

Ethnicity:  
A Review of Data Collection and Dissemination

Social and Housing Statistics Section  
Demographic and Social Statistics Branch  
United Nations Statistics Division

August 2003

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. METHODOLOGY.....	2
III. FINDINGS.....	3
III.1. National Data Collection Practices in the 2000 Round of Censuses.....	3
III.2.a. Countries and Areas Included in the Study.....	3
III.2.b. Inclusion of Ethnicity in the 2000 Round of Censuses.....	4
III.2.c. Concepts and Terminology Used in the Censuses.....	4
III.2.d. Question format.....	8
III.2.e. Multiple ethnic identities.....	9
III.2. International Compilation and Dissemination of Data on Ethnicity.....	9
The Demographic Yearbook.....	9
IV. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	12
V. CONCLUSION.....	13
REFERENCES.....	14
APPENDIX A – Coverage of ‘ethnicity’ in the Demographic Yearbook.....	15

## I. INTRODUCTION

Ethnicity, language, religion and place of birth are often used to express the identity and cultural affiliation of persons in a population. These characteristics are usually investigated in population censuses. *The Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses* states the following: “Depending on national circumstances, cultural diversity may be measured by language spoken in the home or community, religion and national and/or ethnic group. For countries that are not homogeneous in terms of one or more of these variables, linguistic, religious and national and/or ethnic groups provide the basic information for a quantitative assessment of the relative size and age-sex distribution of this diversity.” (United Nations 1998)

Ethnic data is useful for the elaboration of policies to improve access to employment, education and training, social security and health, transportation and communications, etc. It is important for taking measures to preserving the identity and survival of distinct ethnic groups. This paper deals with the efforts of countries in collecting data on ethnicity using population and housing censuses.

## II. METHODOLOGY

Data on ethnic groups may reflect variety of concepts as can be seen from questions asked on the topic by different countries. According to the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses*, “... some of the bases upon which ethnic groups are identified are ethnic nationality (in other words country or area of origin as distinct from citizenship or country of legal nationality), race, colour, language, religion, customs of dress or eating, tribe or various combinations of these characteristics. In addition, some of the terms used, such as "race", "origin" and "tribe", have a number of different connotations.” Therefore, the information needed about the national and/or ethnic groups of the population and how to collect will depend upon national circumstances.

Ethnicity is one of the topics discussed in the Principles and Recommendations published by the United Nations in 1998. The recommendations on this topic are based on the fact that ethnicity is indeed a very heterogeneous concept across countries in the way it is understood as well as measured. In this sense, the publication lists a wide range of criteria that is or can be used to identify ethnic groups: “ethnic nationality (in other words country or area of origin as distinct from citizenship or country of legal nationality), race, colour, language, religion, customs of dress or eating, tribe or various combinations of these characteristics” (as previously mentioned, these definitions were already included in the 1983 issue of the DYB). Furthermore, the Principles and Recommendations also note that some of these terms may have different shades of meaning for different countries and/or at different points in time.

The Principles and Recommendations suggest that “the definitions and criteria applied by each country investigating ethnic characteristics of the population must therefore be determined by the groups that it desires to identify. By the very nature of the subject, these groups will vary widely from country to country; thus, no internationally relevant criteria can be recommended.” Finally, it is also recommended that countries clearly specify in their census report the criteria used when collecting data on ethnicity “so that the meaning of the classification is readily apparent”.

Many users require data for relatively small areas or/and subpopulation groups concerning such matters as ethnic, linguistic, national, racial and religious groups and indigenous and nomadic populations, and so on. Censuses are the most important sources of such data.

This report explores some methodological and conceptual issues surrounding the collection of data on ethnicity both at the national and international level. At the national level, the report offers a review of national data collection practices for the 2000 round of censuses. In doing so, we will analyze the different underlying concepts that countries use when inquiring about ethnicity, as well as the terminology to define such concepts and the possible typology of answers provided in census questionnaires. At the international level, this report includes an overview of conceptual definitions and dissemination of data on ethnicity in the Demographic Yearbook from 1956 until present.

