GANG MIGRATION: PATTERNS AND MOTIVES OF MIGRATION OF MARA

SALVATRUCHA 13 AND OTHER SALVADORAN GANGS INTO THE UNITED

STATES

————————

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the College of Criminal Justice

Sam Houston State University

————————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

————————

by

Alejandro A. Ferrer

August, 2012

GANG MIGRATION: PATTERNS AND MOTIVES OF MIGRATION OF MARA

SALVATRUCHA 13 AND OTHER SALVADORAN GANGS INTO THE UNITED

STATES

by

Alejandro A. Ferrer

_____

APPROVED:

_____
Dr. Kate Fox
Thesis Director

_____
Dr. Philip Lyons

_____
Dr. Mitchell Roth

_____
Dr. Charles M. Katz

Approved:

_____
Vincent J. Webb
Dean, College of Criminal Justice

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to all those who have endured the horrors of a war, whether in the battlefield or on the streets, those who have been victims of atrocities and those who have been forced to leave their country in search for a better life.

To the two most influential immigrants in my life: my parents.

ABSTRACT

Ferrer, Alejandro A., <u>Gang migration: Patterns and motives of migration of Mara Salvatrucha 13 and other Salvadoran gangs into the United States</u>. Master of Arts (College of Criminal Justice), August, 2012, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

      The flow of illegal immigrants has been a topic of discussion among politicians and scholars over the last decade. It has been argued that immigrants increase criminal activities. This is a result of Hispanic immigrants being perceived as criminals and gang members; even though only a small percentage of these individuals belong to criminal organizations. The primary objective of this study is to examine the different reasons behind the migration of gang members, gang associates and non-gang members. The question that will be answered is whether gang members migrate in search of economical benefits and expansion of their criminal networks, while other groups migrate to the United States in search for opportunities or to separate themselves from the lifestyle they pursued in El Salvador.

      This quantitative study consists of interviews with citizens from El Salvador who were detained by immigration authorities. Data were collected at two different Immigration and Customs Enforcement facilities in California. The interviewees answered an in-person interview survey that included sections on immigration, victimization, criminal activities, gang relationships and social networking. Subjects who admitted gang membership or gang association were compared to those with no gang relationship; the data collected was used to examine the motives behind their migration and the patterns of movement from El Salvador into the United States. The analyses aimed to advance our understanding of the motives for migration of these individuals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to thank Dr. Kate Fox, the chair of my thesis committee, whose patience and guidance allowed me to work to the best of my abilities. Her work philosophy and her outlook on life have inspired me to become a better researcher. I am also grateful for Dr. Philip Lyons' and Mitchel Roth's participation in my committee. Their opinions and suggestions greatly increased the quality of my research.

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Charles M. Katz and the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety at Arizona State University for allowing me to participate in the data collection process that made this project possible, and specifically Dr. Katz for serving as member of my thesis committee. His knowledge and experience in the field of gang research have inspired me to continue my investigation in the subject.

I would also like to thank everyone who stood by my side while I worked on this project. My mother who, although far away in distance, was always by my side; my aunt Rosie Martin and my family in Mexico for always being there when I needed the extra support and encouragement; Margaret Melcher and my extended family in Colorado for believing in me and helping me reach my objectives; and the research team from Arizona State University who made this project possible. It was a pleasure working with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Illegal immigration is an extremely sensitive and important issue in contemporary United States. It is estimated that there are over eleven million illegal immigrants in the country (Passel & Cohan, 2011). The flow of immigrants into the United States is no longer primarily of European origin (Martinez, Stowell, & Lee, 2010) as it was at the beginning of the 20th century. Martinez, Stowell, and Lee (2010) estimated that in 2000, nearly a quarter of the population in the average neighborhood in San Diego was born outside of the United States, which is an increase of 53% in two decades. With more than 75% of the immigrant population flowing north from the south, the United States–Mexico Border has supplanted Ellis Island as the main point of entry into the U.S. (Martinez, Stowell, & Lee, 2010). The growing population of immigrants into the United States has triggered various responses from both local and federal governments.

In terms of legislative responses to immigration, the U.S. Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996 (IIRIR). This act expanded the powers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) by allowing the detention and deportation of any immigrant (legal or not) who was charged or convicted of a drug offense, or who otherwise was sentenced to a penalty exceeding one year in prison (Guerrete & Clarke, 2005). The IIRIR resulted in the deportation of thousands of gang members of Salvadoran origin back to their home country. Once they arrived in El Salvador, they resorted to a variety of methods to return to the United States, creating a constant flow of immigrants between both countries. The deportation of gang members served as a way to export gang culture to El Salvador.

While immigration is a problem in the United States, the phenomenon of foreign gang members immigrating is only a reflection or a consequence of a combination of factors in other countries. Lack of education, scarcity of employment opportunities, elevated levels of violence, and social disorganization are some of the many reasons that persuade immigrants to leave their home country and search for better opportunities beyond their native territory. However, it is difficult to determine the legitimacy of the intentions of immigrants, especially if they have been previously deported from the United States.

The primary objective of this study was to examine the different reasons or motives behind the migration of gang members, gang associates and non-gang members into the United States. The question that will be answered through the analysis of collected data is whether gang members migrate in search of economical benefits and expansion of their criminal networks, while associates and non-gang members migrate to the United States in search of economical opportunities and better living standards.

This descriptive study consists of interviews with citizens from El Salvador who were detained by immigration authorities. Data were collected at two different Immigration and Customs Enforcement facilities in California. The interviewees answered an in-person interview survey that included sections on immigration, victimization, criminal activities, gang relationships and social networking. Subjects who admitted current or former gang membership or gang association were compared to those with no gang relationship; the data collected were used to examine the motives behind their migration and the patterns of movement from El Salvador into the United States.

Understanding the motives of migration and the differences between gang members, gang associates and non-gang members, will advance the gang and immigration literatures and may be particularly important for policy makers interested in enacting anti-gang legislation. It is necessary to differentiate individuals with gang membership from those who have no gang relationship when applying sanctions and penalties for immigration violations. One objective of this project is to help policy makers understand that there are different motives to the migration of Salvadoran immigrants and measures need to be adopted to differentiate those who seek better opportunities from those who wish to expand their criminal networks.

CHAPTER II

GANGS IN CENTRAL AMERICA: HISTORY, MOTIVES, AND MEMBERSHIP

History of Salvadoran Gangs

The history of Salvadoran gangs, like Mara Salvatrucha, cannot be explained without analyzing the social, political, and military factors that characterized El Salvador in the late 1970s. During that era, social and political instability were increasing in Central America and people were looking for solutions. Youth started socializing with the purpose of finding a sense of security amongst themselves, which led to the creation of gangs in the region. Hagedorn (2008) affirms that gangs have existed in Central American countries since before the civil war took them over. Youth gangs have been a historic characteristic of Central American cultures (Jütersonke, Muggah & Rodgers, 2009). From Hagedorn's perspective (2008), gangs have long existed hiding within socially disorganized countries and are usually formed by youth in poor neighborhoods, factors that characterize El Salvador and other Central American countries. Cruz (2010) agrees with Hagedorn regarding the nature of gangs in Central America when he explains the origin of these groups. He mentions that "social exclusion, galloping urbanization, the socio-political disarray […], and problematic family dynamics" are the factors that led to the birth of gangs in El Salvador (Cruz, 2010, p.384).

In the 1970s, many Central American countries shared a common denominator: political and social instability. The countries in the region were pervaded with social unrest and many of them were on the edge of civil wars (Oliver, 1999). From the fall of the Somoza regime in Nicaragua, to the fear of Soviet influences in Guatemala, the social

climate across the stretch of land that communicates North and South America became heated, creating a volatile environment (Oliver, 1999). The border of Honduras and Nicaragua was inhabited by the Nicaraguan Resistance, a military group known as the "Contras" (Oliver, 1999, p.150). The Salvadoran government, along with its Honduran counterpart, was struggling to rid their own country's borders of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) which was a very active and well armed group (Oliver, 1999). These violent scenarios were parallel to extreme levels of poverty and malnourishment of the population.

In 1980 the conflict in El Salvador erupted in a civil war that lasted until 1992. It is possible that the civil war could have lasted longer, but Pruss (2010) argued that the United States funded the Salvadoran government, allowing the local authorities to take a hardened stand against the FMLN. It is difficult to determine exactly how many Salvadorans died or how many fled the country during the war. The most accepted figure is of 75,000 casualties and over 1 million immigrants, who mostly settled in California (The Maldon Institute, 2004).

During the civil war in El Salvador, children as young as 14 years old were recruited by the guerrilla and the army (Etter, 2010). During the conflict, many of these youths left El Salvador with their families and sought a new life in the United States (Etter, 2010). Upon their arrival in North America, Salvadoran immigrants started forming their community in the Rampart area of Los Angeles, a predominantly Mexican district (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). There, the newly arrived immigrants were constantly harassed and rejected by the local Hispanic community who did not welcome these immigrants because of their nationality (Diaz, 2009; The Maldon

Institute, 2004). As a result of the social strain, the Salvadorans needed a network to

protect each other and formed groups to protect their community from African American

and Mexican gangs like Barrio 18 - also known as 18th Street gang or Mara 18 - which

was created in that area in the 1960s (Jütersonke at al., 2009; The Maldon Institute, 2004;

U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). According to Logan and Bain (2006),

Barrio 18 did not allow anyone who was not full blooded Mexican to join its ranks, but

Jütersonke et al. (2009) claim that 18th Street Gang expanded in the late 1970s because of

the flow of non-Mexican immigrants from Central America joining their ranks searching

for social inclusion[1]. The presence of both groups in Central America allows us to

assume that these groups are now formed by members of multiple nationalities, and not

only Salvadoran or Mexican nationals.

The Maldon Institute (2004) suggests that the formation of gangs was not a

surprising event, because many of the immigrants already had ties to *maras*[2] (gangs) in

El Salvador, as well as military training and combat experience (Etter, 2010). Various

maras were active in El Salvador in the late 1970s, such as Mara Mozarán, Mara Gallo,

---

[1] Johnson and Muhlhausen affirm that Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Mara Calle 18 (18th Street) began proliferating in Los Angeles during the 1960s. However, the immigrants who formed Mara Salvatrucha in Los Angeles were fleeing El Salvador due to the civil war which lasted from 1980 through 1992 (Pruss, 2010).

[2] The term "mara" was used as part of Salvadoran jargon before the gangs adopted it in the 1980s; it refers to any group of people, and was the equivalent of the English word *folks* (Cruz, 2010). Others indicate that the name *mara* is an abbreviation of the word "marabunta" which refers to ants that attack in swarms and have the ability to create grave damage (Elbert, 2004). A literal translation of the word refers to a group or a gang. The term *mara* has different connotations, and it has led to recurring debates regarding its literal meaning. Etter (2010) affirms that the name Mara Salvatrucha comes from La Mara Street in San Salvador, and Salvatrucha, the colloquial name given to the FMLN who fought the civil war. The Maldon Institute (2004) contends that "Salva" is short for Salvadoran, and "trucha" is slang for "fear us" or sometimes "guerrilla." In colloquial Spanish "trucha" is often used as an adjective meaning "awake," "witty," or "prepared." Logan and Kairies (2006) recognize this definition and explain that Salvatrucha is a word used to describe a streetwise Salvadoran. Gangs existed in Central America before the armed conflict, but their presence did not become noticeable due to the violent environment that led to a civil war. The number 13 represents the letter "M", 13th letter of the alphabet, and is used to signify their allegiance to "La Eme" (The M), a common name for the Mexican Mafia in the Southern California prison system (Logan & Bain, 2006; Logan & Kairies, 2006; The Maldon Institute, 2004).

Mara Quiñonez, Mara AC/DC, Mara No Se Dice, and Mau Mau among others (Cruz, 2010). Jütersonke et al. (2009) explain that "maras" or "pandillas" (gangs) started as neighborhood self-defense groups that could be considered vigilantes of the Salvadoran communities. These groups quickly adopted specific behavioral patterns that, combined with their experience in military operations, allowed them to develop their own gang-warfare (Jütersonke et al., 2009). The groups of immigrants started engaging in theft, extortion, and drug trade, which resulted in a profitable business (Logan & Bain, 2006). These were the circumstances under which Mara Salvatrucha-13 (MS-13) was founded by Salvadoran immigrants in Los Angeles (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007).

Immigration and Deportation of Salvadoran Gang Members

Once the 12 year civil war ended (1980-1992), many of the families who resided in Los Angeles returned to El Salvador, a country in poverty, with weakened governmental structures. Along with their belongings, they brought back a new identity and a new culture. At the same time, in the United States, the immigrant communities in Los Angeles started gaining strength and growing rapidly. Along with that growth, a proliferation of criminal activity obligated the government to take action. As a result of the Los Angeles riots (also known as the Rodney King Riots or the Rodney King Uprising) (Diaz, 2009) in the aftermath of the Rodney King trial in 1990, the U.S. government decided to start deporting all immigrants who engaged in criminal acts and were sentenced to one year of prison or more (The Maldon Institute, 2004). Initially deporting 1,000 gang members, the immigration process aggravated the situation in the Central American countries, particularly in El Salvador.

Upon arrival in their homeland, deported gang members started a criminal enterprise to pursue financial stability, which allowed them to return to the United States (The Maldon Institute, 2004). Salvadoran gangs started incorporating their Los Angeles gang culture into the local gangs. As a result, youth in these groups started imitating the style of the recently arrived deportees from the United States, and even changed the names of their groups to accommodate the street credit of the American-born gangs, including Mara Salvatrucha 13 and Barrio 18 (Cruz, 2010). Salvadoran gang members wore American-style gang clothing, adopted certain tattoos, identified one another as *mara*s, and became more violent (Carranza, 2004)[3]. In sum, the three factors that bolstered the growth of gangs in El Salvador include: the gang members bringing American gang culture to Central America, local youth gangs that had no future or ambition after the war (many of whom had military training and combat experience), and the lack of faith in the government after the civil war concluded (Elbert, 2004).

Although gangs existed in Central America before the war and before the refugees started returning to El Salvador (Cruz, 2010; Hagedorn, 2008), some scholars have blamed the growth of gangs in Central America on the United States government. For example, Arana (2005) contends that the aggravated social situation in El Salvador is a direct result of the United States' deportation policy of returning gang members to countries they barely knew. In addition, U.S. authorities withheld information regarding the deportees, failing to tell the "receiving governments" that the deportees were active gang members who had been convicted for certain crimes (Diaz, 2009, p.164). However, Carranza (2004) argues that gangs thrived as a result of many factors that have to do with

---

[3] The deportations and immigration of Salvadoran gang members are discussed in depth in the following chapter, but a brief description of the mobility of these groups is provided here to clarify the circumstances that have influenced the development of MS-13.

decades of violence and social unrest in El Salvador. Hagedorn (2008) makes clear that the relationship among Salvadoran gangs, the civil war in El Salvador, and the social instability in the region cannot be disentangled. These particular characteristics are the reason why gangs have found an environment that bolsters their growth and their expansion (Hagedorn, 2008). Carranza (2004, p.3) argues that the belief that gangs are a result of the war, or a result of the deportations of criminals to Central America, overlooks many influencing factors that have incubated a cultural "construction of violence." One of the reasons why Central American countries are vulnerable to violence is that they are geographically located between the "world's largest drug producing and drug-consuming countries" (Howell and Moore, 2010, p.16). However, drug trafficking is not the only cause of violence in El Salvador and other Central American countries. The availability of weapons and the dilapidation of formal social structures are a consequence of armed conflicts (Elbert, 2004). According to Hagedorn (2008), countries that have experienced civil war often suffer the appearance of clandestine armed groups, some formed by children who participated in the armed conflict, creating an environment that allows the formation of gangs. Currently, El Salvador is home to two primary transnational gangs, or criminal organizations: 18th Street Gang and Mara Salvatrucha-13 (Carranza, 2004).

Prevalence of Salvadoran Gang Membership

Despite the challenges faced when measuring street gang membership –especially those with international connections- researchers have estimated the membership of Central American gangs, focusing primarily on MS-13 and 18th Street Gang. Campo-Flores (2005) estimates that there are approximately 700,000 MS-13 gang members in

the world. Cruz (2010) more recently suggests that the number of gang members in

Central America is around 67,000, with more than 50% residing in Honduras. Arana

(2005) places the numbers at 10,000 active members in El Salvador, with another 20,000

young associates. Arana's evaluation of Honduras reflects much higher numbers, with

40,000 members in a country of roughly 6.8 million people. The Maldon Institute (2004)

estimates that there are more than 250,000 gang members in Central America. On the

other hand, Central American police forces have stated that there are around 600,000

active gang members in the region (Elbert, 2004). Some analysts suggest that there are

over 100,000 gang members in Honduras and as many as 600,000 in El Salvador (Logan

& Bain, 2006). The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency [SIDA]

(2008) establishes gang membership in Central America between 70,000 and 100,000.

Collectively, gang membership fluctuates from 10,000 to 700,000 in Central America.

These numbers reflect a serious problem that is present throughout many countries and

presents a direct problem to different regions. Nonetheless, the numbers of gang

membership are nothing but "soft estimates" that are adopted as true as they "progress up

the information chain" in law enforcement agencies (Diaz, 2009, p.10).

  While the number of members has fluctuated from a few thousand to more than

half a million in Central America, it is estimated that there are over 750,000 gang

members in the United States in more than 20,000 gangs[4] (Papachristos, 2005). The

National Gang Intelligence Center (2009) estimated that there are approximately 900,000

gang members in the United States, with more than 147,000 serving a sentence in federal,

state and local correctional facilities. In comparison, the Federal Bureau of Investigation

estimates that there are 30,000 street gangs in the United States, with 800,000 members

---

[4] This number includes all gangs, not only Central American groups.

(Loosle, 2006). As a result of its membership and presence, Mara Salvatrucha-13 holds a place at the top of the list; their international presence is what makes MS-13 unique (Logan & Kairies, 2006). The inconsistencies in the measurement of gang membership are partially a result of the different levels of involvement in the gang. The constant mobility of gang members and the various levels of gang association make it difficult to assess real gang membership and establish concrete numbers of gang affiliates.

Level of Salvadoran Gang Involvement and Recruitment

The discrepancies in the reports regarding membership rates may be attributed to difficulties measuring level of gang involvement. There is not one clear and universal definition of what constitutes a gang or what can be defined as gang membership (Diaz, 2009). However, different levels of involvement among Central American gangs have been reported, including: *activos* (actives) who are formal members; *colaboradores* (collaborators), who are not formal members of the gang but are close affiliates to the group; and, *calmados* (calmed or inactive) are those who have received permission to cease participation within the group (Carranza, 2004). The membership of groups like MS-13 may be inflated given researchers' inability to distinguish between individuals who are formally affiliated with a gang and those who claim membership but are only "wannabes" (Pruss, 2010, p.166). Elbert (2004) mentions that it is important to be prudent when looking at the membership numbers, because of challenges with corroborating the information or determining the validity of the measurement. Therefore it is necessary to investigate the level of involvement of individuals before making assumptions about their gang membership. While doing so, it is also important to analyze

the characteristics of youth who join these groups and understand the factors that play a role in the decision to join a gang.

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) studied the characteristics of youths who join gangs and the structure of Salvadoran gangs. Through interviews and surveys with members of cliques, families and authorities, SIDA (2008) analyzed the characteristics of youth who are at risk of getting involved with gangs, finding that youth from broken homes with low economical levels and, in many occasions, with children, are at a slightly greater risk of joining Salvadoran gangs. However, SIDA (2008, p.25) ultimately draws the conclusion that "there are no factors or parameters which per se or by themselves possess predictability concerning who becomes a gang member or not, but rather a specific combination of individual and collective conditions and situations" (SIDA, 2008, p.25). SIDA (2008) explored the culture and organization of the gangs, their activities, reasons for joining, interaction with their neighborhoods and means of leaving the group, finding similarities with U.S. gangs and their culture, but also identifying social and cultural factors in the region as being influences in the gang structure, recruitment and means of departure from the gang. SIDA (2008, p.8) emphasized the complexity of interviewing these individuals due to a "lengthy process of permission seeking, from both the *mara* leader and the prison authorities."

