

## Ethnic Minorities and Censuses

*Inez Zsófia Koller, Ph.D.*

2011 was the year of census in more countries of Central Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Census itself has always been problematic in this region as inhabitants of the region are ethnically very colourful. Back to the medieval ages the region was occupied and inhabited by several powers, ethnic troops. During the nineteenth century, in the period of nation building and at the time of the First World War country borders were shaped. Unfortunately, these borders do not fit ethnic borders. Hoóz argues the problem of different ethnic groups co-existing in one state causes several problems, “as does their treatment and the range of solutions to them that also depends on the general policy of the state since these play a role in the formulation of both the goals of that policy and in how those goals are attained”<sup>1</sup>. States need to know the exact number of their ethnic minorities in order to conduct their minority policy useful in question of the use of mother tongue, special education and cultural perspectives in their mother tongue. States need these numbers regardless they want to implement affirmative or restrictive minority policies.

On the other hand, confessing belonging to an ethnic group is a form of collective action, although it is based on self-identification. Those who indicate their ethnic difference from the majority ethnic group of a country undertake some collateral disadvantages, social exclusion, various forms of discrimination which are historically coded in societies of this region of Europe. Wide-scale experiences in the 20th century have taught minorities to handle censuses gingerly. In a changed way, however, these feelings do exist today, as well. This way, there are different motives of national and ethnic minorities in confessing their ethnic identity, country by country. So the big question is how ethnic minorities reflect on enumeration purposes of states. Strong ethnic communities, like Hungarians in Romania could preserve their population rate according to the Romanian census in 2011. Other could not, possibly as a realistic consequence of emigration, or as a means of opposition in Serbia many Albanians and Bosniaks boycotted the census.

At the time of census all feelings and purposes concerning ethnicity were transformed into questionnaire blankets, heads, rows and columns in 2011. Census questionnaires included

---

<sup>1</sup> István Hoóz wrote a study in *Minorities Research 3*. with the title of *Population census and nationality*. His study has more common points to my analysing study, especially on exploring the background of censuses in light of ethnicity. Moreover, his study has a wider historical perspective and focuses more on relations between census results and minority policies.

questions on minority identity and mother tongue different from the official language of the countries. Some promote the confession of ethnicity and some do not. My questionnaire language analysing inquiry plans to study some census methodologies in Central and Southeast Europe and search for good and bad practises.

### ***Methodology***

One aim of my investigation was to create a data comparison from national censuses of the last one or two years in Central Eastern European and Balkan countries. What are the gains and losses? How data has changed compared to previous censuses? How categories have changed, and how national level party politics have changed on the topic of ethnicity compared to previous censuses? But measuring without exact data is not easy. Nearly a year after the censuses, data on ethnicity are not published in Hungary, and are not or partly available in Croatia, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Serbia. Only some news websites of Hungarian national minorities in Romania and Slovakia could access to comparative data till today. So, not data comparison is in the focus of this study but a semantic comparison.

I chose six countries from the region where there were census conducted accordingly to the new census methodology direction of the European Commission and those who uploaded their individual form of census questionnaire samples in English version (to be comparable) on the website of the United Nations Statistics Division Demographic and Social Statistics. So, I examined census questionnaire samples of:

- Bulgaria (1 February 2011)
- Croatia (31 March 2011)
- Hungary (1 October 2011)
- Montenegro (31 March 2011)
- Romania (20 October 2011)
- Serbia (1-15 October 2011)

For comparing reasons I decided to select two more countries from different regions of the World, where there were also censuses at that time, Australia (2011) and the United States of America (2010).

Analysis aspects had a semantic starting point. Language is not only mirroring the objective World but language itself is the one that create and interpret a commonly known World for us, says Wittgenstein. However, this common World is not entirely common as for all participants it provides different meanings that are shaped further in many different ways. Social shaping of a language was interpreted as an act by John L. Austin (Austin: 1962.).

