groups with short durations of residence (Taeber 1964). Taeber was mainly interested in duration of residence and its implications for fixed interval migration measures rather than comparing migration rates in relation to prior migration status or at different durations. There have been some comparisons of primary and repeat migration of Blacks and Whites based on census information about place of birth, residence five years ago and current residence. Eldridge (1965) showed a higher age for White migrants among primary and other types of migrants but she did not include an examination of race differences in primary migration rates *per se*.

More recently, Newbold (1997) has provided detailed and informative census based comparisons of primary, return and onward migration patterns of Blacks and Whites. He found considerable similarities with respect to migration patterns such as migration toward southern and western states and away from the Midwest and Northeast for Blacks and Whites. But, Newbold also found some differences. Importantly, Blacks were less likely to make a primary migration, as defined by limited census data, than were Whites. Because of his focus on state to migration and data limitations he did not include controls for other factors, such as education, that might influence the relationships between race and primary or repeat migration. Prior research has shown that Whites are more likely than Blacks to make multiple moves during a specified interval of time, especially during the young adult years (Tucker and Urton 1987).

It is important to note that census data do not provide information to fully distinguish between primary and repeat migration because of the limited amount of information on prior residence and the absence of information on duration of residence. A complete distinction between primary and repeat migration and the subcategories of repeat migration, onward and return migration, requires the identification and timing of all prior residences. The analysis of return and onward migration, although very important facets of migration, is beyond the scope of this study. Indeed, researchers have noted that longitudinal survey data utilized in the most extensive studies of primary and repeat migration while providing information about residence over a number of years do not provide all of the needed information. The gap in comparisons across Hispanics, Blacks and Whites in these survey based analysis is undoubtedly related to the fact that the first

panel studies were surveys of Whites only or did not include a sufficient number of Blacks or Hispanics for comparative analysis.

There are a number of reasons why prior migration is related to subsequent migration and for expecting race and ethnic differences. Morrison and DaVanzo (1986) note that migration, itself, provides a learning experience that could easily influence subsequent decisions about whether to migrate. Even research on international migration shows that the presence of migrants in a community provides knowledge that influences the immigration of others as well as the migrants' subsequent movement (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003). Perhaps more important is the notion, as stated in the Cornell Mobility Model, that the development of various social and economic ties that impede repeat migration may take longer for some groups than others. Hirschman's (2001) adept application of the segmented-assimilation hypothesis to the educational adaptation of immigrant youth offers a general reason for expecting that prior migration experiences might have different influences on Hispanics, Blacks and Whites. He explains that some aspects of assimilation may be directly related to increases in duration of residence but that other adaptations are contingent on numerous other factors, including race and ethnicity. The character of the places receiving migrants is noted as important in determining the adaptation on in-migrants. Miller (1977) found that high socioeconomic status groups were more likely to make a repeat migration than were members of low status groups. This raises the possibility of differences in composition accounting for differences in race patterns of migration. Rosenbaum and Friedman (2001) note that the opportunity to live in locations possessing high-quality resources may be less for some race/ethnic groups and that this might diminish their ability to set up attachments that would hold them to a community. Conversely, widespread discrimination and the greater concentration of kin and friends for Blacks (Logan and Spitze 1994) and possibly for other minority groups might make them less likely to migrate in search of social or economic opportunity.

Perspectives on migration nearly always contend that migration is influenced by numerous factors. Age, education, home ownership, ages of children, employment status, and marital status are some of the personal characteristics often related to migration. Differences in characteristics across places, particularly in levels of economic opportunity, are typically viewed as determinants of migration. Fuller comparisons and analysis of race and ethnic differences in primary and repeat migration are needed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relative importance of these factors in determining migration levels in the United States. This research will compare the primary and repeat migration rates of Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites and provide a multivariate analysis to determine whether the extent of differences once key personal and place characteristics are controlled. The above personal characteristics will be included in the analysis along with county level measures of urban –rural levels, race/ethnic composition and employment opportunities.