Other literature has studied specific characteristics of individuals, such as acculturation into American society. Youth who have difficulties adapting to the community have a higher likelihood of joining a gang (Miller, Barnes & Hartley, 2011). However, acculturation might be a problem that has started to decrease within gangs.

Research has found that MS-13 members in the United States are usually second

generation immigrants whose ages vary from 11 through 21 years old (The Maldon

Institute, 2004), and not necessarily born outside the United States. The percentage of

gang members who were born outside the United States may still play a significant role

on the identity of the gang and its members, but no data are available to support this

assumption.

The process in which a youth is recruited into a gang in Central America is

considerably similar to the process in the United States. Johnstone (1983) explains that

gangs in the United States use different methods for recruiting members, from forceful

tactics, to using the youth's sense of honor as leverage. Gangs will test the youth's

physical abilities and challenge him/her to carry out certain activities like fighting, or

availability for risk taking before allowing formal recruitment, but he concluded that the

final decision to join the group is "more often voluntary than forced" (Johnstone, 1983,

p.282). Making the final decision of which gang to join is based on the exposure the

youth has to different groups within his neighborhood or the near proximity (Goubaud,

2008). In the case of El Salvador, the two most viable options are MS-13 or 18th Street.

Although Johnstone (1983) and Goubaud (2008) have established that affiliation with a

gang is mostly voluntary, Logan and Kairies (2006) present the testimony of an

individual who was threatened into joining a gang. The interviewee explained that

members of MS-13 told him that his options were to join or disappear; through this

violent approach MS-13 has incorporated entire smaller gangs into its ranks (Logan &

Kairies, 2006), which is similar to the process of "patching in" or "patching over" in

motorcycle clubs (Quinn & Kock, 2003). However, the literature that addresses means of joining Salvadoran gangs is limited and requires further analysis.

Most of the available literature has primarily focused on MS-13. The sources that address 18th Street gang are limited, but the social policy of 18th Street is very similar to MS-13's. Research has shown that both *maras* share many other similar activities. A study on the behavior of youths belonging to these two gangs found some important characteristics: both of the gangs have similar pastimes and leisure activities; the majority of their members join voluntarily; the testing period is similar; and, new recruits are quickly exposed to violence (Goubaud, 2008). The protocol for an initiation appears to follow a pattern of physical confrontation, and it is also similar in both *maras*.

Similar to the formal initiation procedures in the U.S., a rite of passage of a new member to both MS-13 and 18th Street is "brincarse" (jumped in). In this ceremony of initiation the new recruit is physically beaten by several members ranging from 13 seconds (MS-13) to 18 seconds (18th Street) (Carranza, 2004). Logan and Kairies (2006) interviewed a former member of MS-13 who explained that he was 16 or 17 when he was jumped into the gang, but had seen "seven-year-olds already covered with MS-13 tattoos" (2006, para. 3). However, not all initiations are conducted the same way. A former female gang member explained that her initiation involved stealing, being jumped in for thirteen seconds, and killing a member of the rival 18th Street Gang (Elbert, 2004). Other times females will have to engage in sexual intercourse with members of the gang to be initiated (SIDA, 2008). Once initiations are completed, there is a significant and profound emotional distancing from the family (Carranza, 2004). At this point the youth

is a member of the gang and starts absorbing the identity and adopting the gang's habits,

perhaps substituting the role of family.

Life as a Member of a Mara: Benefits, Behavior, and Departure from the Gang

Gangs have become support structures for troubled youth around the world,

particularly in El Salvador and other Central American countries. In these countries,

community and familial support have decreased, steering marginalized youth into *mara*

affiliation (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). Youth seek out *mara*s for

support, protection, friendship, and financial stability (Logan and Kairies, 2006; U.S.

Congressional Research Service, 2007). MS-13 appears to be aware of these youths and,

as an avenue for recruitment, MS-13 has created at least two sports teams in the Los

Angeles area and in Galveston, Texas, which allows them to legitimize their *mara* as a

social group, facilitating the recruitment of new members (Etter, 2010). The more people

join the gang, the quicker they will be able to control their neighborhoods.

Once recruited, the new *mara* member will start adopting behavior and other

characteristics from the gang and its members. Salvadoran gangs, particularly MS-13 and

18th Street, tend to identify themselves not only by a name, but also by symbols like

graffiti, clothing and hand signs (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). However,

there are differences within the groups that allow their members to differentiate

themselves from other cliques. MS-13 groups on the East Coast of the United States and

in Central America have closer ties to their pre-Hispanic heritage, which is reflected on

their extensive tattoos (Etter, 2010). Facial tattooing is popular within Central American

gangs, and it is more commonly displayed by members who have served prison sentences

(Etter, 2010). Other attitudes are adopted by members in other regions, such as overtly

defiant behavior during court hearings or an arrogant challenging attitude when being

interviewed (Elbert, 2004). As Elbert (2004) mentions, the combination of these

characteristics provides a clear picture of the lack of respect the *mara* members have for

society and the authorities.

Similar to U.S. gangs, Salvadoran gangs tend to control entire neighborhoods,

establishing their way of life as the lifestyle of their community (SIDA, 2008). Gangs

have already taken control of at least fifteen of two hundred and sixty two Municipalities

in El Salvador (Arana, 2005), and entire neighborhoods in the capitals of Honduras and

Guatemala (Bruneau, Dammert & Skinner, 2011). The Salvadoran police believe that

seventy percent of the extortions committed in El Salvador are carried out by *maras*

(Cruz, 2010). Carranza (2004) mentioned that many of the gang's activities are controlled

from within the Salvadoran prison system. Members in prison have substantial influence

over the members outside; being in prison is not a limitation for the members to exercise

their role in the organization (Carranza, 2004). In other words, going to prison is not a

way for *maras* to leave the gang.

It is possible to leave a Salvadoran gang, but not easy and perhaps not all gangs

allow it. In the case of MS-13 and 18th Street, religious conversion, marriage, drug

rehabilitation programs, and enlistment in the military are some of the ways in which a

gang member can turn away from the *mara* (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007).

The structure of each gang dictates whether leaving is possible or not. In some instances,

leaving the gang can be considered as deserting and could lead to ritualistic violence

(Pyrooz & Decker, 2011) or the death of the deserter (SIDA, 2008), a concept known as

"Blood in, Blood out," which is the notion of a "lifelong bond to which one commits

when joining […] a gang" (Diaz, 2009, p.262). Interestingly, SIDA reported that 44-55%

of the *mara* members they interviewed expressed a desire to leave the organization and

find a job or better education (SIDA, 2008). Besides the social consequences that might

result from leaving the gang such as loss of friendship and fear of victimization by their

own *mara*, absconders will also face grave obstacles such as the loss of financial benefits,

lack of opportunities in the job market, lack of support from the authorities and rejection

from family and friends (SIDA, 2008). The combination of these factors appears to be a

good reason for the members who wish to leave the gang to find opportunities away from

their home town. It is possible that the easiest way for them to find a better way of life is

by migrating to the United States, where job opportunities are available for low-skilled

jobs. However, the issue of gang desistance has been understudied and not clearly

understood (Pyrooz & Decker, 2011).

Salvadoran Gang Structure

*Mara*s remain somewhat furtive and, like any criminal organization, they do not

physically reflect their true structure and dimension (Goubaud, 2008). Research has

found that most gangs lack a hierarchical structure and the necessary manpower to

conduct business as a criminal enterprise (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007).

In the particular case of MS-13, research has found that this Central American gang is

organized horizontally, with many smaller sub- groups and no central leadership (U.S.

Congressional Research Service, 2007). Examining the structure of gangs will allow for

an understanding of the way in which they function.

Maras adopted the structure of gangs in Southern California. In order for *maras* to

be able to control individual neighborhoods they created cliques, or "clicas," which allow

them to control different locations at the same time (Cruz, 2010). The clique structure

gives the youth a sense of belonging to the group and withers other social bonds

(Jütersonke et al., 2009). Each clique operates like a franchise, as if they are

"independently owned and operated" but they still retain affiliations with the corporation

such as MS-13 or 18th Street (Etter, 2010, p.2). Cliques can range from a dozen to 80

members and will adopt their own name, but they belong to the primary *mara* (The

Maldon Institute, 2004). Like franchises, *clicas* also fall under a semi-corporate structure.

Clicas are the bottom most basic group, *jenga* is a group of many *clicas*, and *pandilla*

madre (mother gang) is the one that controls the *jengas* (Goubaud, 2008).

Once the general structure of the *mara* has been established, it is possible to

analyze the inner structure of each clique. Etter (2010) establishes four hierarchical levels

of participation in Salvadoran gangs: at the top is the *shot caller,* who gives direct orders

to three *captains*, one in charge of drugs, the other one in charge of weapons and the final

one in charge of finances. Each *captain* has a *lieutenant* and underneath the *lieutenants*

are the *soldiers*. Although it appears to be a logical description, Etter (2010) does not

mention the source of his information or if this structure has been confirmed by current or

former gang members. Other sources have provided alternative explanations of the

structure of the *maras.* For example, the Salvadoran Anti-Gang Commission affirms that

there is one leader who is responsible for the gang at a national level in El Salvador;

beneath him[5] there is a zone leader who controls two or three cliques by controlling the

gang member responsible for each clique (Carranza, 2004).

---

[5] Although *maras* recruit female members who become active within the ranks of the gang and comprise 20-40% of membership, female gang members continue to play a "subordinate role" and are rarely accepted as leaders (SIDA, 2008, p.13)

Carranza (2004) describes that cliques in El Salvador are formed by a recruiting group; a *shock* group who is in charge of defending the gang's territory; a *delinquent* group who carries out the criminal activities; and, an *information group* in charge of monitoring the authorities and publishing propaganda. Goubaud (2008) agrees that there is one administrator of each clique, called *ranflero*, who calls for meetings or periodical reunions where decisions will be made, groups will be evaluated and individual or group behavior will be regulated. The *ranflero* also serves as the gang's treasurer (Goubaud, 2008). He talks about a *primera y segunda palabra* (first and second word[6]) who are the ones in charge of meetings (Goubaud, 2008) or as Carranza (2004, p.14) calls them, *palabrero*, who simultaneously plays the role of a paternal figure within the gang. Clique members are called *jomies* (homies) or *jombois* (homeboys); *Veteranos* (veterans) are the members deported from the United States; who enjoy special prestige, but do not play a special role or occupy a special position of leadership (Goubaud, 2008; SIDA, 2008). The gang also interacts with other individuals who are not active members. These individuals are called *transeros* who are mostly drug distributors and their relationship is purely commercial; *piperos* are crack cocaine addicts that live near the *maras*, and are often used as lookouts (Carranza, 2004). These *piperos* are not subject to the anti-*mara* laws that have been enacted in Central America. Finally, *banderos* are members of criminal groups who conduct business in drugs, weapons, cars and kidnapping (Carranza, 2004). These groups have no formal relationship to MS-13 or 18th Street gang, but might be a reason for the inaccuracy of the reports of membership previously addressed.

---

[6] The literal translation of "palabra" is "word." While the name of these members makes no grammatical sense in English, "palabra" refers to the member in charge of "having the word" or "having the floor."

Salvadoran gang members do not accept the idea of receiving orders from other members; instead they have mentioned the concept of many leaders who hand out orders (SIDA, 2008). Neither MS-13 nor 18th Street follow a single chain of command, but they share a historical origin and consider themselves united to other members through this heritage (Jütersonke et al., 2009). Manwaring (2005) affirms that within these organizations no officials are elected, no laws or boundaries are respected and no responsibility is owed to anyone outside the organization.

Recognizing MS-13 and 18th Street as super gangs with corporate organizations is common in certain governmental circles (Dones, 2010) with the intention to adjust these gangs to the "enterprise theory" which allows criminal investigators to focus on entire organization's criminal structures, particularly when they have connections to guns and drugs (Diaz, 2009, p.100). Even though the discourse of the *mara*s emphasizes the horizontal participation of each member in the group (SIDA, 2008), Dones (2010) claims to have evidence of the *maras* evolving into organized and well structured criminal networks. However, the internal discourse of the gang indicates that the distribution of power is more "horizontal than vertical" (Goubaud, 2008, p.37).

Anti-Gang Policies and Programs in El Salvador and Central America

As a result of the proliferation of *maras* in Central America, local governments took action and responded to the growth of these gangs with strict measures to control crime. When elected as president of Honduras in 2001, Ricardo Maduro initiated an aggressive stance against the *maras* by establishing a "zero tolerance" policy against gangs and gang members (Arana, 2005). These measures were retaliatory actions against the gang because four years prior to the election his son had been murdered by maras

(Arana, 2005). Under his new policy, police were permitted to arrest individuals suspected under the suspicion of being members of a gang, and even arrested individuals for displaying gang tattoos or doing hand signs, which resulted in sentences as long as 12 years in prison (Arana, 2005). Similar policies were then adopted by El Salvadoran, Guatemalan and Panamanian governments (Arana, 2005). Seelke (2010) evaluated the efficiency of *Mano Dura*, an anti-gang zero tolerance effort conducted initially by the authorities in El Salvador and Honduras. Despite the efforts of the government to control the growth of gangs and stop the elevated levels of violence, the long lasting effects of this program are far from beneficial. The levels of violent crime have remained the same; innocent youth have been unlawfully arrested and recruited into gangs while in prison; and the amount of arrests has created a prison overcrowding problem (Seelke, 2010).

Not only have the programs not worked, but according to some researchers, they have aggravated the situation. Cruz (2010, p.381) states that *maras* are the result of "the cultural flows attached to the region's intensive migration, combined with organizational processes that took place in response to the zero tolerance and *mano dura* [hard-hand] crackdowns and policies in Central America." The response of the gangs to *mano dura* was harsher than expected and violence has increased in the countries that have instituted it, while remaining stable in countries who have adopted alternative approaches to the gang problem (Hagedorn, 2008; Jütersonke et al., 2009). One of the most publicized incidents was the attack on a public bus by members of MS-13. The gang members ambushed the bus and opened fire with military grade weapons, and then they entered the vehicle and shot many of the survivors (Diaz, 2009). During the attack 28 passengers were killed, including 7 children (Arana, 2005). With the attack, MS-13 made a statement

that they would not go down without a fight. Arana (2005, p.103) mentions that at least a

dozen young victims were killed and decapitated in Honduras and Guatemala, showing

"grisly symbols of *maras*' undiminished power." Jütersonke et al., (2009) argues that

operations against gangs can generate negative or excessive acts of brutality and new

techniques to avoid capture. As a result of many of these measures gang members have

found ways to adapt to the new legislations to continue their activities (Bruneau,

Dammert & Skinner, 2009).

In 2004 the Panamanian President launched a plan with the opposite connotation.

Mano amiga (friendly hand) is a crime prevention program that provides alternatives to

gang membership for youths at risk (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). On one

side, Honduras and El Salvador adopted aggressive measures against gangs, while on the

other, Nicaragua and Panama adopted prevention strategies. The U.S. Congressional

Research Service (2007) and Hagedorn (2008) found that the stronger the measure to

control gangs is, the stronger the response by gangs will be against the program. The

countries establishing harsh programs, such as El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala,

have seen a significant escalation on criminal activity (Hagedorn, 2008). On the other

hand, Nicaragua and Panama have been able to control gang activity through different,

friendlier, approaches to the gang problem, finding positive results from their efforts

(U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007)[7]. Despite the results, Guatemala's

authorities adopted "Plan Escoba" (Operation Broomsweep) in 2004. The program

allowed authorities to treat minors as adults, and deployed 4,000 reserve troops in

troubled neighborhoods in and around the capital (Jütersonke et al., 2009). Some

---

[7] It can be noted that the different results of the implementation of anti-gang policies can be a result of cultural differences between countries or different levels of gang activity; however, the identity of groups like MS-13 is prevalent across international borders.

researchers have said that these policies have started a war between gangs and the police (Logan & Bain, 2006). These programs not only affected the structure of the gangs, but also the gang member's environment. Many members of gangs have financial responsibilities with their families, because 57% of female gang members have children and 42% of males are parents (Goubaud, 2008; SIDA, 2008). Although being a parent does not necessarily mean that there is a financial responsibility or commitment, the penal sanctions that are excessively repressive may provoke instability within the social fabric of the neighborhoods where they live (Goubaud, 2008). The situation has been aggravated as a result of the killings of gang members by vigilante groups who operate in the area (Seelke, 2010).

Sombra Negra

As a result of the prevailing social unrest in El Salvador and the growth of *maras*, vigilante groups have started finding alternative solutions to the gang problem. By the mid 1990s many deportees had attempted to return to the United States claiming that *Sombra Negra* [Black Shadow], a vigilante squad that besieged gang members, had targeted them for execution (Johnson & Muhlhausen, 2005; Seelke, 2010). A deportee in El Salvador stated that he had heard rumors about death squads targeting tattooed gang members (Zilberg, 2004). Members of El Salvador's higher classes, including politicians, have been accused of paying off-duty police officers to murder gang members (Logan & Bain, 2006).

Vigilante groups have been rumored to be Salvadoran security forces that kidnap and kill MS-13 members when they return to El Salvador from the United States (Corbiscello, 2008; The Maldon Institute, 2004). *Sombra Negra* emerged in 1995 and

was accused of murdering more than ten gang members between 1994 and 1996 (Carranza, 2004). Human rights advocates in El Salvador blame these vigilante groups and government negligence for the death of MS-13 members (Boermann, 2007; U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). More than 2,800 gang members were the target of executions by death squads in El Salvador between 1998 and 2005 (Boerman, 2007). It has been argued that the murders are perpetrated by Salvadoran security forces (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007), however, there are no documented reports of the police participating in these killings.

The existence of vigilante groups, along with the poor living conditions in El Salvador, is one of the motives for the return of gang members to the United States. MS-13 has grown as a result of social, political and economic factors in Central America and the United States. As mentioned before, the growth of this Salvadoran gang has been, in part, the responsibility of the United States and its deportation policies. In order to understand the effect of these policies on the expansion of criminal groups, it is necessary to analyze the effect of immigration on crime and the role immigrant gang members play on this phenomenon.

CHAPTER III

IMMIGRATION AND CRIME

The United States of America has been a haven for immigrants for many years. Since the historical beginning of the country, immigrants from all over the world have arrived searching for opportunities and a better way of life. However, not every immigrant enters the country legally or follows the necessary requirements to become a legal resident. Over the last few years, an increased flow of illegal immigrants has been the motive of discussion among politicians, scholars and members of society (Aguirre & Simmers, 2008; Guerrette, 2007).

Two primary issues have arisen regarding illegal immigration: the first issue focuses on the lack of acculturation that immigrant communities demonstrate as well as the social inequalities that these communities face when residing in the United States (Franco, 1983; Miller & Gibson, 2011; Morenoff & Astor, 2006; Smart & Smart, 1995); the second issue concerns the non-existent regulations and filters to screen immigrants who are entering a country illegally and the means in which they enter (James, 2005), as well as the impact these groups have on criminal activities. Butcher and Piehl (1998) described four ways in which immigration can have an effect on criminality, including: immigrants can commit more crimes than native born people; immigrants can crowd the employment market taking opportunities from native citizens; immigrants may be more likely to be apprehended; and, immigrants can be subjected to longer sentences and unfair treatment as a result of their ignorance of the legal system. However, according to Reid, Weiss, Adelman and Jaret (2005), when looking at the micro-level phenomenon of immigration, the real question is whether immigrants commit more or less crime than the

people who have been born in the host country. It is a simple question, but, as they state "due to the dearth of available data" (2005, p.763), it has proven extremely difficult to answer. Researchers have attempted to explain the role of immigration on crime through different criminological theories such as social disorganization. While the findings remain inconclusive, a discussion of their arguments is presented in the following sections.

