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Data Sources

Regarding sources of data related to the missed detections problem, the book Options for Estimating Illegal Entries at the U.S.–Mexico Border by the National Research Council (A. Carriquiry and M. Majmundar, Eds., 2013) includes summaries of most of the relevant scientific and technical literature through 2012. For example, Table 3-1 in the book summarizes nine surveys related to migration that are conducted in Mexico and/or the U.S. including sampling information (size, frequency, population) and questions asked. Examples are the Mexican Migration Project (MMP), the Survey of Migration at Mexico’s Northern Border (EMIF-Norte), and the Mexican Migration Field Research Program (MMFRP). Additional surveys of U.S. and Mexican households and surveys conducted in Mexican communities known to send migrants to the U.S. are also included. At the time the book was written it was assumed that the vast majority of migrants crossing the Southwest border were Mexicans, an assumption that is no longer valid.

Since 2012, there has been a greater need for data about non-Mexican migration, specifically migrants from the Northern Triangle of Central America (Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador), since the number of these migrants crossing the U.S. border has overtaken the number of Mexican migrants. Our project has focused largely on discovering information about these non-Mexican migrants. For example, the survey conducted at Mexico’s southern border (EMIF-Sur) is growing in importance. Interviews conducted with recently apprehended Central American migrants in the U.S. (see Center for Latin American & Latino Studies at American University) are very informative concerning factors such as fear of extortion and physical danger causing them to attempt to cross the border. Two other academic projects focused on Latin America, the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP at Vanderbilt University), and the Latin American Migration Project (LAMP at Princeton University) conduct recurring relevant surveys in Central America. NGOs such as Doctors Without Borders, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the Women’s Refugee Commission have conducted special purpose surveys of Central American migrants to document conditions in their home countries and reasons for leaving.

A recent addition to the compendium of data sources is an April, 2018 Washington Post article that documents a (previously secret) program run by the U.S. in Mexico in which biometric data are collected and stored for non-Mexican migrants being detained. To date, such data as finger
prints, ocular scans, and other identifying features like tattoos and scars have been collected for some 30,000 migrants. It is possible that such data will improve estimates of missed detections and recidivism in coming years.¹

A table summarizing these and selected other sources follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title, Locator (URL), Dates, Authors</th>
<th>Finding(s)</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tentative Relevance Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) hosted at Vanderbilt University [https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/](https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/)  
Pointer to survey questions: [https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/ab2016/AB2017-v18.0-Eng-170523_W.pdf](https://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/ab2016/AB2017-v18.0-Eng-170523_W.pdf)  
Dates: Beginning in 2004 and resurveyed every other year  
Authors: Mitchell Seligson (founder and currently senior advisor); Elizabeth Zechmeister, Director; Noam Lupu, Assoc. Director | Americas Barometer measures democratic values and behaviors in 29 countries | Interviews based on national probability samples of voting age adults. Collection used handheld devices (smartphones and tablets) | 2016/7 survey included data from 29 countries across the Americas. Sample sizes per country approx. 1500 to 1600. | Survey results are analyzed and reported by a large staff of faculty and students leading to numerous books and publications. One example: “Beneath the Violence: How Insecurity Shapes Daily Life and Emigration in Central America” shows that crime avoidance is one of the strongest predictors of intention to migrate. |
| Latin American Migration Project (LAMP) hosted at Princeton University and the University of Guadalajara [http://lamp.opr.princeton.edu/](http://lamp.opr.princeton.edu/)  
Dates: LAMP began operations in 1998. Surveys have been conducted in various countries in different years since then.  
Authors: Co-Directors: Jorge Durand Arp-Nisen and Douglas Massey; Project Mgr Karen Pren; Data Entry Specialist Veronica Lozano Canales | Extends the Mexican Migration Project (MMP) to migration flows originating in other Latin American countries | LAMP employs the ethnosurveys approach, which combines the techniques of ethnographic fieldwork and representative survey sampling to gather qualitative as well as quantitative data. | LAMP began in 1998 with a set of surveys conducted in Puerto Rico. It expanded later with fieldwork carried out in Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Haiti, Peru, and Guatemala. Ecuador is the most recent country included. | Survey results are a bit “hit or miss” in that a specific country, e.g. Honduras may not be included at all, and in other cases, the most recent survey may be out of date. The data, however, are a good source for many reports and publications concerning migration to the U.S. For those individuals with migrant experience the interviewer records the total number of U.S. trips, as well as information about the first and most recent U.S. trips, including the year, duration, destination, U.S. occupation, legal status, and hourly wage. This exercise is then repeated for first and most recent migrations within Mexico. |