### III. FINDINGS

#### III.1 National Data Collection Practices in the 2000 Round of Censuses

In order to explore in more detail some of the conceptual and methodological issues surrounding the concept of ethnicity, all available national data collection practices from the 2000 round of censuses were analyzed. A classification – based on the different question formats and concepts used in the censuses – was derived from the information provided in the census questionnaires and is presented in this section.

##### III.2.a. Countries and Areas Included in the Study

The 2000 round of censuses covers the period from 1995 to 2004. Our findings are based on the analysis of census questionnaires from 147 countries or areas, which represent 79% of the countries that have already conducted a census in the 2000 round. From the 228 countries or areas, 81 were not included in this analysis. The reasons for their exclusion are as follows: 23 have not taken or planned a census for the 2000 round (nine of them have population registers instead), 19 are expected to have a census in the future, and 39 have supposedly completed a census but the questionnaires were not available to UNSD at the time of reporting. Table 2 below shows the number of countries or areas that were included and those that were excluded by area.

	AFRICA		AMERICA, NORTH		AMERICA, SOUTH		ASIA		EUROPE		OCEANIA		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Questionnaires Included	17	30.5%	30	81%	11	79%	34	71%	36	75%	19	76%	147	64%
Missing Questionnaires*	22	39%	4	11%	2	14%	5	10%	1	2%	5	20%	39	17%
No Census Conducted**	17	30.5%	3	8%	1	7%	9	19%	11	23%	1	4%	42	18%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* “Missing questionnaires” refer to those countries that completed a census but for which questionnaires were not available

\*\* “No Census Conducted” refers to those countries in which no census has been taken or planned or in which a census is expected to be taken at a future date, and therefore a questionnaire was not available.

The coverage rates, defined here as the percentage of countries that were included in the analysis from the total number of countries that completed a census (that is excluding the category of non-available countries), are the following: 17 out of 39 countries (44%) in Africa; 30 out of 34 (88%) in North America; 11 out of 13 (85%) in South America; 34 out of 39 (87%) in Asia; 36 out of 37 (97%) in Europe; and 19 out of 24 (79%) in Oceania. Overall, this study comprises 79% of the countries that have conducted a census in the 2000 round. With the exception of Africa, the results of this study can provide fairly representative indicators.

### III.2.b. Inclusion of Ethnicity in the 2000 Round of Censuses

From the 147 countries or areas included in our analysis, 95 countries (65%) asked one or more questions on 'Ethnicity'. Table 3 shows the distribution of countries by area.

	Countries that included 'National and/or ethnic group'		Countries that did NOT include 'National and/or ethnic group'		Number of countries included in the analysis	Number of countries that conducted a census
	N	%	N	%	N	N
AFRICA	7	41%	10	59%	17	39
AMERICA, NORTH	23	77%	7	23%	30	34
AMERICA, SOUTH	9	82%	2	18%	11	13
ASIA	22	65%	12	35%	34	39
EUROPE	19	53%	17	47%	36	37
OCEANIA	15	79%	4	21%	19	24
TOTAL	95	65%	52	35%	147	186

% refers to the percentage of countries that included or did not include the item within a given continent

As shown in table 3, South America is the continent with a higher proportion of countries including a question on ethnicity, closely followed by Oceania and North America. Asia and Europe had lower proportions, although still more than half of the countries included an ethnicity question. Finally, 7 out of the 17 African countries asked about ethnic groups in their censuses. Please note again that due to the low number of African countries included in the study (44% of those that conducted a census), these percentages may not give an accurate idea of the reality and therefore cannot be generalized to the whole continent.

### III.2.c. Concepts and Terminology Used in the Censuses

As previously mentioned, the criteria for defining ethnicity may differ significantly from one country to another and from one point in time to another and may be based on factors such as: colour, race, ethnic nationality, language, religion, customs, tribes, etc This heterogeneity is clearly reflected in the terminology used in the 2000 round of censuses.