According to his speech-act theory well-selected words are able to direct thinking which manifest in act later on (if there is no choice for indicating my own ethnic group I select from those which are given). To have a complex picture on the semantics of questions on ethnicity in census questionnaires I analysed them in seven aspects:

1. Importance of ethnicity by placement of the topic;
2. Relations of ethnicity to other topics;
3. Number of questions related to ethnicity;
4. Compulsory of confessing ethnicity;
5. Notation of ethnicity in the form text;
6. Are questions on ethnicity open or closed;
7. The language of the questionnaire blankets.

The analyses based on these aspects will lead to a more complex semantic understanding of how questionnaires help or in contrast hinder ethnic minorities in confessing their ethnic identity.

Furthermore, I was interested in the role of ethnic parties in enhancing minorities to be more likely to confess their ethnic identity. What kinds of campaign methods did they take? How ethnic tensions rose in connection with censuses? Are there any changes in relations of number of minorities to their political representation? Are there any relations in number of minorities and their political representation? For this I collected articles on regional and thematic websites related to both the region of Central and Southeast Europe and the topic census.

The analysed national census questionnaires are following directives of the European Union, regardless whether they are member states or not (Croatia, Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia are not members yet). In 2011 the European Commission published a methodologically detailed *Explanatory Notes* for national censuses with the aim of a greater value of compared results between Member States. Steps to harmonise census outputs have already been taken previously (in 1980, 1990 and in 2001) but the last development of census methodology the European Union endeavoured to make aims to disseminate more detailed and more comparable data at European level. The increased variability of factors will provide good basis for the better understanding of “the context of socio-economic phenomena ... in the light of people’s background, e. g. their household and family situation or migration history” (Kyi, Knauth, Lanzieri; 2011: 5.) on those population groups about which less information is available. Interestingly, there were a very few and indirect information about the topic of ethnicity which is a population group category on people whom about quite few

and uncertain information exist. The stance of the European Union is on the side of antidiscrimination in question of ethnicity. This attitude is underpinned by two principles written in the *Explanatory Notes*, firstly, no transmission of confidential data for protection purposes and, secondly, in some cases the EU regulation on censuses (Regulation No 519/20110) “allows Member States to make choices about the specifications of the topics or certain breakdown categories” (Kyi, Knauth, Lanzieri; 2011: 22).

The *Explanatory Notes* does not rate ethnicity among non-derived topics which are place of usual residence, sex, age, legal marital status, country/place of birth, country of citizenship, previous place of usual residence and date of arrival in the current place of usual residence one year prior to the census, relationship between household members. For gaining background information to analyse the question of ethnicity on censuses there are only two useful detailed topic descriptions in the *Explanatory Notes*. The topic on Country of citizenship (the legal bond between the individual and the State) prescribe five categories, the reporting country, another country in the European Union and another country outside the European Union, dual citizenship, with no citizenship. Furthermore, the topic of previous place of usual residence and date of arrival in the current place and place of usual residence one year prior to the census. Censuses have measured citizens in Member States of the European Union who ever resided abroad and the year of arrival in the country since 1980. The topic is useful as it makes it available to compare unchanged usual residence data to changed versions of usual residence data (move within the reporting country, move from outside the reporting country, beside not stated and not applicable for children under one year of age).

### ***Analysis – Questions on ethnicity***

Census is for counting people in several categories. But it is better to be aware of there is no measurement method which could reflect real characteristics of any society. The mirror of a census always distort somehow and not necessarily due to evil reasons. Minority policy of a State, historical relationship between majority and minority in a society and language usage all shape questions on ethnicity in censuses. If we raise the question: why people with different ethnic origin, feelings, behaviour indicate their difference in censuses we have to ask them. But this is a very controversial issue. Both social sciences and political systems had debated on how to define ethnic identity. Hoóz argues, that “demographers have already shown that statistical surveys of this type can only be successful if the definition of national and ethnic identity is based on answers to a set of diverse questions. The most frequently

asked questions concern the mother tongue, ethnicity and language proficiency, although a knowledge of religious affiliation can also be useful in the analysis of areal distribution". These diverse questions promote to roll back revulsions in respondents feeling to belong to ethnic minorities as they are directed to different information. If we are curious about how people can indicate their ethnic difference it is better to check the census questionnaires. A lot of useful information can be read from how these census questionnaires are edited and defined.