¹ However, see Footnote Error! Bookmark not defined.
| Book: National Research Council. (2013). Options for Estimating Illegal Entries at the U.S.–Mexico Border | Chapters include an extensive history of Mexican migration, descriptions, summaries, and limitations of migration-relevant surveys, a description of US government data on undocumented migration, and model-based approaches to estimating migration flows. | This is a survey of the scientific literature available through 2012 concerning illegal Mexican migration to the U.S. with emphasis on quantitative analyses. | Includes published scientific literature through 2012. | This book is a gold mine of relevant scientific literature and analyses, although some of it is already dated, e.g. the assumption that the vast majority of illegal migrants crossing the Southwest border are Mexicans. Table 3-1 in the book is a very useful summary of surveys related to migration that are conducted in Mexico and/or the U.S. including sampling information (size, frequency, population) and questions asked. Included are the MMP, the EMIF-Norte, the MMFRP, and others. The book includes some analyses of deterrence, analyzes model-based approaches to estimating migrant flows and has an appendix dedicated to capture-recapture ideas. The book cites over 200 references, including virtually all important scientific references related to Mexican migration prior to 2012. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dates: Co-Directors: Jorge Durand Arp-Nisen and Douglas Massey; Project Mgr Karen Pren; Data Entry Specialist Veronica Lozano Canales | Authors: A. Carriquiry and M. Majmundar, Eds. Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education | | | |

| Report: Forced to Flee Central America’s Northern Triangle: A Neglected Humanitarian Crisis by Medecins Sans Frontieres ( Doctors Without Borders) | Reported extraordinary levels of violence in the NTCA countries; approximatively half of the migrants cited violence as a reason for their leaving | The survey consisted of asking questions directly to people about the acts of violence they have suffered and how they felt about them. A cluster sampling method was used. | 467 migrants, mostly from the NTCA were surveyed. | While limited in numbers and time, this report includes results of migrants surveyed in Mexico along several migration routes on their way to the U.S. Note that the survey occurred after Mexico had implemented its policy of significantly increasing the apprehension of such migrants. The Medecins Sans Frontieres/Doctors Without Borders group produces surveys and reports on many other displaced groups. |
| Dates: In 2015 to 2016 the MSF surveyed and interviewed migrants from the Northern Triangle at “albergues” in Mexico documenting their reasons for leaving as well as violence and medical issues encountered en route. | Authors: Medecins Sans | | | |
### EMIF Norte

**The Center for Latin American and Latino Studies (CLALS) is at American University**

http://www.american.edu/centers/latin-american-latino-studies/index.cfm

**Dates:** Founded in 2010, CLALS pursues projects in migration, the role of religion, organized crime, the environment, and more.

**Authors:** Eric Hershberg, Director; Dennis Stinchcomb, Assistant Director for Research; Robert Albro Assoc. Research Professor; Alexandra Vranas, Program Coordinator

CLALS has numerous ongoing and archived projects

CLALS studies use a variety of data sources, including government and non-government data and interviews with recent arrivals from Central America.

While a number of recent studies and papers have focused on the Northern Triangle, CLALS also has worked on issues in Cuba, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Mexico, and Peru.

Papers coming from CLALS workshops and projects are usually quite good, and some are relevant to the missed detections and deterrence issues. Kantor and Egan had an extended conversation with Hershberg, focusing mainly on recent interviews of migrants from the Northern Triangle of Central America.

### UNHCR

**United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**

http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/

**Dates:** Founded in 1950 in response to the refugee crises following WW II. Responsible for the international protection of refugees, especially children. Data archives date back 50 years or more.

**Authors:** The current High Commissioner is Filippo Grande whose term runs through 2020.

UNHCR sponsors and contributes to numerous reports and publications concerning the displacement and treatment of refugees.

Interviews of children are constructed to be “child-sensitive” containing open-ended questions encouraging the children to tell the story in their own way.

Recent UNHCR work has included a focus on children and families migrating to the U.S. from the NTCA and Mexico.

UNHCR is an international organization charged with protecting refugees worldwide, especially children. For purposes such as the "surge" in UACs coming from the NTCA, the UNHCR may be a source of data concerning the causes of migration whether the children have parents or relatives in the U.S., etc.

### EMIF Norte and EMIF Sur

**Surveys of Migration at Mexico’s Northern and Southern Borders**

https://www.colef.mx/emif/eng/index.php

**Pointer to questionnaires (in Spanish) used each year:**

https://www.colef.mx/emif/eng/preguntas.php

**Dates:** EMIF Norte started in 1993 to measures the size and characteristics of flows of migrant workers between Mexico and the U.S. EMIF Sur was started in 2004 as a similar survey at the Mexican/Guatemalan border.