Data and Methods :

The data for this study come from 20 interviews conducted between with the National Longitudinal Youth (1979) between 1979 and 2000. This panel initially consisted of over 12,000 youth between the ages of 14 and 21 when they were first interviewed in 1979. Two sub-samples within the larger representative national sample were purposely dropped by the early 1990s, largely related to funding. Yearly interviews were conducted through 1994 with interviews occurring every two years afterwards. The retention rate in 2000 for the representative sample was approximately 80 percent. Because of the need for race and ethnic comparisons the main sample was designed to include approximately 2000 Hispanics and 2000 Blacks. This is the first national panel survey to gather information on a sample of Hispanics as they pass through the young adult years and enter the mid-years of life.

In the initial survey respondents were asked if they had always lived in their current place of residence, identified at the county level. This question provides the basis for identifying subsequent primary migration. Those respondents who had always lived in their current place of residence were at risk of primary migration until they made such a migration. Subsequently, they became at risk of repeat migration along with the respondents who indicated that they had not always lived in their current place of residence in 1979. This study uses two year migration interval to measure migration by comparing place of residence every two years starting in 1980. A two year interval was utilized because of the switch to the two-year interview interval after 1994 and research indicates that a two year interval is an appropriate one for measuring migration (Logan 19??). A person year strategy is utilized in the analysis. Each respondent can potentially contribute 10 units of analysis in this scheme, one for each of the two-year migration intervals. This approach allows the accumulation of relevant information, such as whether a migration had previously occurred, from one interval or person year to the next and an analysis of the determinants of migration across these discrete person years. Because of response differences some respondents contribute more person years than other respondents.

At this time a bivariate analysis has been largely completed of the relationship between race/ethnicity and primary and repeat migration. This descriptive analysis also includes a comparison of primary migration by race/ethnicity and age and of repeat migration by race/ethnicity and duration of residence. Comparisons of race ethnic primary and repeat migration are reported for educational groups and for urban and rural residents. A logit analysis to determine the effects of race and ethnicity independent of other social and economic factors will be completed within the next two months. This analysis will be conducted separately for primary and repeat migration. Independent variables are measured at the beginning of the interval. This is an important advantage for panel data over census and cross sectional survey data. This is important in identifying the direction of causation since migration is recognized as a potential cause as well as consequence of social and economic characteristics (Sandefur and Scott 1981).

Results:

Table 1 shows substantially higher rates of repeat migration than primary migration for Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites. The repeat migration rates are more than twice as high as the respective primary migration rates for each group. Interestingly, Hispanics have significantly lower rates of primary and repeat migration than do Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites. The primary migration rates for non-Hispanic Whites (9.3 percent) is nearly 60 percent higher than the primary migration rate for Hispanics and 39 percent higher than for Blacks. Hispanics also have a significantly lower repeat migration rate than Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites, 13.4 percent compared to 22.5 percent and 24.4 percent respectively.

Lower rates of primary migration for Hispanics than for non-Hispanic Whites exist through the young adult ages, until age 30, but are not significantly lower for ages 30-34 and 35-45 (Table 2). The rates are higher for each group during the young adult years and low once they begin to enter the mid-years. But, the primary migration rates for Hispanics during the young adult years are comparatively low, never reaching above 8.4 percent. Non-Hispanic Whites in the young adult age groups have primary migration rates (as high as 15.1 percent) that are higher than the overall repeat migration of Hispanics observed in Table 1. The primary migration rates for Blacks are substantially higher than Hispanic for the age group below 18 but are more similar to the Hispanic rates afterwards.

Table 3 shows that Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites have much higher rates of repeat migration at short durations of residence than at longer durations. Indeed, the repeat migration rate for the respective groups after 10 or more years of residence are similar to their overall rates of primary migration reported in Table 1. For example, the repeat migration rate for Hispanics with three or less years of residence is 36.5 percent compared to 4.8 percent for Hispanics with ten or more years of residence. Still, Hispanics have significantly lower rates of repeat migration at each duration of residence than do Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites. After 10 or more years of residence non-Hispanic Whites have a repeat migration rate of 11.1 percent compared to a rate of 4.8 percent for Hispanics and 7.4 percent for Blacks.