The Role of Social Disorganization on Immigration and Crime

According to social disorganization theory, areas with large proportions of immigrants are culturally complex and are often characterized by a plurality of value systems, norms, and experiences, which limit the development of effective social control structures (Herzog, 2009). In their original theory, Shaw and McKay (1942) argued that ethnic heterogeneity, which is influenced by factors such as residential concentration of ethnic and immigrant minorities, had traditionally been perceived by social disorganization theorists as disruptive for community organization; and consequently highly criminogenic. Warner (1999) summarized the general neighborhood disruption by saying that ethnic heterogeneity diminishes community ties. She argued that racial and ethnic differences among people may impose barriers to friendships, thereby limiting the communication within the neighborhood and the "consequential potential for informal control" (Warner, 1999, p. 101). Similarly, Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush (2001) contended that communities that lack strong social networks do not have the ability to find collective social values, thus being unable to maintain informal social controls that would bolster a safer environment. Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls (1997) described the link of cohesion and creation of common expectations of control as Collective Efficacy.

This concept refers to the tasks that are assigned to a collectivity to maintain social order. Therefore, when a community lacks ties as a result of their racial, cultural or religious heterogeneity, and lacks a standard of social values, there are no social networks to protect the neighborhood from criminal activities. As Lee and Martinez (2002) mention, the original disorganization theorists had a primary concern regarding the potentially adverse impacts that immigration, as a social process, and the escalation of ethnic heterogeneity would have on the ability of social institutions and informal means of control to be able to supervise the behavior of neighborhood residents, which could be then translated into an increase of criminal activities.

More specifically, neighborhoods that are characterized by elevated levels of ethnic heterogeneity and immigrant population are at a higher risk of becoming criminogenic. Martinez and Lee (2000) affirm that immigrant residential concentration has a proclivity of occurring in poor neighborhoods with low socioeconomic status and high unemployment, thus creating higher levels of social disorganization and strain. Research indicates that the level of economic deprivation in an area, both in relative and absolute terms, influences crime rates (Blau & Blau, 1982). With these two statements it is implied that when immigrants settle into a neighborhood with high levels of social disorganization, including poverty, and face a lack of employment opportunities, criminal activity might be the only available means to achieve their goals (see also Merton, 1938).

Contemporary studies have suggested that Shaw and McKay's (1942) theory, and their position on immigration, does not apply to modern communities. Martinez, Stowell and Lee (2010) focused a considerable part of their efforts analyzing the impact of immigration on criminal activities. While studying this phenomenon, the aim of their

study was concentrated on Shaw and McKay's (1942) theory of social disorganization.

Through the analysis of the impact of immigration on homicides at a community level in

San Diego, California, from 1980 to 2000, they reached the conclusion that the

communities studied by Shaw and McKay (1942) have no resemblance to the new

immigrant communities formed in southern California. Due to the differences in social

structure and mobility, the original theory of social disorganization did not necessarily

apply to those communities. They conclude their argument stating that immigration

allows disorganized neighborhoods to regain an identity and become revitalized, thus

eliminating strain and alleviating social disorganization (Martinez, Stowell & Lee, 2010).

Competition for Employment

Some studies have evaluated the relationship between social disorganization in

immigrant neighborhoods and economical challenges, and how these two factors may

influence crime in certain areas. Lee, Martinez and Rosenfeld (2001) argue that

immigration can be criminogenic when associated with three factors: economical

disadvantages, the conflict of social norms and the weakness of social control across

ethnic groups. These elements play a role with the combination of economic, cultural and

institutional factors (Lee, Martinez & Rosenfeld, 2001). When studying the job market,

illegal immigrants are at a clear disadvantage compared to other ethnic groups when it

comes to finding a variety of employment opportunities (Merton, 1938). As a result of

their illegal status and perhaps lack of technical skills, illegal immigrants tend to obtain

low-skilled jobs, which do not require them to register with any government agency

(Butcher & Piehl, 1998). Due to their clandestine nature, most likely, they are often paid

excessively low wages that are not reported to the authorities, or as Miller and Gibson

(2011, p.8) refer to them, "menial, practically unlivable wages." Morenoff and Astor (2006) explain that the American economical system resembles the shape of an hour-glass; they state that the immigrant population is at the bottom of the glass, facing extremely difficult challenges to climb to the top. To achieve their goals, immigrants must go through a narrow passage where competition and legal obstacles are encountered. Overcoming these obstacles is impossible for many immigrants, so they are unable to reach the upper part of the glass, which is where the high-skill professional and technical jobs are located (Morenoff & Astor, 2006). It is important to mention that the authors make no differentiation between legal and illegal immigrants; therefore it is possible that the opportunities for undocumented aliens are far more limited than those available to legal residents.

Some scholars contend that immigration elevates crime by increasing the share of the population with low educational attainment, marginal labor market skills, and poor employment prospects (Ousey & Kubrin, 2009). Thus an increase in immigration will elevate the competition for the low-end jobs, creating discomfort and strain among the lower classes. Ousey and Kubrin (2009), as well as Martinez, Rosenfeld and Mares (2008) suggest the possibility that illegitimate opportunity structures, such as the illegal drug trade, are particularly appealing avenues of economic success for immigrants who encounter difficulties locating work in legitimate industries. If this is true, then neighborhoods with elevated levels of immigrants would be characterized by high levels of crime. The cumulus of research has produced no conclusive results on this matter. Tanton and Lutton (1993) agree that under the current immigration laws and procedures, large numbers of newly arrived immigrants see crime as their avenue to the American

dream. Criminological theories that defend a positive relationship between immigration and crime assume that immigrants commit crime because they are economically disadvantaged (Reid, et al., 2005), implying that there are not enough employment opportunities available.

Evidence for Immigration as a Cause of Crime

A firmly established criminological finding is that crime follows a distinctive age pattern, with offending rates being higher among teens and young adults (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983). Ramirez and De la Cruz (2003) and Butcher and Piehl (1998) mention that, compared with non-Latino Whites, Latinos immigrants are more likely to be under 18 years old, unemployed, reside in large family households, and live in poverty, however neither study makes reference to the legal status of these Latinos in the United States or if these individuals have any ties to gangs or other criminal groups; both studies specify that the Latino immigrant population tends to be younger. When these two findings are analyzed holistically, it is possible that due to age, Latino immigrants are more likely to commit crimes than non-Latino Whites, supporting general assumptions regarding immigration and crime.

In addition to age and cultural heterogeneity, Lee, Ottati and Hussain (2001) suggest that motivation to maintain a positive sense of social identity (within their own social cumulus) leads members of different racial or ethnic groups to "view their own subculture in more favorable terms than other subcultures" (p.432), generating feelings of competition and rivalry between minority groups. Blau and Blau (1982), as well as Shihadeh and Steffensmeier (1994), argue that inequality increases feelings of frustration and ultimately provokes violence. These reactions are common among minority groups,

supporting the perspective that immigration will increase the levels of social strain in neighborhoods with high levels of non-native born workers (Blau & Blau, 1942; Shihadeh & Steffensmeier, 1994).

Research has shown that even though Latino immigration has created a heightened sense of competition (Lee, Ottati & Hussain, 2001) and, perhaps, elevated levels of violence between minorities, not all Latino immigrant groups have the same effect on their community. Nielsen, Lee and Martinez (2005) analyzed the impact of immigration on Sunbelt cities, focusing primarily on San Diego and Miami. The research aimed to determine the role of race and ethnicity on homicides within these two cities, studying the social impact of this type of crime on the social environment. Although both cities were comprised of a majority of Latinos, Miami's population was mostly Puerto Rican and Cuban, while San Diego was predominantly Mexican. The study also analyzed the interaction between Blacks and Latinos in these cities, and how immigration affects violent crimes between the two ethnic groups. Their findings determined that the Latino population in Miami reflected a greater impact on homicide levels than the Latino population in San Diego when compared to the Black population in both cities. Martinez (2000) examined the links between Latino immigration and homicide within the Latino community, finding that urban homicides are increased by immigration, while having a negative effect on acquaintance homicide. In general, the research that provides evidence of immigration as a cause of crime is very limited. On the other hand, the studies that suggest that immigration does not cause crime are extensive and well documented.

Evidence against Immigration as a Cause of Crime

Although a cumulus of research has tried to establish that immigration is a cause of crime, other research indicates that immigrants do not have a proclivity to commit crimes and that there is no relationship between immigration and crime. In fact, some evidence suggests that foreign born youth are statistically less likely to engage in criminal behavior than their native counterparts (Butcher & Piehl, 1998). Although the research has found that in some cases immigration has generated a decrease on the levels of violent crime on neighborhoods there has been no conclusive evidence on the matter (Lee & Martinez, 2009).

Scholars have explored the effect of immigration on crime trying to find a relationship between the two events. In their study, Shihadeh and Barranco (2010) examined the relationship between a raise in the levels of immigrants and the escalation of violence in minority populated neighborhoods, finding no conclusive evidence that such a relationship existed. Martinez affirms that immigrants and Latinos are less violent "even more so when they live in concentrated immigrant areas [than Blacks]" (2010, p.805). Butcher and Piehl (1998) found that while cities with elevated levels of immigration tend to reflect higher levels of crime, recent immigration has no effect on crime. One of the most important findings in the cumulus of information regarding immigration and crime is that immigrants tend to exhibit lower crime rates than natives (Martinez & Lee, 2000).

Studies have analyzed the influence of immigrant settlements on crime levels in different communities. When analyzing immigration and crime in specific cities, Martinez, Stowell and Lee (2010) focused their efforts on determining the macro-level

impact of immigration on lethal violence rates in San Diego, California. They define immigration as the percent of the population born outside the United States, but make no differentiation regarding legal or illegal status in the country. Among their findings, they established that the number of immigrants or "foreign-born population" is "associated negatively with lethal violence" (Martinez, Stowell & Lee, 2010, p. 817), meaning that the increase in the levels of immigration has decreased the level of homicides. Similarly, Oussey and Kubrin (2009) found that immigrants are not likely to engage in more criminal activities than native-born citizens. They concluded that immigrants do not have a tendency to commit more crimes than native-born citizens; however, they acknowledge that their study focused on very specific groups and their results may not be generalizable to the population. This is a very important distinction, because their study did not take into consideration every group of immigrants, nor did it address the issue of second generation immigrants and problems with acculturation.

As presented in previous sections, researchers have attempted to explain the immigration-crime relationship by applying social disorganization theory. Even though the public perception is that immigrants are heavily involved in criminal gangs that might perpetrate assault and homicide, studies have found that communities with greater concentration of immigrants tend to have lower levels of violence (Ousey & Kubrin, 2009). Reid et al. (2005) contends that immigration actually reduces the levels of criminal activity on large metropolitan areas. Herzog (2009, p.428) agrees when he argues that "immigrant residential concentration facilitates collective mobilization and the achievement of goals." However, the studies mentioned by Herzog (2009) examined neighborhoods where immigrants were considered the majority of the population. Once

the groups of immigrants become a majority there are closer ties within the community, there will be family and friendship ties within the neighborhood and crime rates will be considerably diminished (Herzog, 2009). However, once immigrants from one specific group reach this point, the factors of racial heterogeneity, multiculturalism and residential mobility are eliminated, thus not fitting the model of Shaw and McKay's (1942) original theory. Ousey and Kubrin (2009) examined the impact of illegal immigration on the levels of violent crime, residential stability, labor market and economic characteristics, and the contribution of immigration to illegal drug markets, finding no correlation between these factors. It is important to note that no research has been found that studies the specific effect of illegal border crossing as a predictor for more serious crimes or other deviant behavior.

Although there is no empirical data that supports that immigration is a direct cause of crime, Rumbaut and Ewing (2007, p.3) mention that the misperception that illegal immigrants are responsible for higher crime rates is rooted in the public opinion in the United States, and that it has been sustained by "media anecdote and popular myth." In support of this statement, Desmond and Kubrin (2009, p.1) affirm that the debate regarding immigration is "laced with myths and a failure to separate fact from fiction." These statements are closely related to the *Alien Conspiracy Theory,* which argues that the prevalence of organized criminal organizations in the United States is a result of "outsiders […] transplanting their preexisting criminal cultures and behaviors [into] America" (Williams & Roth, 2011, p.302). In conclusion, there is not enough evidence to determine that immigration causes crime or that settlements of Hispanic immigrants are

more prone to violence than other ethnic groups. More research needs to be conducted on this subject that, despite the controversies surrounding this issue.

Immigrant Victimization

Another issue that has been of interest among immigration scholars is the victimization of immigrants. Using death certificate data from the State of California, Sorenson and Shen (1996) found a significant relationship between immigrant status and homicide rates, indicating that illegal immigrants are at a higher risk of being victimized than Blacks or Whites, but do not define the immigrants as the actors on homicides. Some of the aspects of this study that should be explored in depth are the activities of the victims, their possible involvement with illegal activities, criminal networks, gang membership, drugs, or alcohol. Alba, Logan and Bellair (1994) found that foreign-born Latinos were more exposed to property and violent crime than were other Latinos in suburban New York City. On the other hand, Desmond and Kubrin (2009) are one of the few researchers that have looked at the specific differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic, as well as foreign born and native born immigrants, finding that immigrant communities make a greater effort to protect their youth from violent activities (offending), which protects their youth against violent acts (victimization). These efforts include strict house rules, employment of the youth in local businesses and creating stronger social networks within the community (Desmond & Kubrin, 2009). The studies presented have focused on immigrants residing in the United States, but the victimization of immigrants also occurs during their migration.

When studying immigrant victimization, it is necessary to analyze the victimization of individuals during their trajectory from their home country into the host

country. An isolated study conducted by Guerrette and Clark (2005) investigated the risks involved in crossing the U.S.-Mexico border illegally. Although they were able to examine the different means of entry into the United States, the nature of their data did not allow them to differentiate between the entry of criminals and non criminals or between first time crossers and those who have attempted the journey more than once. The primary focus of their investigation was to expose the shift in activities from illegal immigration into human smuggling as a result of the border policy of the United States. They analyzed the patterns of entry, establishing the primary points of border crossing in Arizona, California, and Texas. They also evaluated the causes of death among Mexican immigrants and found that among their sample (N=400), most died from heat exposure (34%) while the cause of death for others was due to exposure to cold (1%), drowning (14%), motor vehicle accident (16%), train (3%) and confined space (1%). However, they did not determine the particular reasons for "other" (4%) and unknown deaths (28%). While it is impossible to determine whether the unknown deaths were caused by violent crimes perpetrated by members of their migrant group, gang members or the individuals in charge of getting them across the border, it is necessary to raise the question as to why these deaths have not been explained. Guerrete and Clarke (2005) go on to mention that further research needs to focus on interviewing immigrants and smugglers to collect more data on immigrant deaths.

Similarly, Andersson (2005) provides a very detailed description of the dangers many migrants face while entering and traveling through Mexico. Unlike Guerrete and Clark (2005), who have focused their efforts on analyzing migratory patterns of Mexican immigrants into the United States, Andersson (2005) aimed his analysis toward

immigrants in the southern Mexican border, a line that separates Mexico from the rest of Central America. There, he explored the experience of immigrants[8] from all over Central America on their way to the United States through Mexico. While conducting participant observation, he was able to interact with many immigrants who sought the relief of a shelter to rest and obtain some food before continuing their path to the United States. He describes the fear these migrants experience, not only of the possible accidents they could encounter once they jump on the train that will get them one step closer to the American dream, but the fear of being victimized by corrupt Mexican Police Officers who are known to steal money and other belongings from immigrants and have been known to make sexual advances on the traveling women; Mexican Military holding the immigrants at gunpoint and yelling at them in order to inflict fear; and, most of all, *maras* or street-gangs who frequently assault, rape and kill immigrants on their journey to the United States.

The Effect of Gang Migration on the Immigration-Crime Link

Migratory patterns of undocumented immigrants are difficult to evaluate. This is the result of the lack of availability to interview these subjects. Even though a small percentage of migrants have criminal records or are active members of a criminal organization, illegal migration provides gangs with candidates for membership augmenting their numbers (Johnson & Muhlhausen, 2005). Not addressing the threat of illegal immigration opens the possibility of gang members crossing the border with migrant workers. Cruz (2010, p.380) defines gang migration as a mechanism of "norms

---

[8] Andersson (2005) utilizes the term "transmigrants" to define those individuals who are migrating from one point to another across a third region or country. Unlike other immigrants, these individuals are "'not-yet-there'; they are people in perpetual transit." (p.28)

and identities that facilitate the constitution of transnational networks." This issue must be addressed and the migratory patterns of gang members need to be studied to understand the mobility of delinquent groups across international borders.

Researchers have designed theories addressing gang migration, its effects, and the reasons behind it. Maxson (1998) presents an analysis of the effects of gang migration in different U.S. cities, and the relation between the appearance of gangs and the increased levels of criminal activity in certain areas. Maxson (1998) explains that some gangs settle in a new area, which creates competition for other delinquent groups by dividing the drug market or the availability of profits. The second type of gang will be a satellite gang from a larger group, generally from a bigger city, but will not claim to be a part of that larger group but a smaller associate (Maxson, 1998). The third kind of gang listed by Maxson (1998) is the native gang, which has followed no migratory activity, but yet appears as a new gang as a result of its relationships with gangs from different regions. Maxson (1998) found that most gang members are not migrants, but residents of the area in which their activities take place. It is mentioned, however, that although many groups adopt signs and behaviors from larger gangs, these groups are not necessarily members of the larger organization. According to Maxson (1998), gang member migration and their migratory patterns contribute to the proliferation of gangs.

Along with Maxson, Vittori (2007) has attempted to explain gang migration. Vittori (2007) mentions two other theories that address the migration patterns of gang members: the first theory posits that street-gangs gain strength and evolve into more complex organized criminal organizations that seek to expand their territory; the second one is the symbolic association theory, which explains that an individual gang member

will move to a different environment to set up a new gang (Vittori, 2007). Vittori's observation was perhaps based on Papachristos' (2005) argument that symbolic association is an adequate theory to describe the transnational migration of gangs. Sources have agreed that *maras* usually do not migrate for entrepreneurial motives, but for expansion and recruitment (Vittori, 2007). Maxson (1998) explains that if a sufficient number of members move to a new location, they will be able to start a clique of their gang, and that will lead to local gangs emerging to protect their territory. On the other hand, interviewed Salvadoran gang members stated that the primary reason for leaving El Salvador was fear of retaliation by the government and vigilante groups (Seelke, 2010). According to Cruz (2010), *maras* do not migrate because of a centralized identity, but due to imitation of social processes that allow them to expand their networks. Overall, the documented causes of the migration of gang members are expansion of their criminal activities and evasion of law enforcement.

The constant flow of immigrants from Central America has created a reaction from local authorities. Central American *maras* have been a constant theme within political circles and appear to be a permanent issue in the media (SIDA, 2008). In 2004, the governments of Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador signed an agreement authorizing the immediate deportation of *mara* members and the creation of a database of gang members (The Maldon Institute, 2004). Many gang members go further north than Central American countries and have migrated to the United States. The journey has resulted in thousands of members of Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) left behind throughout Central America and Mexico; many of whom have attempted to cross the U.S. border illegally, while others have succeeded and are already in the United States

(Logan & Kairies, 2006). Mexican authorities have stated that the MS-13 members who are in Mexico are only there because they were "stuck there" while traveling to the United States (The Maldon Institute, 2004, p.8). On the other hand, a majority of the Central American gang members already in the United States were born in the country or immigrated at a very young age, most likely escaping the civil war (Logan & Bain, 2006). The percentage of foreign born gang members in the U.S. has not been determined, but the Central American culture prevails within the groups.

Overall, gang members migrate for different reasons. Some are looking for opportunities to expand drug operations and territories, others migrate for recruitment purposes, perhaps evading capture by the authorities or escaping other gangs (Maxson, 1998; National Gang Intelligence Center, 2009). Another cause for the migration of a gang member consists of social expansion, the search for a better structured or bigger gang that will allow individual growth (Vittori, 2007). Maxson (1998) noted that the migration of entire gangs is rare, but the migration of individual gang members is common. Gang members who are migrating can still support their gang by recruiting locals to start a new clique (Maxson, 1998).