1. *Importance of ethnicity* is showed by where reported country questionnaires placed questions on ethnicity. The examined country census questionnaires roughly not differ from each other in placing the topic of ethnicity among the second half of the questions but never at the end. This means ethnicity is not the most important issue. Nevertheless, the topic is put in a separate block, called "Ethnic and cultural characteristics" in the Romanian, "Ethnic characters" in the Serbian, "answering the following questions is not compulsory" in the Hungarian and "Voluntary answering questions" in the Bulgarian questionnaires. The Croatian and Montenegrin questionnaires also put questions on ethnicity in blocks by line off and the combination of colour emphasis. The American and Australian questionnaires do not separate questions on ethnicity from other questions.

2. The topic of *ethnicity is related to* citizenship all in the examined questionnaires, it was in the same block with citizenship in the Croatian and Montenegrin, questionnaires, followed questions on citizenship but in a different block in the Bulgarian, Romanian and Serbian questionnaires. The Hungarian questionnaire placed the topic of citizenship in the first part and the topic of ethnicity much later in the second part, very similar to the Australian questionnaire. The American questionnaire did not include questions on citizenship.

Moreover, in nearly all questionnaires questions on ethnicity were followed by a same style question on religion, except from the American questionnaire which put the next question on a very different topic: "Does this person sometimes live or stay somewhere else?" The relation of ethnicity with religion is very close, as both are community cohesion powers and sometimes they characterise together a nation, a national or ethnic group. Historical censuses underpin the strong correlation of ethnic, linguistic and religious characters.

3. All questionnaires contained *more questions related to ethnicity*. According to analysed questionnaires there are three type questions:

- a. direct question on ethnicity that command the person to confess his or her affiliation to a certain ethnic group (all except from the Australian);
- b. direct question on mother tongue (all except from the Australian and the American)
- c. more specific questions on ethnicity (only Hungarian and Australian)

Direct questions seem to be unambiguous in data comparison. But responding a direct question on ethnicity in the Central and Southeast European region is not so easy. Answers mirror subjective feelings (hopes or fears) which “can be independent of the respondent’s country and mother tongue” (Hoóz: 2000).

In contrast, answers concerning mother tongue “can be regarded as an objective criterion (the tongue transmitted by the parents)... This is an indirect method of the definition of ethnicity since it determines ancestry and the environment in which that tongue was learnt in the case of a single language population. However, the extent to which bi- or multilinguality becomes common, the smaller the importance of the mother tongue in the determination of ethnicity. Thus, for example, the specification of the mother tongue in a bilingual population is not an unchangeable determinant, but a matter of choice. Many minority rights are associated with the use of the mother tongue. Minority language education, the right to use the minority language, newspapers, etc. need to be provided for those who profess a specific language to be their mother tongue” (Hoóz: 2000). Defining mother tongue is easy as it has more objective elements: it is not a matter of choice, it is transmitted by parents, learnt as a child, this is the language to respondent possibly prefers to speak at home and still used at the time of the census.

Mother tongue is often not the one language a respondent uses as ethnic minority members are usually bilingual, this is way census questionnaires contain questions on other spoken languages as well for a long time related to the better understanding of the situation ethnicity in a country. But today as a result of linguistic assimilation and globalisation (the global extension of the usage of English language) it is getting hard to come closer to reality.

Finally, only Hungarian and Australian questionnaires contained some more specific questions on ethnicity. The Hungarian questionnaire was curious about not just one ethnic relation of a respondent, not just one mother tongue, and about not just one used language with family members or friends in order to map a more realistic picture on ethnicity. The Australian questionnaire put more questions related to the origins of the person, his or her ancestry and used language at home.