There are few significant differences between the primary migration rates of Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites once education is controlled (Table 4). The greatest differences are between the primary migration rates of Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites who are still enrolled in school. It may be that Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites are more likely to migrate when they finish school. A large number of respondents are passing through the ages when education is typically completed. Since education is measured at the beginning of such a pattern could create this result.

Table 4 also shows repeat migration rates for Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites by education level. Here the repeat migration rates are significantly lower for Hispanics than for Blacks or Hispanics at each level of education. For each group, the highest repeat migration rate for those who have completed their education is for college graduates. The repeat migration rate for non-Hispanic Whites is 29 percent compared to

18 percent for Hispanic college graduates. As with primary migration, the highest repeat migration rates are for those still in school at the beginning of the interval.

Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites living in rural areas at the beginning of migration intervals are equally likely to make a primary migration with rates of 8.8 percent, 9.4 percent and 8.8 percent respectively. The rates of primary migration for Hispanics in urban areas is significantly lower than the primary migration rates of non-Hispanic Whites, 5.6 percent compared to 9.4 percent respectively. With repeat migration, Hispanic rates are lower than the rates of Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites regardless of type of residence at the beginning of the migration intervals. Notably, the differences between rates of repeat migration are greater between Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites who were living in Urban areas at the beginning of the intervals than for between those living in rural areas at the beginning of the migration intervals. This is mostly due to a particularly low rate of repeat migration for Hispanics in Urban areas, 12.7 percent.

Conclusions:

This research has built on an early line of research that emphasized prior migration as an important determinant of subsequent migration. The major empirical finding in this research was that a relatively small number of individuals who repeatedly migrated accounted for much of the nation's migration. Individuals who had never migrated up to a specified time were much less likely to subsequently migrate than were individuals who had previously migrated. The high rates of repeat migration suggested that people with short durations of residence would be more likely to migrate than prior migrants who had not made a recent migration. Tests of a model referred to as the Cornell Mobility Model of migration confirmed this pattern. Research also demonstrated that people the relationship, higher rates of repeat migration at short durations of residence, held for different age groups and that it was applicable in other countries. Little recent research has directly related to this body of research although length of residence and prior migration are common variables in general studies of migration. Another major gap in this research was the lack of race and ethnic comparisons of primary and repeat migration.

The key finding of this study is lower rates of primary migration and repeat migration for Hispanics than for Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites. The differences are most prominent with respect to repeat migration. Hispanics who have previously migrated are much less likely to make a repeat migration than Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites regardless of their duration of residence, level of education level or rural-urban residence type. In several cases the non-Hispanic Whites are twice as likely to make a repeat migration as are Hispanics. Many of the differences between the primary migration rates of Hispanics and the other two groups are not significant when age, or education are controlled or between Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites in rural areas. Research to be reported in the final draft of this paper will determine the extent to which differences exist once these factors and other factors are included in a logit analysis. This more extensive analysis will incorporate home ownership, employment status, number and ages of children, and

marital status as personal factors and minority population composition and level of economic opportunity as place factors.

Results of this study are important for increasing understanding of the determinants of migration. The Cornell Mobility Mode suggests the lower rates of repeat migration for Hispanics might indicate stronger community attachments for them than for Blacks or non-Hispanic Whites and perhaps that Hispanics form ties more quickly. Other perspectives might suggest that the higher concentration of Hispanics in a few states makes their social networks smaller and thereby leads to lower rates of migration. The smaller social network would lead to less information about opportunities in many locations and to the absence of a local Hispanic community that would help attract Hispanic newcomers. In contrast, the widespread dispersion of non-Hispanic Whites provides a greater flow of information through race/ethnic specific communication channels. In the end, the possibility that discrimination accounts for the lower repeat and primary rates for Hispanics must be recognized and discussed. The implications of chronic migration as outlined by Morrison ((1971) will be considered in drawing final conclusions.

References:

Sara R. Currran and Estela Rivero-Fuentes 2003 "Engendering Migrant Networks: The case of Mexican Migration' *Demography* 40 (2) 289-307

Hope T. Eldridge 1965 "Primary, Secondary and Return Migration in the United States, 1950-60" *Demography* 2:444-455.