Deportation of Gang Members

During the mid-1990s, the United States government implemented deportation programs of Salvadoran criminals. In 1996 the U.S. Federal authorities began implementing the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). This act allowed immigration authorities to deport undocumented migrants, most of them for having criminal convictions (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007; Zilberg, 2004). By 1997, United States

Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS, formerly known as Immigration and Naturalization Services) had deported 111,794 illegal aliens, half of which had been convicted of a crime (Logan & Bain, 2007). Between 1998 and 2005 the United States deported more than 160,000 immigrants back to Central America, of which an estimated 45,000 were convicted criminals (Johnson & Muhlhausen, 2005b; Jütersonke, et al., 2009; Logan & Kairies, 2006). The U.S. Congressional Research Service (2007) mentions that between 2000 and 2004 the number was near 20,000 deportees with criminal records. Many of the deportees did not speak Spanish (Logan & Bain, 2006), did not spend their younger formative years in El Salvador (Rogers, 2003), had no ties to their country of origin except for gang connections (Logan & Kairies, 2006), and many had served time in American prisons (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007). One of the few things that the deportees took with them when returning to their countries of origin was the street-gang culture from the streets of Los Angeles (Rogers, 2003; U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007; Vittori, 2007). Logan and Bain (2006) insist that the U.S. policy of deporting any immigrant with a sentence that carries more than 1 year in jail is the primary reason why gangs in the region grew so rapidly.

Through the deportations from the United States, gangs from California started spreading through Central America during the 1990s. As a result of the flow of criminals into the region, many gangs emerged in the area, such as MS-13, 18th Street, El Salvador-Mao Mao, Crazy Harrisons Salvatrucho, and Crazy Normans Salvatrucho (Manwaring, 2005). Papachristos (2005) agrees, like other scholars (Arana, 2005; U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007), that the increase of the numbers of gang members was a phenomenon that resulted from the massive deportations from the United States.

According to Arana (2005), Central American governments believe that the American government has inflicted the gang problem on the region. These governments have compared the deportation policy to the "Mariel boat lift" of the 1980s, an event that brought criminals from Cuban prisons into U.S. territory (Arana, 2005, p.105). Vittori (2007) suggests that the actions of the United States government can be viewed as a threat to the internal security of Central American countries, and these deportations are primarily supported by the principles of the alien conspiracy theory, which has bolstered law enforcement's proactive efforts to arrest and quickly deport foreign members of organized criminal organizations (Williams & Roth, 2011). It is important to understand the reasons why deportations affect these Central American countries.

The Salvadoran nationals who are deported from the United States have spent a majority of their life in the U.S. When removed from the country these individuals are sent to Central America, to a "place where, in their memory, they have never been" (Zilberg, 2004, p.761). Generally these destinations are places with poverty, drug availability, high crime rates, high divorce rates and high school dropout rates, and where the deportation of criminals from the United States has increased the risk of encountering gangs (Vittori, 2007). As Vittori (2007) argues, the gangs are born in the United States, and it is the government's deportation policy that has helped internationalize these criminal groups.

Deportations are not the only factor that aids the spread of gangs and their members. Sometimes gang members decide to travel back to their home country to visit, using the opportunity to share their lifestyle with peers (Vittori, 2007). They may also use the opportunity of being in their home country to visit friends, family and fellow gang

members (Etter, 2010). Other times the members will be sent back to their countries by their families with hopes of removing them from the gang lifestyle and its social circles (Vittori, 2007). Rogers (2003) explains that the creation of a global economy and free trade agreements are two of the reasons why gangs are proliferating in the American continent. Two clear examples are the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, which, according to Rogers (2003), requires that the borders across member states lose importance and become more permeable, unrestricting the flow of merchandise. This could result in less strict borders, which would allow transnational gangs to thrive across international lines.

It appears that gangs in Central America have already taken into consideration the deportation of gang members and have, perhaps, found ways to benefit from the legal proceedings by establishing transnational networks. Parts of these criminal organizations appear to be oriented toward maintaining and expanding their networks, which might benefit members who are deported to Central America (Cruz, 2010). The flow of deportees and the government actions to control the growth of gangs have allowed these groups to operate beyond international borders. As Vittori (2007) affirms, a predictor for the growth of transnational gangs is the number of criminal deportations from the United States. As long as deportations continue, gangs will continue to thrive under an American gang mentality in other countries (Vittori, 2007). Gang activities may accelerate illegal immigration, as well the trafficking of drugs, people, and weapons into the United States (U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007).

The Revolving Door Phenomenon: Gangs Return after Deportation

The research that studies migration and deportation patterns of gangs across international borders is limited. One of the few publications that study this matter explains that Central American gangs are involved in a *revolving door* migratory pattern (Boerman, 2007). The *revolving door problem* establishes that Central American immigrants who have entered the United States illegally may be deported back to their home countries, only to find a way back into the United States as soon as it is possible (Boerman, 2007). Salvadoran law enforcement agencies suggest that 90% of gang members return to the United States as soon as they can (Johnson & Muhlhausen, 2005). According to Boerman (2007), gang members arriving in Central America leave their country of origin to avoid criminal prosecution, while others leave to avoid the consequences of programs that are aimed at social cleansing of Central American communities or to escape vigilante death squads, such as *Sombra Negra*. The fear of execution, along with the lack of opportunities, leaves no option to the deportee besides the return to the United States.

The young gang members who are removed from the United States are forced to leave their lives behind. Many of the deported gang members have children and wives who are left in the United States, obligating them to attempt to return, regardless of the dangers they will encounter or the legal risks of entering a country illegally (Rogers, 2003; Zilberg, 2004). Deported gang members do not necessarily want to remain in their home countries, and they will typically be faced with one simple choice: return to the United States or join their gang in the country where they are (Papachristos, 2005). Papachristos (2005) considers that gangs like MS-13 are prone to migration in order to

search for new recruits, expanding their criminal networks or looking for a new scenario

for their activities. According to him these patterns are not traditional of gang behavior

(Papachristos, 2005). He describes the story of a gang member whose family sent him to

Mexico to live with relatives so he would stay away from his gang, but instead he became

a liaison between immigrants attempting to get to the United States and gang members in

the country (Papachristos, 2005). Gang members have found ways of functioning

regardless of the legal limitations imposed by international borders.

As a support structure for their members, gangs may establish networks that

provide access to deported gang members into the United States. Rogers (2003) argues

that the increase of legitimate border-crossing and trade generated networks are now well

established, and these networks allow illegal immigrants to enter the U. S. These

networks served as means for criminal aliens and gang members who had been

previously deported to return to the United States using the existing illicit routes into the

country (Rogers, 2003). Arana (2005) recognizes that gangs have spilled over from the

north and are now returning to the United States through Mexico, where they have started

targeting other migrants.

In locations where gangs exist, but are not formally established, migrant gang

members may act as carriers of the culture of sophisticated street gangs (Maxson, 1998).

In the case of Central America, the patterns of gang growth have been considered to be a

result of the deportations from the United States. Originally the regions in which gangs

settled had gang activity, but with the deportation of thousands of gang members, the

culture of American gangs was spread throughout the countries aggravating previous

criminal groups. In the case of MS-13, the deportation policies have displaced thousands

of members; many of them continue to illegally migrate to Central America and back north, often transporting contraband (Papachristos, 2005). This has created social instability and a rapid growth of the gang problem.

It is possible that an increase of the number of gang members is reflected on an increase on the levels of crime. Although many of the gangs that are active in Central America originated in the United States, the groups returning north are more dangerous than their "original incarnation" (Arana, 2005, p.104), and are considered more influential and more dangerous than before (Howell & Moore, 2010). The members of transnational gangs who are deported to El Salvador have also smuggled contraband over the border, including weapons, illegal immigrants and drugs (Etter, 2010). Their strength has allowed these gangs to destabilize neighborhoods in Central America, and it has also allowed them to form alliances with Mexican drug trade organizations (Arana, 2005; Howell & Moore, 2010).

Police in the United States confirm the revolving door phenomenon given that they often see previously deported MS-13 members back on the street (The Maldon Institute, 2004). As it has been discussed, these youth "oscilate between 'home' and 'abroad,' [but] both home and abroad are themselves unstable locations" (Zilberg, 2004, p.774). The cycle of migration and deportation of gangs is a downward spiral that has led to legitimate concerns regarding public safety in Central America and an alarming street presence in the United States (Logan & Bain, 2006). The revolving door phenomenon simply reflects the migration of gang members between the United States and Central America.

Stuck in Central America

While many gang members are involved in the *revolving door* (Boerman, 2007), some lack the necessary means to seek an opportunity to return north, and are bound to remain in their home country. Zilberg (2004) presents the testimony of two gang members, *Weasel* and *Gato*, both of whom were deported from the United States and had to face many challenges upon their arrival in El Salvador. One of the gang members, Weasel, mentions that his deportation from the United States resembles how fools were exiled from kingdoms during medieval times (Zilberg, 2004). According to Weasel's testimony, in medieval times fools were people who did something that could be a threat to the crown, but in the case of these fools -gang members- they were a threat to society (Zilberg, 2004). When gang members arrive in their countries, they must find means to survive in a culture that is unfamiliar to them. To aggravate their situation, they are forced to settle in neighborhoods that might not welcome their lifestyle, or worse, their gang status.

Neighborhoods in El Salvador have been reshaped according to L.A. standards, so it is not uncommon to hear gang youths calling each other *homies* (e.g. short for *homeboy*, meaning close friend); that is one of the many habits that have traveled southbound with U.S. gang members (Zilberg, 2004). Not everyone returning from the U.S. falls into a neighborhood controlled by their gang once they are back in El Salvador. That is the case of *Gato*, a veteran of the 18th Street Gang, interviewed by Zilberg (2004), who now lives in a neighborhood controlled by MS-13, a rival gang, in San Salvador. It is strange and perhaps dangerous for a member of a rival gang to "navigate this terrain" of hostility and violence, as Zilberg explains (2004, p.763). *Gato* describes how he had to

confront former friends and neighbors to explain why he decided to join the rival gang. Even though they have the same roots and share a past in the neighborhood, his former friends are not *homeboys* but sworn enemies (Zilberg, 2004). *Weasel*, the other gang member interviewed by Zilberg (2004), said that his deportation to El Salvador felt like being sent to a different planet, and the reactions and disapproval of people on the street only aggravated that feeling. Although the interviewees were not involved in gang activities upon their arrival to El Salvador, the consequences of the geographical division led to the murder of one of the interviewees. Risk of homicide victimization is just one more of the many problems immigrants face when they are returned to their home country. It is possible to say that acculturation works in both directions and the lack thereof affects people migrating north and south (Zilberg, 2004). It is possible that the opportunities for someone who is actively involved in a gang with cliques in El Salvador are different than those available to gang members who are searching for alternative opportunities for success away from gang life.

The problem of transnational gangs begins with the deportation of gang members back to their home countries, regardless of the ties these individuals have with the host country (Rogers, 2003). A lot of responsibility is placed on the actions of the authorities of the United States regarding the growth of gangs in other countries. Since thousands of individuals in the United States have ties to countries in Central and South America (Manwaring, 2005), it is easy for criminal networks to grow by using pre-existing relationships with citizens of these regions. The deportation of gang members -as a way to confront the problem of transnational gangs- creates more problems than it solves (Rogers, 2003). The following issue that must be discussed includes the migratory

patterns of these individuals, a topic that has been largely ignored by previous research. *Maras* pose a significant threat to social stability in Central and North America, by expanding at a considerably fast rate throughout Mexico and the United States (SIDA, 2008).

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Scope of the Current Study

While immigration into the United States and the impact of immigration on criminal activities have been common research topics over the last decade, immigration of individuals with criminal backgrounds or gang affiliation has not been thoroughly analyzed. This project aims to analyze the motives behind the migration of Salvadoran gang members at an individual level through the application of in-person interview surveys.

Research Hypotheses

The primary purpose of this study is to understand the motive for the departure of gang members from their home country and how those motives and patterns differ between gang members, gang associates and non-gang members. The key hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1: Gang members are significantly more likely to migrate with the intention to expand their gang and their criminal networks.

Hypothesis 2: People with no relationship or association to a gang are significantly more likely to migrate with the intention to better their economical situation and living conditions.

Hypothesis 3: Gang members and gang associates are significantly more inclined to violate migratory regulations than non-gang members.

Analyses were conducted to determine whether the participants entered legally or illegally into the United States, the amount of times they entered the United States illegally, whether or not they have been detained for illegal entry into the country, how

many times they have been deported from the United States, if there exists any

correlation between their gang-status and the reason for their apprehension by

immigration authorities, and the reason for their migration into the country.

Data Collection Procedures

The current study consisted of primary data collected by interviewing citizens

from El Salvador who were detained by immigration authorities. Data were collected at

two different Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention centers in Santa Ana, and

Lancaster, California[9]. The interviewees answered an in-person interview survey that

included questions about immigration, victimization, criminal activities, gang

relationships and social networking. Subjects who admitted active or former gang

membership or gang association were selected from the initial sample to be compared

with non-gang members; the data collected from these individuals were used to examine

the motives behind their migration and the patterns of travel.

Each center where the interviews were conducted provided the research team with

a list of the available male and female Salvadoran citizens in custody at their facility. The

list only provided the name, nationality and degree of dangerousness of the detainees,

along with their internal identification number. The available detainees were transferred

in groups of 15-20 to a waiting area near a room that had been assigned by Immigration

and Customs Enforcement for the research project. When the interview room had been

prepared for data collection, the staff at the facility started bringing groups of four male

or female detainees to meet with the team of researchers. Each detainee met individually

---

[9] Data collection for the present study was reviewed and approved by Arizona State University's Human Subjects Review Board (Protocol # 1101005860) and Sam Houston State University's Institutional Review Board (Protocol # 2011-06-005)

with a researcher who introduced him/herself and asked them the language of their preference (e.g. English or Spanish).

As a characteristic of their nationality, many of the detainees were non-English speakers; the instrument was translated to Spanish to enhance the participation rate. For example, 220 participants (55.7%) did not speak English at the time of the interview and completed the interview in Spanish. Each member of the research team spoke Spanish fluently, which increased their rapport with the detainees and prompted greater sharing of information during the interview. When the language preference of the detainee was established, the researcher invited the detainee to participate in the study by explaining the research project.

The detainees were told that the project was funded by the Federal government through Arizona State University with the intent to understand cliques and gangs of Salvadoran immigrants in the United States. When the project had been explained, the subject was verbally read the consent script included in the front page of the survey and he/she was asked for their consent to participate in the survey. For anonymity purposes the interviewees were not asked to sign the document; instead, consent was obtained verbally to protect respondents' identities. Detainees were given the opportunity to decline participation, and were permitted to refuse answering any questions that made them feel uncomfortable without affecting the delivery of the incentive. It was clearly explained that no benefits would result from their participation with the exception of receiving a candy bar. A managing staff member at one of the detention facilities explained that the compensation was appropriate and it did not cause coercion. The same type of candy was available to all detainees for purchase from the center, so the

participants could not be singled out from the population. However, as a preventive measure, the candy was to be eaten by the participants in the interview room.

Once the subject agreed to participate, the research supervisor assigned a unique numerical identifier to the detainee's instrument to ensure anonymity. There were no identifying data in the instrument traceable to the interviewees. The interviewees had no contact with the data collection instrument. Each question was read aloud to the participant to ensure full understanding. Once an answer was provided, the investigator recorded the response in the survey instrument. In the case of open ended questions, the researchers were instructed to record the answers as accurately as possible.

For the protection of the research team, one or two correctional officers remained present during the interview. However, the correctional officers remained at a distance from the participants so they could not hear or read any information provided by the respondents. To ensure anonymity, it was necessary that the correctional officers did not have access to the information that was being collected. The staff at the detention facilities had no participation in the data collection process and never had contact with the completed instruments.

Data Collection Instrument

The instrument utilized to collect data from the Salvadoran immigrants consisted of eight sections (see Appendix A). Each section addressed particular topics of interest to the research team. The first part of the instrument was a cover sheet where general information was recorded, such as the date of the interview, year of birth of the interviewee, gender, level of confinement, country of origin, citizenship, reason for apprehension, agency and place of apprehension, whether or not the interviewee spoke

English, the facility at which the interview was taking place and the consent of the interviewee to participate in the survey.

The second section of the instrument collected general demographic information, including education, citizenship, residence, family, income level, and source of income. The sources of income were divided into legitimate and illegitimate, such that the interviewee specified the amount of money received from both sources. The third section focused on self-reported victimization during the 12 months prior to apprehension. The fourth section addressed use of firearms, their possession and transport, as well as the means of acquisition over the lifetime of the subject. The fifth section of the instrument focused on criminal involvement in the 12 months before being apprehended.

The sixth section was comprised of gang-related questions. It asked the participants to provide information regarding their gang relationships, whether they were active or former gang members or if they had any type of gang association or friendship. If the answers to the initial three gang questions were negative, the rest of the gang section was omitted and the interview would continue with the seventh section: social networks. This section analyzed the social structure surrounding the interviewee by asking him/her about the ten most important people in his/her life and assigning a numerical value to each individual.

Finally, the eighth and last section of the instrument focused on immigration. The section was divided into two parts, the first included a general section that addressed how many times the interviewee had entered the United States illegally, how many times he/she had been deported, means of entry, reason for entry, and methods for avoiding arrest. The second part of the immigration section asked the participant specific questions

regarding their last journey from El Salvador into the United States, dividing the trip into segments from one city to another. This part of the interview, called an "Immigration Grid" (Appendix B) consisted of 38 open ended questions that required the participant to be as detailed as possible regarding the travel from his or her place of residence in El Salvador to the United States.

Measures

Demographic Characteristics

The initial data collected from the participants reflected demographic information. The country of origin was the first important data collected, because if the participants were not of Salvadoran citizenship they had to be excluded from the survey. The gender and age of the participants were recorded on the first page of the instrument along with their Level of Confinement (Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3), the reason for their apprehension (Criminal Charge, Deportation, Papers Revoked, Other) and the language of their preference (Do you speak English? Y/N). Finally the facility where the participants were approached was selected from a list of 7 possible options (See Appendix A).

Gangs

Gang membership was measured with affirmative responses to the item: "Are you currently a member of a clique?" If their answer was negative, the following question asked was "Are you a former member of a clique?" This item allowed the researchers to identify active and former gang members[10]. In the event of the participants providing a negative answer to both of these questions, respondents were asked "Are any of your

---

[10] Due to the limited number of active gang members, individuals who admitted former or current gang membership were categorized as "Gang Members" for this project.

friends currently members of a clique?" If the answer to the third question was positive, then the participants were asked "How many of your friends are currently members of a clique?" To which they could respond "All of them," "Most of them," "Half of them," or "A few of them"[11]. When the respondents admitted friendship with gang members they were categorized as "Gang Associates." Then the individuals were asked specific open ended questions regarding gang membership such as "What is the name of the clique in the United States?" and "What is the name of the clique in El Salvador?" the location of the clique in either country, and the gang to which the clique belongs to.

Previous research has grouped gang involvement responses under four primary categories: non-gang members, current gang members, former gang members and associate members or non-gang members with some level of gang involvement (Curry, Decker & Egley, 2006; Decker & Curry, 2000). Curry, Decker and Egley (2006, p.283) supported their classification by arguing that "any status that is defined by the social space between gang member and nonmember should be differentially associated with delinquency." They also mentioned a local police department using the term "gang associate" to describe individuals who are known to be associated with a gang, but are not identified as gang members. They argued that gang membership is not essential for individuals to be familiar with the criminal effects of full gang membership (Curry, Decker & Engley, 2006). Decker and Curry (2000) found that current membership, former membership and associates do not reflect statistically significant differences in their responses regarding the activity of the gang. Based on Decker and Curry's argument, this study recognized gang association when respondents reported having any

---

[11] All respondents who admitted friendship with gang members were asked specific questions regarding the cliques to which their friends belong.

friends who were active members of a gang. Since they contend that no statistical differences exist between different levels of involvement, former and active gang members were grouped under a single gang member category.