4. As the topic of ethnicity has a very subjective nature questionnaires many times call attention that *filling questions related to the topic are not obliged*. All citizens have individual rights, among these the freedom of speech, in this aspect they have the right to freely identify their ethnicity if they want to. They do not have to prove it, they will not be controlled later on, it is a subjective self-identification. The expression of filling this topic is not compulsory ensures the freedom of self-identification, the lack of any pressure.

According to the analysed questionnaires some handle questions on ethnicity very tentatively:

The Bulgarian questionnaire says:

*“voluntary answering questions”*

The Hungarian questionnaire states:

*“Answering the following questions is not compulsory”*

According to the Romanian questionnaire:

*“each person is free to express his or her opinion, without any constraint”*

Finally in the Serbian questionnaire it is written:

*“person is not obliged to declare”.*

The Croatian and the Montenegrin questionnaires does not contain any notes on this freedom of self-identification, and the Serbian questionnaire contain an obligatory question on mother tongue, although in the Montenegrin questionnaire respondents are not obliged to answer the question on their religious affiliation. Furthermore, neither the American nor the Australian questionnaires contain any notification that these questions are freely answerable. Maybe not insensitivity toward free self-identification is in the background, but a state decision on priority of gathering more data and getting closer to reality above feelings (hopes and fears) of citizens. But when this state direction can be accepted in historically multinational countries such as in the United States and in Australia, it is hard to understand in Croatia and Montenegro which countries are located in a region where the question of ethnicity needs to be handled tentatively. Censuses during the 20<sup>th</sup> century gave the experience for demographers that self-identification-based census results are very far from actual situation “since the subjective feeling of belonging to a specific ethnic group and its declaration or acceptance did not always correlate with each other. This was rarely a result of flaws in the statistical data gathering techniques, but rather a consequence of external, social and political causes. The territorial and political changes following the close of World War 1 convinced the

populations living in this region that the declaration of ethnicity does not fall into the same category as the reporting of other personal data — such as age or marital status — and that declarations of this kind can often have dire consequences, such as deportation or population exchange. This led to a barely resolvable conflict, namely that the members of an ethnic group were often unwilling to declare their ethnicity and, as a result, they felt themselves to be ‘undercounted’ when the census data were published. Statistics on ethnic groups are often regarded as imprecise since census publications usually contain lower numbers than the expected (and, often, than the actual number) (Hoóz: 2000). It seems, Croatian and Montenegrin census policies made a step forward and made a decision to stress back historical experiences with the aim of gaining more realistic data.

5. The aim of my analyses is a semantic comparison that is based on comparable characteristics. One important character is the common language of the questionnaires. Here we meet double difficulty as not just national censuses are free to make choices about the specifications of the topics they include in their questionnaires allowed by the EU regulation but the translations of national language *notations of ethnicity* to English also make exact comparison nearly impossible. In table 1. I listed all notations of the analysed questionnaires.

Table 1: Notation of ethnicity by countries

| <b>Reported Country</b>  | <b>Notation</b>                       |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bulgaria                 | “ethnic group”                        |
| Croatia                  | “ethnicity”                           |
| Hungary                  | “nationality”                         |
| Montenegro               | “ethnicity”                           |
| Romania                  | “ethnic and cultural characteristics” |
| Serbia                   | “ethnic characters”                   |
| Australia                | “ancestry”                            |
| United States of America | “race, origin”                        |

As we can see the “ethnic” word and its variables characterise mostly the Central and Southeast European region, except from Hungary where there is a strong distinction of nationality from ethnicity as they separate the definition of national minority (ethnic



community in minority status with a mother country) from the definition of ethnic minority (those ethnic groups who have no mother country such as the Roma). As Hungarian minority policy is conducted always reflecting on Hungarian minorities living in surrounding countries in the word “nationality” there is also an exemplary behaviour in the background.

6. Questionnaires put questions on ethnicity in two ways, some edit the related question or questions *openly*, that is there is possible choices to put a ring around or make an x mark but the respondent has to fill it in. Others put some possible choices with the category of “Other” as it may happen not all ethnic groups are listed just those with higher proportions in the society or those who are officially accepted minorities in the country and state every minorities because of economic padding in the questionnaire blanket. These are *closed questions*. As we can see in Table 2. there are examples for both ways.