Julie S. Davanzo and Peter A. Morrison 1981 "Return and Other Sequences of Migration in the United States." *Demography* 18 (1) 85-101.

Sidney Goldstein 1954. "Repeated Migration as a Factor in High Mobility Rates." *American Sociological Review* 19 (5) 536-541.

Sidney Goldstein 1964 "The Extent of Repeat Migration: An Analysis Based on the Danish Population Register." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 59 1121-1132.

Charles Hirschman 2001 "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis." *Demography* 38(3) 317-336.

Kenneth C. Land 1969 "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: Further Evidence." *Demography* 6 (2) 133-140

John R. Logan and Glenna D. Spitze 1994 "Family Neighbors" *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (2) 453-476.

Larry Long 1988 *Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage.

Ann R. Miller 1977 "Interstate Migrants in the United States: Some SocialEconomic Differences by Type of Move." *Demography* 14:1-17.

Peter A. Morrison 1967 "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: The Evaluation of A Stochastic Model of Internal Migration." *Demography* 4:553-561.

Peter a. Morrison 1971 "Chronic Movers and the Future Redistribution of Population: A Longitudinal Analysis" *Demography* 8(2) 171-184.

George C. Myers, Robert McGinnis, and George Masnick 1967 "The Duration of Residence Approach to a Dynamic Stochastic Model of Internal Migration: A Test of the Axiom of Cumulative Inertia." *Social Biology* 14 (2) 121-126.

K. Bruce Newbold 1997 "Race and Primary, Return, and Onward Interstate Migration." *Professional Geographer* 49 (1) 1-14.

Karl E. Taeuber 1961 "Duration –of Residence Analysis of Internal Migration in the United States." *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 39:116-131.

C. Jack Tucker and William L. Urton. 1987. "Frequency of Geographic Mobility: Findings from the Natinal Health Interview Survey." *Demography* 24 (2) 265-270.

Table 1: One Year Primary and Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites– 1979-1994.

	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>
Hispanics	4.0 (5975)	11.3 (17820)
Blacks	4.3 (15284)	15.1 (21391)
Whites	5.8 (19704)	17.5 (58580)
Total	5.0 (41503)	15.8 (97791)

Table 2: One Year Repeat Migration Rates at Specified Durations of Residence for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites – 1979-1994.

	Years Of Residence			
	<u>< 3 Years (N)</u>	<u>3-5 Years (N)</u>	<u>6-9 Years (N)</u>	<u>10 or More</u>
Hispanics	22.2 (4282)	10.9 (2503)	6.5 (2377)	4.7 (5861)
Blacks	24.2 (6948)	13.7 (3269)	8.6 (2316)	6.0 (5416)
Whites	25.4 (20882)	15.5 (9548)	10.5 (6607)	8.8 (12827)
Total				

Table 3: One Year Primary Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Age – 1979-1994.

	Age Groups					
	<u><18 (N)</u>	<u>18-20 (N)</u>	<u>21-24 (N)</u>	<u>25- 29 (N)</u>	<u>30-34 (N)</u>	<u>35> (N)</u>
Hispanics	3.9 (855)	5.7 (1266)	4.3 (1680)	3.0 (1557)	2.1 (585)	
Blacks	4.4 (2163)	6.7 (3303)	4.6 (4433)	3.0 (4106)	2.4 (1733)	
Whites	6.0 (2970)	8.4 (5709)	6.6 (5709)	3.7 (4749)	2.0 (1866)	
Total						

Table 4: One Year Primary Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Education at the beginning of the Interval: 1979-1994.

	Still	Education Completed			
	Enrolled	< 12 Years (N)	12 Years (N)	Some College (N)	College (N)
Hispanics	4.8 (1660)	3.6 (1189)	3.6 (2135)	3.7 (781)	4.5 (200)
Blacks	6.1 (4105)	4.0 (3089)	3.4 (6070)	3.9 (2110)	5.1 (1057)
Whites	8.7 (5375)	4.4 (2576)	4.5 (8504)	4.8 (2174)	6.3 (1057)
Total					

Table 5: One Year Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Education at the End of the Interval – 1979-1994.