Immigration

Several questions were used to assess immigration. For example, participants were asked: "How many times have you entered the USA unlawfully?" "How many times have you been detained in the US for illegal entry?" and "How many times have you been deported from the US?" The responses were recorded in a numerical scale comprised of four columns with the numbers 0-9 on each. The instrument then illustrated a legend saying "For the next set of questions, I want you to think about the last time you entered the United States. This includes whether you entered legally or illegally." The first question after the statement was read was "What day did you arrive in the US?" Although it was difficult for many of the respondents to answer the question accurately, it was necessary to probe for an estimate[12]. The following question asked "On this most recent trip to the US, how old were you when you arrived?." In some cases the respondent would remember the exact age they were at the time, when the answer was not accurate they would be asked their year of birth and that number would be subtracted from the year of entry that answered in the previous question.

Once the date of entry to the United States had been established, the participants were asked "how did you enter the United States?" to which they could choose from nine

---

[12] When participants did not remember the exact date of entry they would be asked "Were you a child or an adult?," which allowed the researcher to estimate a year. Then, if possible, a short conversation was started to help the participant remember the year. In order to establish the month of entry it was necessary to ask the detainee whether the weather was cold or warm. Depending on their answer it was possible to establish the proximity of the date to a holiday such as Christmas, New Years, 4th of July or their birthday. When the date was not remembered, the day of entry was filled as 00. Similar techniques were used when probing for more information was necessary.

responses, including: "entered with immigrant visas issued by the U.S. state department," "admitted as a refugee seeking asylum," "entered with student, work, or long-term visa," "entered the U.S. with non-immigrant visa and overstayed," "entered the U.S. without documents," "entered with false documents," "used another person's documents," "other," and "refused."

To measure the reason behind their migration to the United States, respondents were asked the following open-ended question: "Why did you decide to come to the United States on this most recent trip?"Given that many respondents provided similar answers regarding the reason for their departure from El Salvador, responses were categorized (Table 1). For example, answers such as "Came as a kid," or "My family brought me here when I was young" were grouped under the variable "Came with family (Age < 12)." Table 1 presents a detailed explanation of how the answers were coded.

The identification of criminal groups along the U.S.-Mexico border and determining whether those groups are part of a gang or other organizations was assessed with the following question: "On this most recent trip, did any individual or organization assist you in crossing the border into the U.S.?" The response options were dichotomous (e.g., yes/no), and included a probe for information regarding whether or not they were helped by cliques of their gang to cross the border into the United States. Participants were then asked "On this most recent trip, were other things smuggled with you?" This question allowed for "yes" or "no" answers, probing for additional information in case of an affirmative response.

Table 1

Reason for Migration Responses and Coding Categories

Coding Category	Examples of Original Responses
Came with family (Age<12)	Came as a kid "My family brought me when I was young"
Came with family (Age>12)	"I came with my mom when I was a teenager"
Reunite with family	"My parents sent for me" "My mom missed me" "My mom was already here"
Better opportunities	Better jobs To find a better place to live Better living conditions
Escaping the war	Running from the war Running from the military Fear of the guerilla
Running from a gang	Running from a gang Gang threats Fear of victimization by a gang
Avoid persecution	Fear of reprisals Avoiding death squads Fear of persecution
Avoid legal action	Avoiding legal prosecution
Unidentified threat	"Fear of my safety" "My life was in danger" "I feared for my life"
Criminal network	Expansion of criminal network Recruitment Other criminal activities
Return to the U.S.	"I already lived here" "I work in the US" "I had gone on vacation"
Tourist	Entered the country with a tourist visa
Other	"Came to donate an organ" "Came to a funeral"

Analytic Plan

In order to examine the motives behind the migration and means of entry of

Salvadoran immigrants into the United States, it was necessary to conduct a series of

statistical tests. Simple descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the sample of

Salvadoran detainees. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were observed to establish

the category under which the individuals were placed by their level of gang involvement

(non-gang members, gang associates and gang members). One way ANOVA and

Tukey's post hoc tests were conducted to find the variance between the groups regarding

demographic information, the motives for their migration, means of entry into the United

States, and violations of immigration regulations.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

The total number of Salvadoran detainees available for interviewing according to the official lists of the facilities was 449. Of those detainees invited to participate, 22 were ineligible because they had already been interviewed in previous data collection sessions for this study, and an additional 3 detainees were excluded because they were not of Salvadoran nationality. Of the 424 eligible Salvadoran detainees, 11 were not located at the time of the data collection due to various reasons (e.g. court dates, medical appointments) and 18 refused participation. This resulted in a response rate of 93.1% (n=395). Table 2 presents the descriptive information for the sample.

Among the full sample, males comprised 92.4% of the sample (n=365) and females accounted for the remaining 7.6% (n=30). The ages ranged between 18 and 63 with a mean of 34.7. Most of the participants preferred to answer the survey in Spanish (n=220; 55.7%). The reasons for apprehension varied within the sample; 207 (52.4%) individuals were apprehended for criminal charges, 123 (31.1%) were detained for immigration violations leading to deportation, and 28 (7.1%) were detained for revocation of their papers. The majority of the detentions took place in the city of Los Angeles, California and its vicinity[13]. All participants were awaiting deportation at the time of the interviews.

---

[13] The respondents were asked the location of their apprehension. Many responses provided the name of the city where they had been arrested, others gave reference points and many just provided the name of neighborhood. The wide variety of responses made it difficult to present a chart of the location of their arrest.

Table 2

Demographic Information

	Full Sample
	(n=395; 100%)
Sex	
Male	365 (92.4%)
Female	30 (7.6%)
Age	
Range	18-63
Mean (S.D.)	34.7 (9.3)
Language	
Spanish	220 (55.7%)
English	175 (44.3%)
Reason for apprehension	
Criminal Charge	207 (52.4%)
Deportation (no other charge)	123 (31.1%)
Papers Revoked	28 (7.1%)
Missing Responses	37 (9.4%)
Gang Involvement	92 (23.3%)
United States	74 (18.7%)
El Salvador	32 (8.1%)
Level of confinement	
Level 1	76 (19.2%)
Level 2	224 (56.7%)
Level 3	73 (18.5%)
Not Available	22 (5.6%)
Facility	
Mira Loma	236 (59.7%)
Santa Ana	155 (39.2%)
Missing Responses	4 (1.1%)

Among the entire sample, 92 (23.3%) participants were identified as having some level of gang involvement, whether by active membership, former membership or being friends with gang members (see Table 2). Seventy four (18.7%) individuals with some level of gang involvement admitted association with a gang in the United States. Thirty two (8.1%) participants recognized being involved with a gang in El Salvador. Twelve participants admitted simultaneous gang involvement in El Salvador and the United States. The detainees were assigned a level of confinement based on their criminal record and behavior. Level 1 reflects an administrative or immigration violation, thus assigning them a low level of confinement, and seventy six (19.2%) participants were held on this

level. Level 2 is generally assigned to individuals charged with a misdemeanor, and 224 (56.7%) of the participants were detained under this category. Level 3 is a felony or another aggravated offense which required the highest level of confinement and held 73 (18.5%) of the deportees who participated in the survey. The subjects were interviewed at one of two Immigration and Customs Enforcement facilities in California including Mira Loma (n=236; 59.7%) and Santa Ana (n=155; 39.2%).

Table 3 presents the descriptive characteristics by gang membership status. Two hundred and ninety eight (75.4%) interview participants denied any relationship to a gang, whereas 49 (12.4%) participants admitted gang association and 43 (10.9%) claimed current gang membership. The three groups were comprised primarily of men. Non-gang members were significantly more likely to be older than gang members and gang associates, and no significant differences were found between the two groups that admitted gang involvement. The majority of those individuals who admitted gang membership (n=28; 65.1%) and gang associates (n=28; 57.1%) preferred English for the interview instead of Spanish, compared to the majority of non-gang members (n=114; 38.3%) who did not speak English. The contrasts for the reason behind their apprehension were significantly different for the groups. Gang members (n=31; 72.1%) were more likely to be detained for criminal charges than non-gang members (n=140; 47%); similarly, gang associates (n=33; 67.3%) were significantly more likely to be apprehended for criminal charges than non-gang members. In contrast, non-gang members (n=104; 34.9%) were more likely to be detained for deportation than gang members (n=7; 16.3%).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics by Level of Gang Involvement

	No Gang Involvement	Gang Associates	Gang Members	Significant Contrasts
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)	
Sex				
Male	272 (91.3%)	47 (95.9%)	42 (97.7%)	
Female	26 (8.7%)	2 (4.1%)	1 (2.3%)	
Age				
Range	19-63	18-59	18-51	
Mean (SD)	36.1 (9.3)	30.4 (8.7)	29.9 (7.8)	NG>GM; NG>GA
Language				
Spanish	182 (61.1%)	21 (42.9%)	15 (34.9%)	
English	114 (38.3%)	28 (57.1%)	28 (65.1%)	GM>NG; GA>NG
Reason for apprehension				
Criminal Charge	140 (47%)	33 (67.3%)	31 (72.1%)	GM>NG; GA>NG
Deportation (no other charge)	104 (34.9%)	11 (22.5%)	7 (16.3%)	NG>GM
Papers Revoked	22 (7.4%)	2 (4.1%)	4 (9.3%)	
Missing Responses	32 (10.7%)	3 (6.1%)	1 (2.3%)	
Country of Gang Affiliation				
United States	N/A	39 (79.6%)	35 (81.4%)	GA>GM
El Salvador	N/A	23 (46.9%)	9 (20.9%)	GA>GM
Level of confinement				
Level 1	62 (20.8%)	8 (16.3%)	3 (7%)	
Level 2	179 (60.1%)	27 (55.1%)	17 (39.5%)	NG>GM
Level 3	42 (14.1%)	10 (20.4%)	20 (46.5%)	GM>NG; GM>GA
Not Available	15 (5%)	4 (8.2%)	3 (7%)	
Facility				
Mira Loma	173 (58%)	35 (71.4%)	25 (58.1%)	
Santa Ana	123 (41.3%)	13 (26.5%)	18 (41.9%)	
Missing Responses	2 (0.7%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) using Tukey HSD indicate significant differences among non-gang members (NG), gang associate (GA), and gang members (GM). Statistical significance at p<.05

The participants with gang involvement in the United States were more likely to be gang associates than gang members. The same differences apply to gang involvement in El Salvador. Eleven respondents acknowledged gang involvement in both countries and one respondent admitted simultaneous membership to gangs in the United States and El Salvador. No significant differences were found between the groups confined in Level

1, however, non-gang members were more likely to be held in Level 2 than gang members, and gang members were more likely to be detained in Level 3 than gang associates and non-gang members.

Gang Affiliation

In order to determine the gang to which the participants belong, it was necessary to group answers based on their allegiance. Answers like Mara-Salvatrucha, MS-13, Mara-13, or Mara-Salvatrucha 13 were grouped into one single variable that has been labeled as MS-13 to identify members of Mara Salvatrucha 13, or MS-13. Other answers like 18th, M-18, 18, Barrio 18 and 18th St were grouped under 18th St to denominate "18th Street Gang." In many cases, answers including the number 13 were given, but due to the nature of the gang it is impossible to assume gang relationships between MS-13 and other groups that might have just adopted the number as an independent identifier of a certain group. The number 13 has been documented to be a reference to the Mexican Mafia (La Eme) because the letter M is the 13th letter in the alphabet (Diaz, 2009; Logan & Bain, 2006). Answers that denoted any gang other than MS-13 or 18th Street were coded as "Other gang." Two respondents in this study claimed to have been associates of both rival groups: MS-13 and 18th Street. The motives behind the migration of these individuals were evaluated independently of their gang-relations.

Table 4 presents the number of gang associates and gang members who acknowledged membership to either MS-13, 18th Street or other gangs. Twenty three associates (46.9%) acknowledged involvement with Mara Salvatrucha-13. Similarly, five associates (10.2%) acknowledged involvement with 18th Street gang. Two gang associates (4.1%) claimed to be friends with MS-13 and 18th Street gang simultaneously.

Nineteen associates (38.8%) were friends with other gangs. In contrast, 14 (32.6%) gang members admitted membership to MS-13 and 4 (9.3%) claimed membership in 18th Street. No gang members claimed membership to both groups simultaneously. Twenty five (58.1%) gang members admitted involvement with other gangs.

Table 4

Gang Affiliation

	Gang Associates	Gang Members
	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)
MS-13	23 (46.9%)	14 (32.6%)
18th St	5 (10.2%)	4 (9.3%)
MS-13/18th St	2 (4.1%)	0 (0%)
Other gang	19 (38.8%)	25 (58.1 %)

Note: No statistically significant differences emerged between the groups.

Immigration

Table 5 displays the motives behind the migration of Salvadoran deportees. The most common reasons for non-gang members to migrate involved seeking better opportunities (n=91; 30.5%), escaping the war (n=40; 13.4%) and avoiding an unidentified threat (n=40; 13.4%). In comparison, the primary reasons for the migration of gang associates were "Escaping the War" (n=9; 18.4%), "Running from a gang" (n=8; 16.3%) and "Better Opportunities" (n=8; 16.3%). Gang members identified the search for better opportunities as the primary reason for their departure (n=7; 16.3%), along with reuniting with their family (n=6; 13.9%), escaping the war (n=6; 13.9%), and running from a gang (n=6; 13.9%).

Table 5

Reasons for Migration

	No gang association	Gang Associates	Gang Members
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)
Came with family (Age 12 or less)	9 (3%)	6 (12.2%)	5 (11.6%)
Came with family (13 or over)	10 (3.3%)	2 (4.1%)	2 (4.6%)
Reunite with family	30 (10.1%)	5 (10.2%)	6 (13.9%)
Better opportunities	91 (30.5%)	8 (16.3%)	7 (16.3%)
Escaping the war	40 (13.4%)	9 (18.4%)	6 (13.9%)
Running from a gang	31 (10.4%)	8 (16.3%)	6 (13.9%)
Avoid persecution	15 (5%)	0 (0%)	4 (9.3%)
Avoid legal action	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unidentified threat	40 (13.4%)	1 (2%)	2 (4.6%)
Criminal network	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Return to the U.S.	12 (4%)	5 (10.2%)	3 (6.9%)
Overstayed Visa	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	12 (4%)	4 (8.1%)	0 (0%)
Don't know	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.6%)
Refused	2 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The reasons for migration presented in Table 5 provide a detailed image of the

motive for the migration of the interviewees. However, some categories include very few

cases and made it difficult to conduct simple tests to determine the statistical significance

of the apparent differences. It was necessary to collapse some responses into broader

categories. The categories that relate to family or a better life were condensed into

"Quality of life." Answers related to fear of gangs, fear of the military or guerilla or

escaping the war were categorized into "Fear of Victimization," If the answers related to

expanding criminal networks or avoiding legal consequences for crimes in El Salvador,

they were summarized under "Criminal motives." Finally, other answers that related to

the individual entering the country to return to a residence or for travel were categorized

into "Legal entry." This allowed for a better analysis of the motives of the migration of the participants and to find any statistically significant differences between non-gang members, gang associates and gang members as established in the first hypothesis. Table 6 exemplifies the motives for departure from El Salvador in a more concise manner, which also allowed for further analysis and comparison. The summarized reasons for migration show that most answers can be grouped into the three categories created for the analyses, showing that there are no statistically significant differences between the migrations of the groups.

Hypothesis 1: Gang members are significantly more likely to migrate with the intention to expand their gang and their criminal networks.

The first hypothesis focused on the motives behind the migration of gang members, and it posited that gang members migrate with the intention to expand their gang and their criminal networks. The information presented on Table 6 provides data to test this hypothesis.

Table 6

Summarized Reasons for Migration

	No gang association	Gang Associates	Gang Members
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)
Quality of Life	137 (45.9%)	21 (42.8%)	20 (46.5%)
Fear of Victimization	129 (43.3%)	18 (36.7%)	18 (41.9%)
Criminal Motive	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Legal Entry	28 (9.4%)	9 (3%)	3 (7%)
Unknown/Refused	4 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.6%)

Note: No statistically significant differences emerged between the groups.

After analyzing the data it was clear that no respondents admitted that the motive of their migration into the United States was to avoid legal action against them or to expand their criminal networks. This finding provides evidence to refute the first hypothesis. When comparing the reasons behind the migration of non-gang members, gang associates and gang members, it is clear that the primary reasons for the migration of non-gang members and gang members are very similar.

Hypothesis 2: People with no relationship or association to a gang are significantly more likely to migrate with the intention to better their economical situation and living conditions.

The second hypothesis posited that non-gang members migrate with the intention to better their economical situation. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings. The primary reason for the migration of non-gang members is to search for better opportunities (n=91; 30.5%), although neither the information displayed in Table 5 nor Table 6 provide sufficient evidence to consider this a significant finding.

Hypothesis 3: Gang members and gang associates are significantly more inclined to violate migratory regulations than non-gang members.

The third hypothesis states that gang members are significantly more likely to violate migratory regulations than non-gang members. Table 7 and Table 8 provided data to test this hypothesis. Table 7 presents the details of the entry of the deportees into the United States. Although every detainee interviewed was awaiting deportation, they had not necessarily entered the country illegally. The categories of entry were divided into two primary sections: legal entry and illegal entry. The age of non-gang members at the time of their entry (either legal or illegal) into the United States varied from 1 to 51 years

(Mean=22, SD=9.7). Gang associates' ages ranged from less than one year to 45

(Mean=15.8, SD=8.9) and the age of gang members at the time of entry ranged from less

than one year to 31 (Mean=12.3, SD=8.3). Non-gang members were significantly more

likely to be older when entering the United States than gang associates and gang

members.

Table 7

Entry into the United States

	No gang association	Gang Associates	Gang Members	Significant Contrasts
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)	
Age when entering the U.S.				
Range	1-51	0-45	0-31	
Mean (SD)	22 (9.7)	15.8 (8.9)	12.3 (8.3)	NG>GA; NG>GM
Legal Entry into the U.S.	35 (11.7%)	7 (14.3%)	8 (18.6%)	
Immigrant Visa	22 (7.4%)	4 (8.2%)	3 (6.9%)	
Admitted as a refugee	2 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	
Student, work or long term Visa	4 (1.3%)	2 (4.1%)	0 (0%)	
Overstayed a non-immigrant visa	7 (2.3%)	1 (2%)	4 (9.3%)	GM>NG
Illegal Entry into the U.S.	260 (87.2%)	41 (83.7%)	33 (76.7%)	
Without documents	245 (82.2%)	39 (79.6%)	26 (60.5%)	NG>GM
False documents	4 (1.3%)	1 (2%)	4 (9.3%)	GM>NG; GM>GA
Another person's documents	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Other	10 (3.4%)	1 (2%)	3 (6.9%)	
Refused	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Missing	2 (0.7%)	1 (2%)	2 (4.7%)	

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) using Tukey HSD indicate significant differences among non-gang members (NG), gang associate (GA), and gang members (GM).Statistical significance at p<.05

A small percentage of respondents entered the United States lawfully. The only

significant finding in this category is that gang members are more likely to overstay the

time allowed to remain in the United States than non-gang members when entering the

country with a non-immigrant visa. The majority of the respondents from the three

categories admitted entering the country illegally. Non-gang members were significantly

more likely to enter the country without any documentation than gang members. However, gang members were significantly more likely than non-gang members and gang associates to use false documents to cross the United States border.

Although not statistically significant, Table 7 shows that gang members were less likely to enter the United States unlawfully (n=33; 76.7%) than gang associates (n=41; 83.7%) or non-gang members (n=260; 87.2%). It is interesting that non-gang members are more likely than other groups to violate immigration regulations when crossing the border between Mexico and the United States. Nonetheless, data showed no significant differences between the proclivity of non-gang members and gang members to violate migratory regulations. The means of entry into the United States are similar for the three groups presented in the analyses. No evidence emerged to support the hypothesis that gang members and gang associates are more likely to violate migratory regulations than non-gang members.

Each of the respondents was being held in custody by ICE for an immigration violation at the time of the interviews. As shown in Table 8, the number of unlawful entries into the United States is similar for non-gang members, gang associates and gang members. There are no significant differences between the groups regarding illegal entries into the country. When analyzing the number of detentions for unlawful entry the results were similar. There are no significant differences in the number of detentions between non-gang members, gang associates and gang members. Likewise, non-gang members, gang associates and gang members show no significant differences regarding the number of times deported from the United States. The third hypothesis posits that

gang members and gang associates are significantly more inclined to violate migratory

regulations than non-gang members. Table 8 displays the data to test this hypothesis.