Table 2. Response choices on ethnic affiliation

| <b>Reported Country</b>  | <b>Response choices</b>  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Bulgaria                 | closed with 3 possible choices, the “Other” and “Not stated” categories                |
| Croatia                  | closed with “Croat”, “Other” and “Not declared” categories                             |
| Hungary                  | closed with 18 possible choices and the “Other” and “Do not wish to answer” categories |
| Montenegro               | completely open  |
| Romania                  | completely open  |
| Serbia                   | completely open  |
| Australia                | closed with 7 possible choices and the “Other” category                                |
| United States of America | closed with 18 possible choices and the “Other” category                               |

The Hungarian questionnaire seems to aspire for completeness (just as the multinational United States of America) as it list not just those minorities who are officially accepted in Hungary and have special minority rights but also those ethnic groups who are numerically significant in the country.

Picture 1. Hungarian census questionnaire, topic of ethnicity

**V. Nationality, used languages, religion**

**34. Which nationality do you feel you belong to?**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Hungarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    | Armenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Arabian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Bulgarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    | Romanian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Chinese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Gipsy (Roma) ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ruthenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Greek ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>        | Serbian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | Vietnamese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Croatian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>     | Slovakian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Polish ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>       | Slovenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| German ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>       | Ukrainian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |

other, namely: .....

do not wish to answer ...

**35. Do you think you belong to another nationality in addition to what you marked above?**

do not belong to another nationality

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Hungarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    | Armenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Arabian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Bulgarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    | Romanian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Chinese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Gipsy (Roma) ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ruthenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Greek ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>        | Serbian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | Vietnamese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Croatian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>     | Slovakian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Polish ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>       | Slovenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| German ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>       | Ukrainian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |

other, namely: .....

do not wish to answer ...

**36. What is your mother tongue? (Please mark two answers maximum!)**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Hungarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>            | Armenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Arabian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Bulgarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>            | Romanian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Chinese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Gipsy (Romani, Beas) ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ruthenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Greek ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                | Serbian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | Vietnamese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Croatian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>             | Slovakian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Polish ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | Slovenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| German ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | Ukrainian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |

other, namely: .....

do not wish to answer ...

**37. In what languages do you usually speak with family members or friends? (Please mark two answers maximum!)**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Hungarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>            | Armenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Arabian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Bulgarian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>            | Romanian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Chinese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Gipsy (Romani, Beas) ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ruthenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    |
| Greek ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                | Serbian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | Vietnamese ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Croatian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>             | Slovakian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| Polish ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | Slovenian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |
| German ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               | Ukrainian ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |

other, namely: .....

do not wish to answer ...

There are two national questionnaires, the Bulgarian and the Croatian ones that listed very few possible choices. The Bulgarian listed beside “Bulgarian” only the two biggest minority groups of the country, although Macedonians, Armenians, Tatars and Circassians also live there, they constitute 0,7% of the Bulgarian population according to the census of 2011. Maybe this method is one of the causes that there are 10% of the Bulgarian population who declared themselves in the “Other” category and their origin, ethnic affiliation is unknown.

Picture 2. Bulgarian census questionnaire, topic of ethnicity

**10. Ethnic group\***

1. Bulgarian
2. Turkish
3. Roma
4. Other: / .....
5. Not stated

**11. Mother tongue\***

1. Bulgarian
2. Turkish
3. Roma
4. Other: / .....
5. Not stated

The Croatian questions on ethnicity and mother tongue are closed but put namely only one possible choice, Croatian and the respondent can fill in the brackets if he or she wants to confess some different ethnic affiliation. This is the worst method, as it publicly favours Croatian against other ethnic groups which can be interpret discriminative (as more than 10%

of the Croatian population are not Croatians but Serbs, Bosniaks, Hungarians, Slovenes, Czechs, Roma and others) and it makes the data setting difficult and time demanding.