**Authors:** Both surveys are managed by the following institutions: El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF), the

Each year substantial data sets are published on the volume, trends, characteristics, and effects on labor forces. Publication, Annual Reports, Newsletters, Related Articles and Theses are also available

Surveys are conducted based on a stratified random sampling of a large location X time grid. The locations have been identified based on a lot of previous research and when a specific flow might

EMIF Norte surveys include:

- Migrants from the South, 15- and older, Mexican residents who do not plan to return;
- Migrants from the North, 15 and older who are either residents of the U.S. or Mexico;
- and

These are substantial and well recognized ongoing surveys. Much of the survey and results (questions, labeling of results, etc.) are in Spanish. It is likely that the EMIF Sur is becoming more important recently, given the increased flow of migrants to the U.S. from the Northern Triangle of Central America, and the recent strengthening of Mexican attempts to apprehend and return undocumented migrants crossing Mexico’s Southern border.
The Secretariat of Government, the National Population Council, the Secretariat of Labor and Social Welfare, Migration Policy Bureau of Secretariat of Government, the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs, and the National Council to Prevent Discrimination. And in 2015 the Secretariat of Social Development joined the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be found (e.g. a bus station’s arrival gate between 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM)</th>
<th>Migrants returned by the U.S. to Mexico. Sample size is 14,000 respondents. EMIF Sur includes sets of migrants based on Country of Origin (Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala), Destination (Mexico or U.S.), and Return Condition (returned either by U.S. or Mexican Immigration Officials).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Book:** "Childhood, Migration, and Human Rights" (2015) based on research directed by The Center for Gender & Refugee Studies at the University of California Hastings College of the Law and the Migration and Asylum Program, Center for Justice and Human Rights at the National University of Lanús, Argentina.[https://cgrs.uchastings.edu/Childhood-Migration-HumanRights](https://cgrs.uchastings.edu/Childhood-Migration-HumanRights)

**Dates:** The Center for Gender and Refugee Studies was founded in 1999. It maintains a database of asylum records and decisions and works with international human rights agencies to address the underlying causes of forced migrations that produce refugees.

**Authors:** The book comprises 13 chapters written by partnering organizations, including the Women’s Refugee Commission, the UNHCR, and various centers.

The book examines the root causes of the forced migration of children and families in the Northern Central America–Mexico–United States corridor. It evaluates the policies, practices, and underlying conditions of countries of origin, transit, and destination; and each chapter used publicly available data and in-country surveys. For example, the chapter on Guatemala surveyed children between 12 and 17 who had been returned to Guatemala from the U.S. or Mexico.

Interviews of repatriated children: Honduras (200); Guatemala (47); El Salvador (83) plus focus groups with potential migrant children.

The book is the result of a two-year regional investigation into the treatment of Honduran, Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Mexican, and United States citizens and permanent resident children affected by migration. It examines the root causes of the forced migration of children and families in the Northern Central America–Mexico–United States corridor. It also analyzes the re-integration programs for children repatriated to the Central American Northern Triangle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and universities in the Northern Triangle and Northern and Southern Mexico.</td>
<td>examines their effects on children throughout the region, particularly with respect to the violation of children’s rights. The authors also analyze the effectiveness of reintegration efforts for repatriated children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates: 1977-2013</td>
<td>Used the MMP and LAMP databases which surveyed people in their home countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors: Katherine M. Donato and Blake Sisk, Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Considered all children residing as a child (40 years of age or younger) in a household headed by a parent. Created a subsample of those who migrated to the U.S. as minors between 1977 and 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows strong effect of parents’ earlier migration to the U.S. on the likelihood of children’s migration (both authorized and unauthorized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19ACK: The Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized</td>
<td>“The &quot;residual method&quot; is, however, a widely-accepted methodology for estimating the size and certain characteristics, such as age and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pew Hispanic Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates: 2005
Authors: Jeffrey S. Passel


Dates: 2000
Authors: Passel, Van Hook, Bean Bureau of Census and SABRE systems.

21ACK: A Post-Apprehension Survey of Unauthorized Immigrants along the U.S.-Mexico Border http://www.borders.arizona.edu/cms/sites/default/files/Post-Apprehension-Survey-REPORT%20may31-2013_0.pdf

Dates: 2013; Data collected in 2012 by interviews
Authors: Mark Grimes Elyse Golob Alexandra Durcikova Jay Nunamaker BORDERS COE DHS S&T University of Arizona National Center for Border Security and Immigration

Relevance: This may be the best interview data by persons not working for the government. The methods look sound to me. We can draw some qualitative results from it, but must note that it is 5 years out of date. Warning: I am not sure what the numbers in Table c.1 mean. I have written to them.