Table 8

Immigration Violations

	No gang association	Gang Associates	Gang Members
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)
Unlawful entry to the U.S.			
0	25 (8.4%)	6 (12.3%)	9 (20.9%)
1	230 (77.2%)	37 (75.5%)	29 (67.4%)
2	30 (10%)	4 (8.2%)	4 (9.3%)
3 or more	11 (3.7%)	1 (2%)	1 (2.3%)
Missing	2 (0.7%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Detentions for unlawful entry			
0	147 (49.3%)	22 (44.9%)	23 (53.5%)
1	114 (38.2%)	24 (48.9%)	15 (34.9%)
2	26 (8.7%)	2 (4.1%)	4 (9.3%)
3 or more	10 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)
Missing	1 (0.4%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Times deported from the U.S.			
0	250 (83.9%)	44 (89.8%)	35 (81.4%)
1	34 (11.4%)	2 (4.1%)	7 (16.3%)
2	8 (2.7%)	2 (4.1%)	0 (0%)
3 or more	6 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Missing	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1 (2.3%)

Note: No significant differences emerged between the groups.

The data shown on Table 8 provides no evidence to support the hypothesis

regarding the violation of migratory regulations. Although gang associates seem to be

more likely to be detained for entering the country unlawfully in one occasion (n=24;

48.9%) than non-gang members (n=114; 38.2%) and considerably more likely to be

detained than gang members (n=15; 34.9%), no significant differences emerged between

non-gang members, gang associates and gang members regarding unlawful entry into the

United States, detentions for unlawful entry or deportations from the country. It is

important to note that although gang members are subject to more deportations as a result of legislative actions, the number of deported gang members is not statistically significantly higher than the number of deported non-gang members or gang associates.

Table 9 features the percentages of detainees receiving help to cross the border. Almost half (n=148; 49.7%) of the non-gang members admitted having been helped by an individual or organization when crossing the border. Twenty seven gang associates (55.1%) admitted receiving assistance to enter the United States and 25 (58.1%) gang members admitted receiving help. Although not statistically significant, gang members appear to be more likely to receive help crossing the border than non-gang members or gang associates. However, the missing responses from gang members raise the question regarding whether or not those individuals were helped to cross the border and whether those findings would be statistically significant.

Table 9

Assistance Crossing the Border

	No gang association	Gang Associates	Gang Members
	(n=298; 75.4%)	(n=49; 12.4%)	(n=43; 10.9%)
Did anyone help you cross the U.S. border?			
Yes	148 (49.7%)	27 (55.1%)	25 (58.1%)
No	121 (40.6%)	12 (24.5%)	4 (9.3%)
Missing	29 (9.7%)	10 (20.4%)	14 (32.6%)

Note: No significant differences emerged between the groups.

Only one active gang member admitted receiving help from a *homie*, while the rest of the sample received help from strangers, "Coyotes," friends, or family members. Four interviewees acknowledged being smuggled into the country along with other things. One was brought in with fruit, one with other people, one with marihuana (no

description of the amount was provided), and one admitted being smuggled along women, drugs and weapons.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The primary objective of this project was to examine the motives behind the immigration between gang members, gang associates and non-gang members from El Salvador into the United States. The hypotheses suggested that the motive for the migration of Salvadoran gang members would include an expansion of their criminal networks, while non-gang members would migrate in search of better opportunities and implement their lifestyle. The data collected at the two ICE facilities in California allowed for analyses of the motives behind the migration of gang members. Analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between the level of gang involvement (non-gang member, gang associate or gang member) and the motives for migration, means of entering the country and proclivity to violate immigration regulations.

Summary of Findings and Comparison with Previous Studies

Hypothesis 1: Gang members migrate with the intention to expand their gang and their criminal networks.

The analyses conducted to determine the relationship between gang membership and motives for migration produced no significant results. The first hypothesis presented established that gang members migrate with the intention to expand their criminal networks. The results of the analyses showed that none of the gang members admitted departing from El Salvador with the intention to establish relationships with other gang members, expand their current clique, start a new clique, or for economical benefits deriving from illegal activities. After comparing the motives for the migration of gang members to the motives for the migration of non-gang members and gang associates, it is

clear that the principal motives for the migration of all groups are similar: finding a better quality of life. The data do not support the first hypothesis.

On the other hand, previous research suggests that illegal immigrants tend to be younger than 18 years when entering the country (Butcher & Piehl, 1998), and thus may be at greater risk of being involved with criminal activities (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 2983). The findings of this project support that statement. The mean age at the time of entry into the United States of non-gang members was 22 years of age, whereas the mean age of gang members was 12.3 and gang associates 15.8. According to Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) teens are prone to having higher offending rates than adults, which would explain why individuals entering the country at a younger age reported gang membership more frequently. It is possible that although gang members did not migrate for expansion of their networks, they migrated for better opportunities before they became gang members and joined their gang once they were living in the United States, which is contrary to research that has argued that foreign born youth are less likely to be involved in criminal activities than natives (Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Martinez & Lee, 2000; Martinez, Stowell & Lee, 2010; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009). It has been argued that Central American gang members are foreign born, but have become gang members in the United States after entering the country at a young age (Logan & Bain, 2006). The current study could not establish the causality of gang membership and immigration, further research must be conducted to determine the relationship between the two events. Furthermore, the evidence that disproves the first hypothesis of crime expansion also refutes the validity of the *Alien Conspiracy Theory* presented by Williams and Roth (2011). The *Alien Conspiracy Theory* explains that transnational criminal organizations –

such as MS-13- are the result of immigrants "transplanting […] preexisting criminal cultures and behaviors [into] America" (Williams & Roth, 2011, p.302). No participants of this project admitted that the motive for their migration was the expansion of their criminal networks, thus the theory may not apply to this particular group of immigrants.

Finally, the lack of evidence to suggest that gang members depart from El Salvador with the intention to expand their gang is contrary to Maxson's (1998) argument that the migration of gang members contributes to gang proliferation. On the other hand, the same lack of evidence may be used to discredit Vittori's (2007) and Papachristo's (2005) explanations of gang expansion by the migration of individual members for recruitment. Furthermore, research has argued that Salvadoran gang members migrate for fear of retaliation by vigilante groups (Seelke, 2010), although the results do not provide enough evidence to support this assumption. Nonetheless, the data suggest, in agreement with previous research (Cruz, 2010), that gang members migrate due to an imitation of contemporary social processes.

Hypothesis 2: People with no relationship or association to a gang are significantly more likely to migrate with the intention to better their economical situation and living conditions.

The second supposition was that people with no relationship or association to a gang migrate with the intention to better their economical situation and living conditions. Of the 298 individuals interviewed who did not admit gang association or membership, 91 (30.5%) claimed to have entered the United States in hopes of finding better living conditions, economical benefits and a higher quality of life. This percentage is nearly double than the percentages found for of gang associates (16.3%) and gang members

(16.3%) when asked the same question. Nonetheless, when the answers were grouped into the categories, the percentages of non-gang members migrating to the United States for a better quality of life (45.9%) were not significantly different than the percentage of gang associates (42.8%) and gang members (46.5%) who migrated for the same reason. A similar pattern was seen for fear of victimization as a motive for migration. The evidence does not support the hypothesis that individuals with no gang association are more likely to migrate for economical reasons than individuals with gang involvement.

Though research has found that youth join *maras* searching for economical stability (Logan and Kairies, 2006; U.S. Congressional Research Service, 2007), the findings of this project suggest that members of *maras* continue to migrate in search for economical steadiness. This finding suggests that *maras* do not necessarily provide their members with the stability they desire in their home country and therefore migrate in search of better possibilities for economical development. Furthermore, studies have reported that a significant number of gang members wish to leave the gang and search for better economical and educational opportunities (SIDA, 2008) or to provide support for their families (Goubaud, 2008), which supports the results of this project. Gang members migrate for economical betterment and the possibility of achieving economical stability. Whether they do so by joining a clique in the United States or pursuing lawful employment is yet to be analyzed.

Hypothesis 3: Gang members and gang associates are more inclined to violate migratory regulations than non-gang members.

The third hypothesis was tested through two different questions. The first question analyzed for this purpose was the means used by the deportees to enter the country. The

assumption was that gang members and gang associates were more likely to use illegal means, while non-gang members would enter the country legally. No statistical significances were found to determine a true difference between the groups (Table 7). However, the percentages of individuals violating migratory regulations were higher among non-gang members (87.2%) than gang associates (83.7%) and considerably higher than gang members (76.7%). The supposition that gang members and gang associates are more likely to violate immigration regulations was not supported by statistically significant findings. Nevertheless, the differences between the percentages of gang members who had never entered the country unlawfully (20.9%) is much higher than the percentage of gang associates who had never entered the United States illegally (12.3%) and more than 10% higher than the non-gang members who never entered the country through illegal means (8.4%). In conclusion the analyses did not provide evidence to support the third hypothesis. The defiant attitude against authorities and the lack of respect for the law that has been described in previous research (Elbert, 2010; Manwaring, 2005) has no apparent effect on the proclivity of gang members to violate migratory regulations when entering the United States. Although researchers have expressed concern of the constant threat that criminal organizations pose and how immigration of criminals aggravates problems resulting from illegal immigration into the United States (James, 2005), the evidence found through this study does not support those statements.

Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research

Despite the important contributions made by the current study, some limitations are worth noting. The accessibility to research subjects through a detention facility

creates noteworthy obstacles for the current study. The availability of subjects was a decisive factor in the size of the original sample. Every participant in the study was in custody of Immigration and Customs Enforcement awaiting deportation. Immigration authorities explained that they continuously send groups of immigrants back to their home country, thus availability of subjects would be dependent on when the studies were to be conducted. However, the scheduling of the interviews at the first location was done in a timely manner and allowed for a larger sample (n=236; 59.8%). The sample at the second location was also of a considerable size (n=155; 39.2%). Among the entire sample, a small number of gang members were identified, so it was necessary to group current and former gang members into one category to compare with gang associates and non-gang members. The number of gang members who participated in the project, though useful, was smaller than needed to conduct more advanced statistical analyses. Furthermore, Curry, Decker and Egley (2006), as well as Decker and Curry (1996) based their analyses on juvenile populations. Although their classification of non-gang members, current gang members, former gang members and associates has proved useful for the purpose of the present study, the interaction between adults may be different than the interaction between youths. The interaction with gang members must be further studied to determine if the classification may be further applied to adult samples.

The representativeness of the sample can be considered a limitation of the study. While all Salvadoran citizens under custody of I.C.E. were invited to participate in the survey, it is difficult to determine whether or not they are representative of the entire population of Salvadoran nationals in the State of California, in the United States, or representative of their cliques or gangs. Also, it is not uncommon for inmate samples to

have lower response rates (Fox, Zambrana, & Lane, 2011). Nonetheless, the current study featured a relatively high response rate (93.1%). Therefore, the data collected may be representative of the available population of immigrants in custody of immigration authorities. Another limitation of the current study is the age of the respondents. Due to the nature of the locale where the interviews took place, each respondent was at least 18 years old, leaving the juvenile population automatically excluded from this study.

Due to their immigration status and the nature of the deportation process, it is possible that the number of deportees on detention facilities may have underreported their offending behavior. The strain and frustration of being detained and facing deportation may have influenced the subjects to minimize or conceal their wrongdoing during the interview. Particularly with gang members, it is possible that they attempted to conceal the real motives behind their departure from El Salvador. Furthermore, some of the participants expressed concern about sharing information due to fear of further legal consequences. The researchers assured the participant of their anonymity, and built rapport with the detainees to diminish tension and attempt to collect as much information as possible. The validity of data collected through self-report instruments relies entirely on the respondents' desire to provide honest information, although respondents may under-report or over-report previous activities, research suggests that detainees will generally provide truthful information about their criminal activities (Fox, Zambrana, & Lane, 2011; Peterson, Braiker, & Polich, 1981).

Future research must address the issues presented above. It is necessary to continue research on the motives behind the migration of gang members, for which it is essential to have a larger sample. Finally, it is important to conduct further research on

foreign-born juvenile gang members to understand their acculturation process and the motives for joining a gang, and how these motives differ from native-born gang members, which will allow us to further understand cultural differences between gangs in different countries.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Illegal immigration is a sensitive issue that has gained considerable attention in contemporary United States. It is clear that the flow of immigrants from Latin America has displaced Europe as the origin of the majority of the immigrants in the United States (Martinez, Stowell & Lee, 2010). Legislative responses created a constant flow of immigrants to and from Central America, many of whom are gang members. The primary objective of this study was to understand the motives behind the migration of gang members into the United States and how those motives vary between gang members, gang associates and non-gang members. In-person interview surveys were answered by Salvadoran immigrants being held at I.C.E. detention facilities in California. These instruments provided data to study the reasons for their migration and to support the findings of this project.

The data collected from Salvadoran deportees did not provide evidence to find statistically significant differences between active gang members, gang associates and non-gang members regarding immigration motives and means of entry into the United States. The data and the analyses have failed to find significant evidence to support the three hypotheses presented for this project. There are no statistically significant differences between the motives behind the migration of gang members, gang associates and non-gang members (Table 5). Similarly, no significant differences were found within these groups regarding the reason for their migration from El Salvador into the United States (Table 6), the means of entry into the country (Table 7), or the violations of immigration regulations (Table 8).

The migration of individuals with criminal records or involvement in criminal activities will remain to be a concern for immigration authorities. However, the results of the analyses should be interpreted with caution with respect to the policy-oriented implications. For example, this cross-sectional study is based upon a relatively small sample from one state. The findings show gang members and gang associates migrate for the same reasons as non-gang members. Legislators may consider this information when addressing the entry of foreigners into the United States, although additional research should be conducted (e.g., replications and extensions of this study) before relying upon the findings to inform policy.

The activities of gangs like Mara Salvatrucha-13 and Barrio 18 continue to be prevalent in Central American countries, and the migration of workers from Central America remains an important issue in the United States. Although immigrants are being deported back to their home countries, gang members and non-gang members continue to attempt to return to the United States in search for a higher quality of life. In order to find a solution to the problem of transnational gangs such as MS-13, the United States government and its Salvadoran counterpart must address the issue together. It is important to continue studying the migration of individuals into the United States through the southern border and their possible relation to gangs or other criminal organizations.

The availability of research focusing on the migration of Central American gangs is limited. Though there are theories regarding the migration of gangs within a country (Maxson, 1998), very few studies have addressed the migration of gangs across international borders (Cruz, 2010; Papachristos, 2005; Vittori, 2007). The findings of this project are contrary to the theories presented by Cruz (2010), Vittori (2007) and

Papachristos (2005) regarding the migration of gang members for expansion and

recruitment. Seelke (2010) argued that Salvadoran gang members leave their country to

avoid retaliatory actions from the government and vigilante groups. The current study

found evidence to partially support Seelke's perspective, although further research must

be conducted with a larger sample to provide statistically significant evidence. Future

research must be conducted on active members of the *maras* to learn more about their

networks, the operation and communication between their cliques, their transnational

activities and the organization of their groups across international borders and within

prisons, as well as their motivations and gang lifestyle. Another aspect of gangs that must

be addressed is the nationality of members within these groups and the relationship

between the age of entry into the country and the initiation with the gang. No research

has been conducted to analyze the nationality of gang members belonging to *maras* in the

United States.

Although the media attention on the *mara* problem has not been as prevalent as it

was in the early 2000s, there is no evidence to support the assumption that these Central

American groups have disappeared or lost any strength. Theories addressing the

evolution of gangs have been presented (Sullivan, 2006). These theories explain how

gangs evolve from a street level into transnational criminal organizations, and have

compared the evolution of MS-13 to other non-state combatants such as terrorists and

mercenaries. The internal functioning of these groups has allowed them to recruit

individuals from societies suffering from social ailments, such as El Salvador. It is

important for researchers and law enforcement agencies to conduct research on the

known members of these groups to understand the future of *maras* in Central America

and the United States, and how these gangs present a future threat to entire communities and the national security of the United States.

REFERENCES

Aguirre, A., & Simmers, J. K. (2008). Mexican border crossers: The Mexican body in immigration disclosure. *Social Justice, 35*(4), 99-106.

Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., & Bellair, P. (1994). Living with crime: The implications of racial/ethnic differences in suburban locations. *Social Forces*, *73*, 395-434.

Andersson, R. (2005). The New Frontiers of America. *Race and Class, 46*(3), 28-38.

Arana, A. (2005). How the street gangs took Central America. *Foreign Affairs, 84*(3), 98-110.

Blau, J. R., & Blau, P. M. (1982). The cost of inequality: Metropolitan structure and violent crime. *American Sociological Review*, *47*, 114-129.

Boerman, T. (2007). Central American gangs: An overview of the phenomenon in Latin America and the U.S. *Journal of Gang Research, 15*(1), 35-52.

Bruneau, T., Dammert, L., & Skinner, E. (2011). *Maras: Gang violence and security in Central America*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Butcher, K. F., & Piehl, A. M. (1998). Cross-city evidence on the relationship between immigration and crime. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17, 457–493.

Campo-Flores, A. (2005). The most dangerous gang in America. *Newsweek, 145*(3), 23-26.

Carranza, M. (2004). *Detention or death: Where the "pandillero" kids of El Salvador are heading*. San Salvador, El Salvador: Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas.

Corbiscello, G. (2008). Border crossings: A look at the very real threat of cross border gangs to the U.S. *Journal of Gang Research, 15*(2), 33-52.

Cruz, J. M. (2010). Central American *maras*: From youth street gangs to transnational protection rackets. *Global Crime, 11*(4), 379-398.

Curry, D. C., Decker, S., & Egley, A. E. (2006). Gang involvement and delinquency in a middle school population. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(2), 275-292.

Decker, S., & Curry, D. C. (2000). Addressing key features of gang membership: Measuring the involvement of young members. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*, 473-482.

Desmond, S. A., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). The power of place: Immigrant communities and adolescent violence. *Sociological Quarterly*, *50*(4), 581-607.

Diaz, T. (2009). *No boundaries: Transnational latino gangs and American law enforcement.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Elbert, C. A. (2004). La violencia social en América Latina a través del caso Centroamericano de las bandas juveniles "maras." *Revista Cenipec, 23,* 11-31.

Etter, G. W. (2010). Mara Salvatrucha 13: A transnational threat. *Journal of Gang Research, 17*(2), 1-17.

Fox, K., Zambrana, K., & Lane, J. (2011). Getting in (and staying in) when everyone else wants to get out: 10 lessons learned from conducting research with inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*(2), 304-327.

Franco, J. (1983). An acculturation scale for Mexican-American children. *Journal of General Psychology*, *108*, 175-181.

Goubaud, E. (2008). Maras y pandillas en Centroamérica [Maras and gangs in Central America]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Seguridad Ciudadana, 4,* 35-46.

Guerette, T. (2007). Immigration policy, border security, and migrant deaths: An impact evaluation of life-saving efforts under the border safety initiative. *Criminology and Public Policy, 6*(2), 245-266.

Guerette, T., & Clarke, R. V. (2005). Border enforcement, organized crime, and deaths of smuggled migrants on the United States-Mexico border. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, *11*, 159-174.

Hagedorn, J. M. (2008). Making sense of Central American maras. *Air and Space Travel Journal.* Retrieved from: http://www.airpower.au.af.mil/apjinternational/apj-s/2008/2tri08/hagedorneng.htm

Herzog, S. (2009). Ethnic and immigrant residential concentration, and crime rates. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(5), 427-434.

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 89*, 552–584.

Howell, J. C., & Moore, J.P. (2010). History of gangs in the United States. *National Gang Center Bulletin, 4,* 1-25.

Interview with Darell Dones. (2010). *The Forensic Examiner, 19*(3), 110-111.

James, A. (2005). Criminal networks, illegal immigration and the threat to border security. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 7*(4), 219-229.

Johnson, S., & Muhlhausen, D. B. (2005). North American transnational youth gangs: Breaking the chain of violence. *Trends in Organized Crime*, *9*(1), 38-54.