Picture 3. Croatian census questionnaire, topic of ethnicity

The image shows a portion of a census form with three questions:

- 18. Citizenship**: Options are 'Croatian', 'Croatian and other', and 'without citizenship', each with a red 'X' in a box. Below 'Croatian and other' is 'foreign' with a red 'X' and an arrow pointing to 'STATE WHICH', followed by a row of 15 empty boxes.
- 19. Ethnicity**: Options are 'Croat', 'other', and 'not declared', each with a red 'X' in a box. Below 'other' is 'STATE WHICH' with a red arrow pointing to a row of 15 empty boxes.
- 20. Mother tongue**: Options are 'Croatian' and 'other', each with a red 'X' in a box. Below 'other' is 'STATE WHICH' followed by a row of 15 empty boxes.
- 21. Religion**: Options are 'Catholic', 'other', 'atheist', and 'not declared', each with a red 'X' in a box. Below 'other' is 'STATE WHICH' followed by a row of 15 empty boxes. Below 'atheist' and 'not declared' is another row of 15 empty boxes.

Finally, the remaining census questionnaires from the region are open related to the topic of ethnicity. Although it makes evaluation time demanding the value of equality prevails in them. Formerly, in Romania there were forms only in Romanian and the question on ethnicity was not open. Only Romanian was given, those with other ethnicity had to fill in a dotted line. It was the same as with the question on mother tongue. In 2011 the possible answers were fully open.

Picture 4. Romanian census questionnaire, topic of ethnicity

The image shows a section of a Romanian census form titled 'ETHNIC AND CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS' with the subtitle 'EACH PERSON IS FREE TO EXPRESS HIS OR HER OPINION, WITHOUT ANY CONSTRAINTS'. It contains three questions:

- 23. WHAT ETHNIC GROUP DOES THE PERSON CONSIDER HE/SHE BELONGS TO?** followed by a dotted line and four empty boxes.
- 24. WHAT IS THE PERSON'S MOTHER TONGUE?** followed by a dotted line and four empty boxes.
- 25. WHAT RELIGION DOES THE PERSON CONSIDER HE/SHE BELONGS TO?** followed by a dotted line and two empty boxes.

7. The *language of the questionnaire form* can make it easier to fill it in in at least two ways. First, directly through linguistic lucidity, second, indirectly through a courtesy of the state toward its minorities. In Hungary census questionnaires were available to fulfil in all languages of ethnic minorities living in the country. In Romania, differently from the 1992 census, not one central body transacted the data collection but local authorities and data were

available for demographic inquiries. Further innovation was that the census questionnaire forms were available not only in Romanian any more but in Hungarian as well.

### ***Conclusions and other thoughts***

Several articles dealt with the process of census and census results in 2011. In January, members of the Hungarian community living in Romania gave voice to their hopes that according to their former demographic studies on the past 20 years more signs indicate the decrease in the number of Hungarian inhabitants of Romania is getting to be toning down. However, the number of those Hungarians who emigrate to Hungary is still high but emigration of Romanians increasing due to the economic crisis and the late join of Romania to the Schengen area.

SETimes reported on fraud plaguing during the census process in Macedonia, also in 2011. According to members of the State Census Commission there were “attempts to identify citizens by photocopies of their identification cards and passports, which is absolutely contrary to the law and the Eurostat methodology”. These attempts provoked revulsion among Albanian citizens. In Serbia many Albanians and Bosniaks boycotted the census to end longstanding discrimination against them. The interrogation commissioners got false information in Romania on how to put questions on ethnicity. Sometimes they did not ask them and did not register ethnic affiliations of those family members who were not present at the time of the census interrogation.