This is a large study: (N=1000) FINDINGS: A: "According to this study, in general, detainees who are more likely to attempt to recross the border are those that: • have relatives or friends in the United States, • have a job in the United States, • have relatively more education than other detainees, • live in the United States (or consider the United States home), • are relatively familiar with crossing options and dangers, and/or • have made relatively more attempts at crossing. What are the effects of the consequences of national origins, of the undocumented population based on official data. This methodology essentially subtracts the estimated legal-immigrant population from the total foreign-born population and treats the residual as a source of data on the unauthorized migrant population (Passel, Van Hook, and Bean 2004)." I added this reference to our table.

In Passel’s study for Pew the methods are detailed here: http://www.pewhispanic.org/2006/03/07/note-on-methods-and-terminology/
apprehension? For individuals with motivations listed above, the consequences of apprehension do not seem to be a major deterrent”
B: “B: Individuals who had higher numbers of attempts and higher numbers of apprehensions, or who had experienced more success in crossing in the past, were more likely to indicate they would attempt to re-cross”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of</th>
<th>Fraction with this number of attempts</th>
<th>This number of apprehensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a good summary (bottom of page 2) about specific plans for crossing again. Only 24% planned to cross again in same way. On p.5, they offer evidence of truthfulness, getting answers much closer to BP stats on recrossing than do agent interviews. Also check. p.10 overall apprehension rate: estimated 76% If I read their summary correctly, only 16% were not sure how or whether they would try again. The summary does not contain data on the question: Do you think you will return to the US someday? (yes, no, maybe, not sure) However, it appears in Appendix C as 38.1%. Only 7.4% (74 persons -- so +/-8 persons) intend to return within 7 days. It seems 60% of those had never been caught on previous attempt(s). Note: percentage of the time apprehended while crossing does not sum to 100%! ? An academic collaborator who clarified the Appendix C table. The (+/-x) is the difference between the group rate and the overall rate. Without numbers on the group sizes we cannot estimate the precision of any of these numbers. But for 7 days, they are parts of 74, so they will be small, several less than 20, perhaps.

w11456 Mexican Immigration and Self-Selection: New Evidence from the 2000 Mexican Census
Dates: 2000
Authors: Pablo Ibarraran;

Relevance: Low
From the NBER search
Abstract: We use data from the 2000 Mexican Census to examine how the education and socioeconomic status of Mexican immigrants to the United States compares to that of non-migrants in Mexico. Our
Darren Lubotsky

primary conclusion is that migrants tend to be less educated than non-migrants. This finding is consistent with the idea that the return to education is higher in Mexico than in the United States, and thus the wage gain to migrating is proportionately smaller for high-educated Mexicans than it is for lower-educated Mexicans. We also find that the degree of negative selection of migrants is stronger in Mexican counties that have a higher return to education.

Illustrative Ranges of the Distribution of Undocumented Immigrants by State

| Dates: 1994 |
| Authors: Edward W. Fernandez & J. Gregory Robinson |

Relevance: possibly useful for method. Beyond the scope of our project. Would require transfer of funds to Census to do the analysis, probably Population Division
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233
October 1994
POPULATION DIVISION TECHNICAL WORKING PAPER NO. 8

“Using both national estimates, therefore, the overall range for California shows a "lowest" estimate of 1.3 million undocumented immigrants and a "highest" estimate of 1.8 million of these persons.” This is about +/-25%.

U.S. gathers data on migrants deep in Mexico, a sensitive program Trump’s rhetoric could put at risk


Dates: Story was printed April 6, 2018. Data from 2017-2018.

Authors: Joshua Partlow and Nick Miroff

U.S. is collecting biometric data on non-Mexican migrants being detained in Mexico

Relevance: Apparently there has been biometric data collection in Mexico, under a State Department program “Operating in detention facilities in southern Mexico and here in the capital, Department of Homeland Security officials have installed scores of screening terminals to collect migrants’ fingerprints, ocular scans and other identifying features, including tattoos and scars.”

“The biometric program does not collect information on Mexican citizens, but over the past 13 months, it has gathered data on more than 30,000 migrants at immigration detention facilities in Tapachula, in southern Mexico, and at Iztapalapa, in Mexico City, according to figures obtained by The Washington Post.” This raises the possibility of looking for subsets who are almost sure to try to cross the border, after release. With this program, we already have biometric data on them!