Johnstone, J. W. C. (1983). Recruitment to a youth gang. *Youth and Society, 14*(3), 281-300.

Jütersonke, O., Muggah, R., & Rodgers, D. (2009). Urban violence and security promotion in Central America. *Security Dialogue, 40*(4-5), 1-20.

Lee, M. T., & Martinez R., Jr. (2002). Social disorganization revisited: Mapping the recent immigration and black homicide relationship in Northern Miami. *Sociological Focus, 35*(4), 363-380.

Lee, M. T., & Martinez, R., Jr. (2009). Immigration reduces crime: An emerging scholarly consensus. *Sociology of Law, Crime and Deviance, 13,* 3-16.

Lee, M. T., Martinez R., Jr., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). Does immigration increase homicide? Negative evidence from three border cities. *The Sociological Quarterly, 42*(4), 559-580.

Lee, Y., Ottati, V., & Hussain, I. (2001). Attitudes toward "illegal" immigration into the United States: California Proposition 187. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*(4), 430-443.

Logan, S., & Bain, B. (2006). Street gangs, a transnational security threat. Retrieved on October 19, 2011 from http://www.samuellogan.com/articles/street-gangs-a-transnational-security-threat.html

Logan, S., & Kairies, K. (2006). Recruitment, redemption in the MS-13. Retrieved from http://www.samuellogan.com/articles/recruitment-redemption-in-the-ms13.html

Loosle, R. B. (2006). Combating violent street gangs in L.A. and nationwide. Testimony, *Federal Bureau of Investigation*. Retrieved from: http://www.fbi.gov/news/testimony/combating-violent-street-gangs-in-l.a.-and-nationwide

The Maldon Institute. (2004). *Mara Salvatrucha*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Manwaring, M. G. (2005). *Street Gangs: The new urban insurgency* [Insurgency and Counterintelligence in the 21st Century]. Retrieved from http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?PubID=597

Martinez, R., Jr. (2000). Immigration and urban violence: The link between immigrant Latinos and types of homicide. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*(1), 363-374.

Martinez, R., Jr., & Lee M. T. (2000). On immigration and crime. In G. LaFree (Ed.), *Criminal Justice 2000: The changing nature of crime* (p.p. 485-534), Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Martinez, R., Jr., Rosenfeld, R., & Mares, D. (2008). Social disorganization, drug market activity, and neighborhood violent crime. *Urban Affairs Review, 43*(6), 846-874.

Martinez R., Jr., Stowell, J. A., & Lee, M. T. (2010). Immigration and crime in an era of transformation: A longitudinal analysis of homicides in San Diego neighborhoods, 1980-2000. *Criminology*, *48*(3), 797-829.

Maxson, C. L. (1998). *Gang Members on the Move*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review, 3*(5), 672-682.

Miller, H.V., Barnes, J.C., & Hartley, R. D. (2011). Reconsidering Hispanic gang membership and acculturation in a multivariate context. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(3), 331-355.

Miller, H. V., & Gibson, C. L. (2011). Neighborhood, acculturation, crime, and victimization among Hispanics: The cross-fertilization of the sociologies of immigration and crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 27*(1), 4-17.

Morenoff, J. D., & Astor, A. (2006). Immigrant assimilation and crime: Generational differences in youth violence in Chicago. In Martinez R., Jr., & Valenzuela A. Jr. (2006), *Immigration and crime: Race, ethnicity, and violence* (pp. 36-63). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology, 39*(3), 517-559.

National Gang Intelligence Center. (2009). *National gang threat assessment* (Product No. 2009-M0335-001). Retrieved from:

http://www.justice.gov/ndic/pubs32/32146/index.htm

Nielsen, A. L., Lee, M. T., & Martinez, R., Jr. (2005). Integrating race, place and motive in social disorganization theory: Lessons from a comparison of black and Latino homicide types in two immigrant destination cities. *Criminology, 43*(3), 837-872.

Oliver, J. (1999). The Esquipulas process: A Central American paradigm for resolving regional conflict. *Ethnic Studies Report, 17*(2), 149-179.

Ousey, G., & Kubrin, C. (2009). Exploring the connection between immigration and violent crime rates in U.S. cities, 1980-2000. *Social Problems, 56*(3), 447-473.

Papachristos, A. V. (2005). Gang world. *Foreign Policy* (3), 48-55.

Passel, J. S., & Cohan, D. (2011). *Unauthorized immigrant population: National and state trends, 2010*. Washington, D.C: Pew Hispanic Center.

Peterson, R. H., Braiker, H.B., & Polish, S. M. (1981). *Who commits crimes-A survey of prison inmates*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain. In Fox, K., Zambrana, K., & Lane, J. (2011). Getting in (and staying in) when everyone else wants to get out: 10 lessons learned from conducting research with inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*(2), 304-327.

Pruss, H. (2010). The mediated body as the site for contested agencies: MS-13 as a case study. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology, 2*(1), 137-177.

Pyrooz, D.C., & Decker, S.H. (2011). Motives and methods for leaving the gang: Understanding the process of gang desistance. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39,* 417-425.

Quinn, J., & Kock, D. (2003). The nature of criminality with one-percent motorcycle clubs. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 24*, 281-305.

Ramirez, R. R., & De la Cruz, P. (2003). The Hispanic population in the United States: March 2002. *Current population reports*, *P20-545*. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington DC. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/p20-545.pdf

Reid, L. W., Weiss, H. E., Adelman, R. M., & Jaret, C. (2005). The immigration-crime relationship: Evidence across U. S. metropolitan areas. *Social Science Research, 34*, 757-780.

U.S. Congressional Research Service. (2007). *Gangs in Central America*. (CRS Report 7-5700 RL34112). Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34112.pdf

Rogers, J. (2003). Confronting transnational gangs in the Americas. *Journal of Gang Research, 10*(2), 33-44.

Rumbaut, R. G., & Ewig, W. A. (2007). *The myth of immigrant criminality and the paradox of assimilation: Incarceration rates among native and foreign-born men*. Washington, D. C.: American Immigration Law Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/docs/Imm%20Criminality%20(IPC).pdf

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study off collective efficacy. *Science, 277,* 918-924.

Seelke, C. R. (2010). Gangs in Central America. *Congressional Research Service.*

Shaw, C., & McKay, H. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency in urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shihadeh, E. S., & Barranco, R. E. (2010). Latino employment and black violence: The unintended consequence of U. S. immigration policy. *Social Forces, 88*(3), 1393-1420.

Shihadeh, E. S., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (1994). Economic inequality, family disruption, and urban black violence: Cities as units of stratification and social control. *Social Forces, 73*, 729-751.

Smart, J. F., & Smart, D. W. (1995). Acculturative stress of hispanics: Loss and challenge. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 194-204.

Sorenson, S. B., & Shen, H. (1996). Homicide risk among immigrants in California, 1970-1992. *American Journal of Public Health, 86*, 97-100.

Sullivan, J. P. (2006). Maras morphing: Revisiting third generation gangs. *Global Crime, 7 (3-4), 487-504.*

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency [SIDA]. (2008). *Maras and youth gangs, community and police in Central America: Summary of a regional and multidisciplinary study* (Art. Number Sida45307en). Retrieved from: http://www.sida.se/Global/About%20Sida/Nyhetsarkiv/Nyhetsarkiv%202009/Do kument/Maras_and_Youth_Gangs,_Community_and_Police_in_Central_America [1].pdf

Tanton, J., & Lutton, W. (1993). Immigration and crime in the USA. *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies, 18*, 217–234.

Vittori, J. (2007). The gang's all here: The globalization of gang activity. *Journal of Gang Research, 14*(3), 1-34.

Warner, B. D. (1999). Whither poverty? Social disorganization theory in an era of urban transformation. *Sociological Focus, 32*, 99-113.

Williams, C. & Roth, M. P. (2011). The Importation and re-exportation of organized crime: Explaining the rise and fall of the Jamaican posses in the United States. *Trends in Organized Crime, 14*(4), 298-313.

Zilberg, E. (2004). Fools banished from the kingdom: Remapping geographies of gang violence between the Americas (Los Angeles and San Salvador). *American Quarterly, 56*(3), 759-779.

APPENDIX A
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

ICE DETENTION SURVEY
Cover Sheet

1

SURVEY ID #

INTERVIEW DATE		
MONTH	DAY	YEAR

- ○ Jan
- ○ Feb
- ○ Mar
- ○ Apr
- ○ May
- ○ June
- ○ July
- ○ Aug
- ○ Sept
- ○ Oct
- ○ Nov
- ○ Dec

INTERVIEWER INITIALS & ID#

YEAR OF BIRTH

US Residential Zipcode

SEX
- ○ Male
- ○ Female

Level of Confinement
- ○ Level 1
- ○ Level 2
- ○ Level 3
- ○ Other

Country of origin
- ○ El Salvador
- ○ Other (specify below)

Citizenship
- ○ USA
- ○ El Salvador
- ○ Other (specify below)

Reason for apprehension
- ○ Criminal charge
- ○ Deportation (no other charge)
- ○ Papers revoked
- ○ Another reason

Agency, Jurisdiction, or Place Apprehended

Official apprehension location

CONSENT SCRIPT:

Hello, my name is ____ and I work for Arizona State University. The purpose of the project is to understand issues and problems associated with cliques in the United States and El Salvador. This project is funded by the U.S. federal government. I would like to ask you a series of questions that will take anywhere between 45 minutes and one and one-half hours to answer. There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research project, and there are no benefits to you individually. If you chose to participate in the interview the information you provide will be confidential. In other words, no one other than ASU research staff will have access to the information you provide us. However, you should be aware that the results of the research may be published, but your name will never be used. You can refuse to answer any question, and you may stop the interview at anytime for any reason. This means you can ask for any question to be explained, skip any questions you do not want to answer, and stop participating in the interview at any time. Do you have any questions? Would you like to participate in the study?

Do you speak English?
- ○ No
- ○ Yes

Facility
- ○ Mira Loma
- ○ Santa Ana - TLACY
- ○ Orange Co - "Farm"
- ○ Orange Co. - Other
- ○ Texas 1
- ○ Texas 2
- ○ Other

Would you like to participate in this research project?
- ○ Agreed
- ○ Declined
- ○ Not Available - e.g. ill, taken to court, released, transferred, violent, isolation, etc.

14

Demographic Information

2

I want to begin by asking some questions about you.

1. How old are you?

2. How many total years of education have you successfully finished?

3. How many years of education did you successfully finish in El Salvador? [Or elsewhere other than the US]

4. How many years of education did you successfully finish in the USA?

5. In what country were you born?
- ○ El Salvador
- ○ OTHER (specify below)

6. What country are you a citizen of? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]
- ○ USA
- ○ El Salvador
- ○ Other [SPECIFY]

7. Where do you consider yourself to be from in the US? [CITY & STATE]

8. Where do you consider yourself to be from in El Salvador? [CITY & STATE]

9. In the 30 days prior to your apprehension were you living in the United States? If so, where? [CITY & STATE]

10. In the 30 days prior to your apprehension were you living in another country? If so, where? [CITY & STATE & COUNTRY]

11. In the past month prior to your apprehension, in what kind of place did you live?

[PROBE: What kind of building? Where did you stay? Where did you live for *most* of the past 30 days?]
- ○ House, apartment, condo, or mobile home
- ○ Emergency or short-term shelter
- ○ Jail or prison
- ○ No fixed residence
- ○ OTHER [SPECIFY BELOW]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT FAMILY SHOULD INCLUDE ONLY LIVING FAMILY MEMBERS.

About your family....

	Yes or No?	How many?	How many live in El Salvador?	How many live in the United States?
12. Do you have any children?				
13. Do you have any siblings? (brothers or sisters)				
14. Do you have any parents?				
15. Do you have any other relatives [cousins, aunts, uncles, etc]?				

---

[14] The consent script states that the information disclosed will not be available to anyone other than "ASU research staff." At the time of the data collection I was hired by Arizona State University to participate in the process, officially making me ASU's research staff.

16. In the past month (30 days) prior to your apprehension, what was the main source of your income or spending money?

[SPECIFY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OR SOURCE. USE FULL- OR PART-TIME FOR SELF-EMPLOYED. DO NOT RECORD EMPLOYER'S NAME.]

- ○ Working FULL-time **[USE 16a BELOW]**
- ○ Working PART- time **[USE 16a BELOW]**
- ○ Family (boyfriend/girlfriend, allowance)
- ○ Other LEGAL sources **[USE 16b BELOW]**
- ○ Prostitution
- ○ Dealing / Drug Sales
- ○ Other ILLEGAL sources **[USE 16b BELOW]**
- ○ No Income **[PROBE-NEVER ACCEPT W/O PROBING]**

17. In the past 30 days prior to your apprehension how much money have you received from all...

a. LEGAL sources?

b. ILLEGAL sources?

LEGAL SOURCES	ILLEGAL SOURCES
(digit columns 0-9)	(digit columns 0-9)

16a. SPECIFY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT	16b. SPECIFY OTHER INCOME SOURCE
○ Automotive (mechanic, auto-body, painting)	○ Burglary, Home Invasions
○ Bar (bartender, cocktail server)	○ Child Support (or alimony)
○ Caregiver (adult or child)	○ Copper (or other metal) Theft
○ Carpenter, Electrician, Framer, Plumber	○ Donate Blood or Plasma
○ Clerical (admin asst., bank teller, paralegal)	○ Disability
○ Construction	○ Gambling
○ Dancer (exotic, stripper)	○ Hustling [NOT DRUG SALES]
○ Day Labor (general laborer, odd jobs)	○ Loans (student, other)
○ Healthcare (hospital, clinic, or home)	○ Panhandling or Begging
○ Home Remodel (cabinets, fencing, painter, tile)	○ Savings (tax return, inheritance)
○ Housekeeping (janitor, businesses, houses)	○ Shoplifting
○ Landscaping (arborist, mowing lawns)	○ Street Vending
○ Restaurant (server, cook, dishwasher, fast food)	○ Retirement or Pension
○ Retail (cashier, grocery, theaters, cust. service)	○ Robbing People
○ Service Tech (cable, phone, HVAC, A/C)	○ Theft (unspecified stealing)
○ Truck or Delivery Driver	○ Tribal Per Capita (casino money)
○ Warehouse (stocker, forklift operator)	○ Unemployment Benefits
○ OTHER **[SPECIFY]**	○ OTHER **[SPECIFY]**
○ REFUSED	○ REFUSED

Specify:

VICTIMIZATION SECTION:
The next series of questions are about whether you have been the victim of a crime or not.

4

In the 12 months prior to your apprehension, have you been . . ?

	Happened in past 12 months prior to your apprehension?	How many times in the US?	How many times in El Salvador?	How many times while travelling from El Salvador to the US?
18. Threatened with a gun?	N / Y			
19. Shot at?	N / Y			
20. Shot?	N / Y			
21. Threatened with a weapon other than a gun? (knife, club, bat, taser, etc.)	N / Y			
22. Injured with a weapon other than a gun? (knife, club, bat, taser, etc.)	N / Y			
23. Sexually assaulted?	N / Y			
24. Assaulted or attacked without a weapon?	N / Y			
25. Robbed? (Personally robbed with force or threat of force - not burglary!)	N / Y			
26. Held against your will? [KIDNAPPED]	N / Y			
27. Extorted?	N / Y			
28. Had something stolen (burglary, car stolen, etc)?	N / Y			
29. Assaulted or threatened by a domestic or romantic partner?	N / Y			
30. Forced to work (human trafficking)? Type of work:_____	N / Y			
31. Threats made against you or your family if you did not work?	N / Y			
32. Victimized in some other way? _____	N / Y			

FIREARMS SECTION 5

NOTE: INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS ARE IN ALL CAPS AND ARE NOT TO BE READ TO THE RESPONDENT. INSTRUCTIONS IN *ITALICS* INDICATE THAT THE INTERVIEWER SHOULD SUBSTITUTE THE APPROPRIATE WORD OR PHRASE. EVERYTHING ELSE SHOULD BE READ TO THE RESPONDENT, INCLUDING TRANSITION STATEMENTS.

The following questions are about any firearms you may have owned or possessed in your lifetime. Please do not include any guns for military or police service, but do include any guns you have owned, borrowed, held for someone, or got in any other way.

	Handgun or Pistol	Rifle or Shotgun	Fully Automatic Gun
33. Have you ever owned or possessed a [READ FIREARM]?	N / Y	N / Y	N / Y

ASK FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR EACH TYPE OF GUN POSSESSED

	Handgun or Pistol	Rifle or Shotgun	Fully Automatic Gun
34. Were you in possession of the [FIREARM] at any time during the past 12 months prior to your current apprehension?	N / Y	N / Y	N / Y
35. Were you in possession of the [FIREARM] at any time during the past 30 days prior to your current apprehension?	N / Y	N / Y	N / Y
36. During your last migration from El Salvador to the US, were you in possession of the [FIREARM]	N / Y	N / Y	N / Y

37. Thinking about the [FIREARM] you acquired most recently, how did you get the gun?

Other specify or "Found it" where

	Handgun or Pistol	Rifle or Shotgun	Fully Automatic Gun
Bought it Legally [i.e. STORE]	○	○	○
Bought it illegally [i.e. STREETS]	○	○	○
Rented it	○	○	○
Traded something for it	○	○	○
Borrowed it	○	○	○
It was a gift, or inherited	○	○	○
Stole it	○	○	○
Found it [SPECIFY WHERE]	○	○	○
REFUSED	○	○	○
DON'T KNOW	○	○	○
OTHER (specify)	○	○	○

	Handgun or Pistol	Rifle or Shotgun	Fully Automatic Gun
38. Was this gun acquired in the US?	N / Y	N / Y	N / Y

CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT

6

In the past 12 months, prior to apprehension, have you done any of the following?

In the 12 months prior to your apprehension, how many times have you .. ?	How many times have you done [CRIME] in past 12 months?	How many times in the United States?	How many times in El Salvador?
39. Destroyed property worth LESS than $100?			
40. Destroyed property worth MORE than $100?			
41. Stolen property worth LESS than $100? (including shoplifting)			
42. Stolen property worth MORE than $100 not including a motor vehicle? (including shoplifting)			
43. Stolen a car or other motor vehicle?			
44. Broke into a house, store, or building to commit a theft, or burglary?			
45. Robbed someone by force or by threat of force?			
46. Committed extortion?			
47. Participated in a drive-by shooting?			
48. Attacked, assaulted, battered, or beaten up someone?			
49. Obtained an ID or identity, like a green card, social security card, driver's license, etc., to commit fraud or obtain employment?			
50. Sold ID's, such as a green card, social security card, drivers license, etc?			
51. Driven under the influence of drugs or alcohol?			
52. Possessed a firearm?			
53. Possessed a firearm while committing a crime?			
54. Sold drugs?			
55. Committed rape or sexual assault?			
56. Engaged in prostitution? [INCLUDES HIRING PROSTITUTES]			
57. Engaged in pimping, or solicitation of prostitution?			
58. Committed domestic or interpersonal violence (includes assault, disorderly conduct, criminal damage, etc.)?			
59. Used alcohol?			
60. Used marijuana?			
61. Used cocaine?			
62. Used heroin?			
63. Used meth?			
64. Helped smuggle people into the United States, or out of El Salvador?			
65. Helped smuggle drugs into the United States, or out of El Salvador?			
66. Helped smuggle guns into the United States, or out of El Salvador?			

GANG SECTION `7`

67. Are you <u>currently</u> a member of a clique?

US		El Sal
○	No	○
○	Yes [GO TO Q70]	○
○	*REFUSED*	○

68. Are you a <u>former</u> member of a clique?

US		El Sal
○	No	○
○	Yes [GO TO Q70]	○
○	*REFUSED*	○

69. Are any of your friends <u>currently</u> members of a clique?

US		El Sal
○	No [GO TO Q-99]	○
○	Yes [GO TO Q69a]	○
○	*REFUSED*	○
○	*DK*	○

69a. How many of your friends are <u>currently</u> members of a clique?