An interesting innovation was that most detailed questions were about residence. During the census in Croatia only those were counted to constant population who lived at least 12 months before the census in Croatia or planned to live there for at least 12 months. According to the *Eurostat Yearbook of 2011* that present statistics on international migration, population stocks of national and foreign citizens in the European Union, in Romania and in Bulgaria emigrants outnumber immigrants. Beside migration return migration in Europe is getting to be more characteristic. In 2008 some 600 000 immigrants were nationals (Eurostat Yearbook; 2011:145). These were characteristic for Romania and Bulgaria, but not for Hungary which has a very low share in nationals of its immigrants. As the *Eurostat Yearbook* states, “migration is influenced by a combination of economic, political and social factors, either in a migrant’s country of origin (push factors) or in the country of destination (pull factors)” (Eurostat Yearbook; 2011:144). Migration is an important issue related to ethnicity (the decreasing tendency of minorities is a consequence of emigration beside assimilation).

## ***Bibliography***

Austin, John L. (1962): *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press.

Geertz, Clifford (1973): *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic.

István Hoóz. *Population census and nationality*. Minorities Research 3.

[http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbssegkutatas/mr\\_03/cikk.php?id=1229](http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbssegkutatas/mr_03/cikk.php?id=1229) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

Balázs Majtényi. *The Autonomy of Minorities and Registration*. Minorities Research 5.

[http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbssegkutatas/mr\\_05/cikk.php?id=1208](http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbssegkutatas/mr_05/cikk.php?id=1208) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

Kyi, Gregor, Knauth, Bettina, Lanzieri, Giampaolo (2011): *EU legislation on the 2011 Population and Housing Censuses. Explanatory Notes*. Eurostat. European Commission. Methodologies and Working Papers ISSN 1977-0375

*Europe in figures – Eurostat yearbook 2011* (2011): Eurostat Statistical Books. ISSN-1681-4789. European Commission

*Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of Croatia 2011* (2011): Croatian Bureau of Statistics, ISSN 1333-3335 Zagreb

O'Reilly, Camille C. (2001): *The Politics of Language and Ethnicity. The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. Vol. 1, no. 2, December 2001, 67-73

Vermeersch, Peter (2004): *Minority Policy in Central Europe: Exploring the Impact of the EU's Enlargement Strategy. The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. Vol. 3, no. 2, January 2004, 3-19.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1992): *Filozófiai vizsgálódások*. Budapest, Atlantisz

### *Web sites*

Croatian Bureau of Statistics

[http://www.dzs.hr/default\\_e.htm](http://www.dzs.hr/default_e.htm)

United Nations Statistics Division Demographic and Social Statistics

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/sources/census/censusquest.htm>

### *Articles from internet*

SETimes

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/07/feature-03](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/07/feature-03) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/17/feature-03](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/17/feature-03) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/08/feature-02](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/08/feature-02) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/articles/2010/12/13/reportage-01](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/articles/2010/12/13/reportage-01) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/25/feature-02](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/25/feature-02) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

[http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en\\_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/10/feature-02](http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/en_GB/features/setimes/features/2011/10/10/feature-02) downloaded on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

#### Balkan Insight

<http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/only-three-serbian-cities-register-population-growth-on-census> downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

#### Kitekintő

[http://kitekinto.hu/karpat-medence/2012/06/29/ujabb\\_nepszamlalasi\\_adatokat\\_tettek\\_kozze/](http://kitekinto.hu/karpat-medence/2012/06/29/ujabb_nepszamlalasi_adatokat_tettek_kozze/) downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

[http://kitekinto.hu/karpat-medence/2012/02/09/mit\\_mondanak\\_a\\_szamok\\_a\\_romaniai\\_magyarokrol/](http://kitekinto.hu/karpat-medence/2012/02/09/mit_mondanak_a_szamok_a_romaniai_magyarokrol/) downloaded on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012

#### Transindex

<http://itthon.transindex.ro/?cikk=13485> downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

<http://media.popis2011.stat.rs/2011/obraci/Law-on-Census-of-population-households-and-dwellings.pdf> downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

<http://www.metro.co.uk/weird/850385-aliens-allowed-to-declare-themselves-on-census> downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.41/2009/sp.22.e.pdf>

downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-09-29/eu-urges-serbia-s-ethnic-minorities-to-take-place-in-census.html>

downloaded on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2012