	Still	Education Completed			
	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>< 12 Years (N)</u>	<u>12 Years (N)</u>	<u>Some College (N)</u>	<u>College (N)</u>
Hispanics					
Blacks					
Whites					
Total					

Table 6: Two Year Primary and Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites – 1980-2000.

	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>
Hispanics	5.9 (3598)	13.4 (10275)
Blacks	6.7 (9285)	22.5 (10843)
Whites	9.3 ((10870)	24.4 (30282)
Total		

Table 7: Two Year Repeat Migration Rates at Specified Durations of Residence for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites – 1980-2000.

	Years Of Residence			
	<u>< 3 Years (N)</u>	<u>3-5 Years (N)</u>	<u>6-10 Years (N)</u>	<u>10 or More</u>
Hispanics	36.5 (2063)	17.6 (1258)	8.2 (1278)	4.8 (3520)
Blacks	47.6 (2856)	28.9 (1463)	16.3 (1175)	7.4 (3520)
Whites	43.2 (9420)	26.2 (4641)	17.3 (3681)	11.1 (7922)
Total				

Table 8: Two Year Primary Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Age – 1980-2000.

	Age Groups					
	<u><18 (N)</u>	<u>18-20 (N)</u>	<u>21-24 (N)</u>	<u>25- 29 (N)</u>	<u>30-34 (N)</u>	<u>35> (N)</u>
Hispanics	7.9 (484)	8.4 (407)	7.7 (846)	4.6 (828)	3.9 (696)	2.7 (328)
Blacks	11.2 (1231)	9.8 (1061)	8.8 (2226)	4.6 (2144)	3.6 (1719)	2.5 (904)
Whites	15.1 (1638)	13.9 (1380)	11.5 (2823)	6.4 (2376)	4/0 (1743)	2.9 (910)
Total						

Table 9: Two Year Primary Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Education 1980-2000.

	Still	Education Completed			
	Enrolled	< 12 Years (N)	12 Years (N)	Some College (N)	College (N)
Hispanics	8.4 (723)	4.6 (734)	5.4 (1418)	5.7 (557)	5.3 (152)
Blacks	12.0 (1755)	6.1 (1816)	4.9 (3949)	5.6 (1455)	9.0 (299)
Whites	17.6 (2281)	7.2 (1816)	7.0 (5038)	6.1 (1497)	10.3 (677)
Total					

Table 10: Two Year Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Education – 1980-2000

	Still	Education Completed			
	Enrolled	< 12 Years (N)	12 Years (N)	Some College (N)	College (N)
Hispanics	15.0 (1324)	12.0 (1324)	14.0 (3417)	14.0 (1706)	18.0 (646)
Blacks	30.0 (1481)	22.0 (1863)	21.0 (4336)	21.0 (1925)	27.0 (1001)
Whites	34.0 (4955)	24.0 (3989)	20.0 (11149)	23.0 (4394)	29.0 (5209)
Total					

Table 11: One Year Primary and Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Place of Residence at Beginning of Migration Interval – 1979-1994.

	<u>Rural at Beginning of Interval</u>		<u>Urban at Beginning of Interval</u>	
	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>
Hispanics	8.9 (281)	16.2 (1155)	3.7 (5640)	10.5 (16237)
Blacks	5.5 (2929)	17.8 (3250)	4.0 (12797)	14.0 (17579)
Whites	5.4 (6182)	18.0 (13935)	5.8 (13350)	16.7 (42858)
Total				

Table 12: Two Year Primary and Repeat Migration Rates for Hispanics, Blacks and Whites by Place of Residence at Beginning of Migration Interval – 1980-2000.

	<u>Rural at Beginning of Interval</u>		<u>Urban at Beginning of Interval</u>	
	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>	<u>Primary (N)</u>	<u>Repeat (N)</u>
Hispanics	8.5 ((201)	20.1 (742)	5.6 (3354)	12.7 (8936)
Blacks	9.4 (1701)	26.8 (1677)	6.0 (7534)	21.5 (8630)
Whites	8.8 (3502)	25.8 (7171)	9.4 (7291)	23.9 (39119)
Total				