US		El Sal
○	All of them	○
○	Most of them	○
○	Half of them	○
○	A Few of them	○

70a. What is the name of the clique in the US?

70b. In what US city is this clique located?

70c. What gang is this US clique a part of?

71a. What is the name of the clique in El Salvador?

71b. In what El Salvadoran city is this clique located?

71c. What gang is this El Salvadoran clique a part of?

72. How old were you when you first joined your clique? Or, if not a member, when you first started hanging-out with the clique?

US	El Sal

74. When did you join? [DATE]

74a. US   _____   74b. El Sal   _____

73. What did you have to do to join? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

US		El Sal
○	Get jumped in/beaten up	○
○	Fight or Shoot someone	○
○	Commit a Crime	○
○	Kill someone	○
○	Get sexed in	○
○	Born into it	○
○	Nothing	○
○	OTHER	○
○	REFUSED	○
○	DON'T KNOW	○

75a. How many members does the US clique have?

_____

75b. Of the members of your US clique (or your friends clique if you are not a member), approximately how many are MALE?   _____

75c. Of the members of your US clique (or your friends clique if you are not a member), approximately how many are FEMALE?   _____

76a. How many members does the El Salvadoran clique have?

_____

76b. Of the members of your El Sal clique (or your friends clique if you are not a member), approximately how many are MALE?   _____

76c. Of the members of your El Sal clique (or your friends clique if you are not a member), approximately how many are FEMALE?   _____

77. What is your current rank, position, or title within the clique (or gang)?

77a. US	77b. El Sal

	US	El Sal		
78. Does your clique have members in different cities?	○ No [GO TO Q-80] ○ ○ Yes [SPECIFY] ○ ○ REFUSED ○ ○ DK ○		**Please list all of the cities where the clique has members:** **USA** ⎮ **El Salvador**	**8**

	US	El Sal	
79. Do members associate with branches of your clique from other cities?	○ No [GO TO Q-80] ○ ○ Yes [SPECIFY] ○ ○ REFUSED ○ ○ DK ○		**For what purpose do they associate?** **USA** ⎮ **El Salvador**

The following questions are about the organization of your clique, please answer in your own opinion and to the best of your knowledge.

USA ← → El Salvador

REFUSED	DK	YES	NO		NO	YES	DK	REFUSED
○	○	○	○	**80. Does your clique have a territory or turf it claims?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**81. Is there one person who is the leader?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**82. Does your clique have regular meetings?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**83. Does your clique have rules that members have to follow?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**83a. Are there punishments if rules are broken?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**84. Does your clique have special colors, symbols, signs, or clothing?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**85. Do members give money to the clique?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**86. Does the clique make money from drug sales?**	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	**87. Does the clique make money from gun sales?**	○	○	○	○

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE FOR <u>FORMER CLIQUE MEMBERS ONLY</u> - OTHERS GO TO Q-94

88. When did you stop being a member of your former clique?	**89. Why did you stop being a member of your former clique?**		**90. How did you quit?**	
USA _____ **El Salvador** _____	**US** El Sal ○ To avoid violence ○ ○ Got tired of it ○ ○ Got a job ○ ○ Started a family ○ ○ Went to jail / prison ○ ○ OTHER [SPECIFY] ○ ○ REFUSED ○ ○ DK ○	Other specify: [q89 & 90]	**US** El Sal ○ Got beaten-out ○ ○ Committed a crime ○ ○ Moved out of area ○ ○ Nothing, just quit ○ ○ OTHER [SPECIFY] ○ ○ REFUSED ○ ○ DK ○	

	YES	NO		NO	YES	
U S A	○	○	**91. Since you stopped being a member have you:** **A.** Hung-out in the same places or with clique members?	○	○	**E l S a l v a d o r**
	○	○	**B.** Intentionally worn clique colors?	○	○	
	○	○	**C.** Gotten drunk or high with clique members?	○	○	
	○	○	**D.** Stolen things with clique members?	○	○	
	○	○	**E.** Flashed clique signs?	○	○	
	○	○	**F.** Participated in clique fights?	○	○	
	○	○	**92.** Even though you're no longer a member, would you respond if someone disrespected your former clique?	○	○	
	○	○	**93.** If someone hurt a member from your former clique, would you retaliate?	○	○	

> **Next, I want to ask you about illegal activities that your clique (or friends clique) may do.**
> **Remember, everything you tell me is confidential.** **9**

> NOTE: FOR EACH ITEM, ASK IF THE CLIQUE DOES THE ACTIVITY (Q-94). IF "YES" THEN ASK IF THE RESPONDENT HAS EVER DONE IT WITH THE CLIQUE OR CLIQUE MEMBERS (Q-95). THEN IF "YES" ASK IF THEY HAVE DONE IT IN THE PAST 30 DAYS (Q-96). AT EACH STAGE, IF THE ANSWER IS "NO" PROCEED TO THE NEXT LETTERED ITEM.

> IF THE RESPONDENT "DOES NOT KNOW", REMIND THEM THAT IT IS TO THE BEST OF THEIR KNOWLEDGE.
> IF THE RESPONSE IS STILL DK, CODE THE RESPONSE AS "NO".
> IF THE RESPONDENT REFUSES TO ANSWER, LEAVE THAT ITEM BLANK.

NOTE: FOR Q-95 AND Q-96, "YOU" REFERS TO THE RESPONDENT - EVEN IF THEY ARE ONLY A "FRIEND OF A CLIQUE MEMBER".

	94. Do members of your clique ever ____:				95. Have you ever done this with them:				96. Have you done this with them 30 days prior to apprehension:			
	USA		EL SAL		USA		EL SAL		USA		EL SAL	
	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
A. Draw graffiti?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
B. Steal?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
C. Intimidate or threaten people?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
D. Enagage in 'pimping'?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
E. Rob people?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
F. Commit extortion?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
G. Jump or attack people?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
H. Do drive-by shootings?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I. Kill people?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
J. Use alcohol?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
K. Use marijuana?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
L. Use cocaine?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
M. Sell marijuana?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
N. Sell cocaine?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
O. Sell drugs to other drug dealers?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
P. Sell guns?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Q. Smuggled people (El Sal to USA)?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
R. Worked as, or for, a coyote?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

10

97 & 98. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement below.
There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, just tell me your own opionion.

USA (Q-97)				Statement	El Salvador (Q-98)			
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGRE		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
○	○	○	○	A. My clique has very little to do with how I feel about myself.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	B. My clique is an important reflection of who I am.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	C. Belonging to my clique is an important part of me.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	D. My clique has almost nothing to do with what kind of person I am.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	E. My clique is a big part of my life.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	F. The members of my clique are cooperative with each other.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	G. The members of my clique know that they can depend on each other.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	H. The members of my clique stand up for each other.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	I. Being in a clique makes a person feel important.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	J. Clique members provide a good deal of support for one another.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	K. Being a member of the clique makes me feel like I am a useful person to have around.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	L. Being a member of the clique makes me feel like I really belong somewhere.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	M. Being a member of a clique is really enjoyable.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	N. Being in a clique is a good way to make money.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	O. A clique member expects to remain in the clique for many years.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	P. A clique member would leave the clique if something better came along.	○	○	○	○
○	○	○	○	Q. There is no future in belonging to a clique.	○	○	○	○

SOCIAL NETWORKS SECTION   `11`

I want to remind you that everything you tell me is confidential, and that you can skip any question you would prefer not to answer.

I would like you to list up to 10 people that you consider yourself to be very close to. I do not want you to use the person's real name. Please use a fake name to identify the person.

99a. On a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 is very close and 1 is not close at all, how close are you to [*FIRST PERSON LISTED*]? USE THE FIRST COLUMN, LABELED "RESP" TO RECORD HOW CLOSE 1-10.

99b. On a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 is definitely would and 1 is definitely would not, what is the likelihood that [#1] and [#2] talk to each other or hang out with each other without your involvement, or independently of you?	Pseudonym (Fake Name):	Resp	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
	1.											
	2.											
	3.											
	4.											
	5.											
	6.											
	7.											
	8.											
	9.											
	10.											

100. Is #_ a male or female?											
101. How old is #_ ?											
102. What country was #_ born in ?											
103. How long have you known #_?											
104. Prior to apprehension, how many days out of 30 do you hang out with #_?											
105. Is this person related to you?											
106. Is #_ a member of a gang or clique?											
107. In the 12 months prior to apprehension, did you commit a crime with #_?											
108. Where does this person live (country)?											
109. Do you know if #__ has ever entered the US illegally? _____											
109a. If so, how many times?											
110. Do you know, has #__ ever helped smuggle people into the U.S.?											

IMMIGRATION SECTION:
The next few questions are about immigration.

12

111. How many times have you ever entered the USA unlawfully?

⓪⓪⓪⓪
①①①①
②②②②
③③③③
④④④④
⑤⑤⑤⑤
⑥⑥⑥⑥
⑦⑦⑦⑦
⑧⑧⑧⑧
⑨⑨⑨⑨

112. How many times have you been detained in the US for illegal entry?

⓪⓪⓪⓪
①①①①
②②②②
③③③③
④④④④
⑤⑤⑤⑤
⑥⑥⑥⑥
⑦⑦⑦⑦
⑧⑧⑧⑧
⑨⑨⑨⑨

113. How many times have you been deported from the US?

⓪⓪⓪⓪
①①①①
②②②②
③③③③
④④④④
⑤⑤⑤⑤
⑥⑥⑥⑥
⑦⑦⑦⑦
⑧⑧⑧⑧
⑨⑨⑨⑨

For the next set of questions, I want you to think about the last time you entered the United States. This includes whether you entered legally or illegally.

114. What day did you arrive in the US?

MONTH	DAY		YEAR			
○ Jan						
○ Feb						
○ Mar	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪
○ Apr	①	①	①	①	①	①
○ May	②	②	②	②	②	②
○ June	③	③	③	③	③	③
○ July		④	④	④	④	④
○ Aug		⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤
○ Sept		⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥
○ Oct		⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦
○ Nov		⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧
○ Dec		⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨

115. On this most recent trip to the US, how old were you when you arrived?

⓪⓪⓪
①①①
②②②
③③③
④④④
⑤⑤⑤
⑥⑥⑥
⑦⑦⑦
⑧⑧⑧
⑨⑨⑨

116. How did you enter the U.S.?
[REMEMBER TO USE THE MOST RECENT ENTRY]

○ Entered with immigrant visas issued by the U.S. State Department
○ Admitted as a refugee seeking asylum
○ Entered with student, work, or long-term visa
○ Entered the U.S. with non-immigrant visa and overstayed
○ Entered the U.S. without documents
○ Enter with false documents
○ Used another persons documents
○ OTHER
○ REFUSED

117. Why did you decide to come to the United States on this most recent trip?

118. What was your plan if you got caught on this most recent trip?

13

119. On this most recent trip, did you think about getting caught?
○ No
○ Yes

120. On this most recent trip, what did you think your chances of getting caught were? (out of 100)

121. On this most recent trip, did any individual or organization assist you in crossing the border into the U.S.?
○ No
○ Yes Specify:

122. On this most recent trip, were other things smuggled with you? (drugs, guns, etc)
○ No
○ Yes

If YES, what other things?

123. On this most recent trip, were any of the people travelling with you caught while crossing the border into the US?
○ No
○ Yes

124. On this most recent trip, how did you avoid detection?

125. On this most recent trip, if you had been convicted of entering the US illegally, what sentence did you believe you would receive?

126. I want you to think about the chances of being arrested for illegally crossing the border. Would it stop you from trying to illegally enter into the US if the chances of getting caught were...

	NO	YES
1 out of 100?	○	○
10 out of 100?	○	○
50 out of 100?	○	○
75 out of 100?	○	○
90 out of 100?	○	○

127. If you have ever smuggled drugs into the U.S., what kind of drug or drugs have you typically smuggled?

Please share with me your story of how you left El Salvador and arrived in the US *most recently*. Use as much detail as you can recall, and remember that what you tell me cannot be linked to you.

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE REFER THE IMMIGRATION GRID, USING AS MANY AS NECESSARY. ALSO, USE THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PAGES AS NECESSARY.

Immigration Grid Q # _____   **Period ___ of ____**

Immigration Grid Q # _____   **Period ___ of ____**

Immigration Grid Q # _____   **Period ___ of ____**

Immigration Grid Q # _____   **Period ___ of ____**

APPENDIX B
IMMIGRATION GRID

The next series of questions are about how you travelled (the last time) from El Salvador to the United States. Remember, everything you tell me confidential. Please answer to the best of your memory.

IMMIGRATION GRID- Note to interviewer: A PERIOD is a change in either country or mode of transportation.

Period ____ of ____

1	Number of days in period described	
2	Start Date current for period	
3	End Date for current period	
	Travel	
4	What country were you in at the **start** (of this period)?	
5	What city were you in at the **start** (of this period)?	
6	What country were you in at the **end** (of this period)?	
7	What city were you in at the **end** (of this period)?	
8	Type of transportation	
	Sea or Air	
9	Was it private or commercial?	
10	Where did it start?	
11	Where did it stop?	
12	How much did it cost?	
13	How did you learn about it?	
14	Was there an intermediary? (If YES, do People section)	
15	Were you with other people? (If YES, do People section)	
	Land	
16	Was there an intermediary? (If YES, do People section)	
17	Where you with other people? (If YES, do People section)	
18	Where did you sleep?	
	Border	
19	Did you cross a border?	
20	Going in to what country?	
21	What kind of documents?	
22	How did you get the documents?	
23	How much did they cost you?	
24	Where did you cross?	
25	Were you with other people? (If YES, people section)	
	People	
26	How did you first meet the intermediary? [EVER]	
27	How much did the intermediary get paid?	
28	How many people did you travel with?	
29	Who was you with?	
30	Was one of them your guide?	
31	How did you meet the guide?	
32	How much did you pay them?	
33	Did the guide stay with you the entire time?	
34	How many times have you used this person in the past?	
35	Were you always free to leave during this period?	
36	Did you always have access to your money?	
37	Did any gang member accompany you during this period?	
38	What was the gang members' role during this period?	

APPENDIX C
LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION FROM ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

CENTER for
VIOLENCE PREVENTION
and COMMUNITY SAFETY
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 31, 2011

Re: Letter of authorization for use of data by Alejandro A. Ferrer

To whom it may concern:

This document gives permission to Alejandro A. Ferrer from Sam Houston State University to access self-report and official data obtained from El Salvadorian detainees with respect to the research project Central American Gangs as Proxy for Terrorism following his institutions IRB approval. This letter authorizes him to use the resulting data for his thesis. The Thesis per Department of Homeland Security Requirements should state the following in an appropriate section.

1. Acknowledgement. "This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security under Award Number 2008-ST-061-BS0002."

2. Disclaimer. "The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security."

We would also appreciate it if you would include the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety in the acknowledgement section; and send us an electronic copy of your thesis when it is complete so that we can post it our web site dedicated to products produced through this project.

Following the completion of his thesis we are open to Alejandro using the data for academic publications. However, prior to starting such an endeavour we ask that he consult with Dr. Katz, because we have several manuscripts that we will be working on and we want to make sure no duplicative efforts take place. Similarly, if Alejandro has an interest in participating in any efforts taking place by ASU faculty and staff he is welcome to collaborate on them with us.

Dr. Charles Katz, Ph.D.
Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
Arizona State University

APPENDIX D
LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION TO REPRODUCE THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

ASU
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Alejandro A. Ferrer
Graduate Research Assistant
College of Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University

March 8, 2012

Re: Letter of authorization for Alejandro A. Ferrer to reproduce survey instrument

Dear Alejandro:

This document gives permission to Alejandro A. Ferrer from Sam Houston State University to reproduce the survey instruments titled "ICE Detention Survey" and "Immigration Grid." The instruments were created for data collection on El Salvadorian detainees with respect to the research project Central American Gangs as Proxy for Terrorism. This letter authorizes him to include the instruments as appendixes on his Thesis.

Charles Katz, Ph.D.
Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
Arizona State University

VITA

Alejandro A. Ferrer
Sam Houston State University
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Box 2296; 816 17th Street
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
(936) 294-4816
(713) 294-4532
Aaf009@shsu.edu

Education

2012	**M.A., Criminology and Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University.**
	Areas of Interest: Gangs, Immigration and Crime, Gun Legislation, Corrections.
	Thesis: Gang migration: Patterns and motives of migration of Mara Salvatrucha 13 and other Salvadoran gangs into the United States.
2006	**L.L.B., Criminal Law, Universidad del Valle de México**
	A.A. in Criminal Science, Universidad del Valle de México

Professional Experience

Teaching Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Victoria Titterington, Summer 2012.
   - Online facilitator for CJ-4386, Problem Analysis in Criminal Justice.

Graduate Research Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Kate Fox, Summer 2011 - Spring 2012.
   - Assisted in the evaluation of gang intervention programs in Harris County, Texas.

Graduate Research Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Bill Wells, Summer 2011.

NIJ Funded Sexual Assault Kit Action Research Project: Grant number NIJ-2011-2808

- Scheduled and Conducted interviews with the Houston Police Department's Sex Crimes unit.

Research Assistant: **Arizona State University,** Dr. Charles M. Katz, Spring, 2011.
- Conducted data collection at federal detention facilities.

Teaching Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Gaylene Armstrong, Spring 2011.
- Online facilitator for CJ-261, Introduction to Criminal Justice.

Graduate Research Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Rolando Del Carmen, Fall 2010.
- Comparative analyses of gun legislation.

Graduate Research Assistant: **Sam Houston State University,** Dr. Rita Watkins, LEMIT. Fall, 2010.
- Research on Crisis Intervention Teams and police response to persons with mental illnesses.

Independent Negotiator: Mexico and U.S.A. 2006-2007, 2009-2010
- Private negotiations with clients and authorities
- Avoided judicial conflicts through the creation of agreements and the formulation of contracts
- Provided legal aid to clients, mostly on the contractual area
- Negotiated extrajudicial payment requirements and collections

Legal Manager / Operations Coordinator (Managing Partner): **Star Life Ambulances**, Mexico City, 2007-2008.
- Directed contract negotiations with distributors, clients and insurance companies
- Created the legal strategy for the company and managed procedures with government offices, as well as criminal and civil litigation
- Trained First Aid brigades and supervised paramedics on the field.

Litigating Attorney: **Requena Abogados, S.C.,** Mexico City. 2008
- Criminal Law Litigation
- Carried out negotiations with District Attorneys and clients
- Responsible for the translation of legal documents
- Developed defense and accusation strategies for clients

Intern: Procuraduría General de la República (Office of the Attorney General), Direction of Forensic Science, 2006.
- General assistance receiving evidence for criminal evaluation
- Detailed analysis of legal documents

Legal Aid: Torres & Chajín, Mexico City, 2005.
- Avoided economical losses for our clients and the company through the detailed analysis of contracts, documents and permits
- Aided the negotiations department
- Appointed to provide service to our international costumers
- Consulted all types of procedures with government agencies
- Duplicated the income based on extrajudicial collections and payments

Publications

Fox, Kate A., Webb, Vincent J., Ferrer, Alejandro, Katz, Charles M., & Hedberg, Eric. (2012). Gang intervention treatment re-entry development for youth (GitRedy): A report of the first year of implementation. Final report prepared for the Texas Juvenile Justice Department.

Service to Sam Houston State University

Fall, 2011 - Created crime victimization brochures to promote student awareness and prevention of stalking and dating violence.

Professional Development

Guest Lecturer: Central American Government's Response to MS-13. Ensenada, B.C., Mexico (February, 2012).

Conference Presentation: To Each State Its Own Law: A Comparative Analysis of
Gun Legislation. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Toronto, Canada
(2011).

Guest Lecturer: Introduction to Criminology and Victimology, Universidad del
Valle de México (January 2010)

Guest Lecturer: Decision Making in Small Corporations, Universidad Autónoma
de Querétaro (October, 2008)

Academic Awards

Awarded Rolando and Jocelyn Del Carmen Criminal Justice Scholarship. August
2011-May 2012 ($1,000)

Professional Affiliations

2011-Present: Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences – Student Member

Research Interests

Gangs
Immigration and Crime
Corrections
Security Threat Groups
Gun Legislation