For classification purposes, all questions used in the 2000 round of censuses were combined into 6 different categories: “ethnic group”, “ancestry or ethnic origin”, “race”, “nationality”, “indigenous or aboriginal groups”, and “tribes” and/or “castes”. However, the delineation between categories is not always well defined and in some cases census’ questionnaires included combinations of two or more of these groupings. The classification shown in table 4 is based on the terminology used in the question and not the concepts in which the output categories are based. However, comments on the discrepancies between the terminology and the underlying concepts are included in this section. Table 4 shows the detailed distribution of countries by terminology and continent.

Table 4: Terminology used in the census questionnaires

	AFRICA		AMERICA, NORTH		AMERICA, SOUTH		ASIA		EUROPE		OCEANIA		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
-- Question on 'Ethnic group'	6	86%	16	70%	3	33%	12	55%	7	37%	7	47%	51	54%
-- Questions on 'Ancestry' or ethnic origin'	-	-	3	13%	-	-	1	5%	-	-	3	20%	7	7%
-- Question on 'Race'	-	-	6	26%	1	11%	-	-	-	-	4	27%	11	12%
-- Question on 'Nationality'	-	-	1	4%	-	-	7	32%	12	54%	1	7%	21	22%
-- Question on 'Indigenous/aboriginal groups'	-	-	4	17%	6	67%	-	-	-	-	2	13%	12	12%
-- Question on 'Tribes' and/or 'Castes'	1	14%	-	-	-	-	2	10%	-	-	1	7%	4	4%

%. Column percentages are calculated within a given continent. In some cases, they do not add up to a 100% because some countries included more than one question on ethnicity.

### *“Ethnic group”*

As table 4 shows, slightly more than half of the countries for which a questionnaire was available included a question with the term “ethnic group”. In most cases, the question format was “To what ethnic group does (the person) belong to?” Although the terminology used in the question format was apparently the same for all these countries or areas, the answer categories referred to a variety of concepts such as race, nationality, indigenous groups or a combination of two or more of those. In Africa, 3 out of the 6 countries that asked about “ethnic group” included answer categories that referred to race<sup>1</sup>. In the case of Zambia and Senegal, “locals” had to enter their ethnic group and foreigners had to mark a major racial group (in Zambia) or their nationality (in Senegal). The remaining country – Ghana – included a question on ‘ethnic group’ to be answered by Ghanians only. In North America, Costa Rica and Trinidad and Tobago included a question on “ethnic group” with output categories that reflected a racial classification. The same was true for the United Kingdom. Jersey (Channel Islands) and Guyana combined race and nationality in their response categories.

<sup>1</sup> These countries were: Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. Please note that they are all part of SADC (South African Development Community) and have agreed to ask similar questions in their census.

Both in North and South America, the indigenous component was included for some countries in their answer categories. Belize, Peru and Suriname are three countries that used a combination of racial and indigenous categories in their response categories to the “ethnic group” question. Honduras and Guatemala used the term “ethnic group” to ask for affiliation to indigenous groups. Although these countries were grouped under the “ethnic group” category, they will be discussed together with the rest of countries that included a question on indigenous or aboriginal groups.

On the other hand, countries that integrated two or more terms (one of them being “ethnic group”) in their question format were also grouped under this category. Examples are Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Lucia, all of which asked “To what ethnic, racial or national group do you think you belong to?” and combined the three concepts in their output categories.

In Asia, the Iraqi census included a question on ‘ethnic group’, but only to be answered by the local people. Finally, Malaysia and Singapore are also two special cases in which language was the principal criteria used in determining the respondent’s ethnic group. This linkage between language and ethnicity becomes very clear in the way the question is asked: “To what ethnic/dialect group does (the person) belong to?”

#### *“Ancestry” and/or “ethnic origin”*

“Ancestry” is another concept used to measure the ethnic composition of a population. As Aspinall (2001: 831) argues, “ancestry or ethnic origin” somewhat differs from “ethnic group” in the sense that it is an externally allocated concept of identity which “focuses the question back in time and conveys an historical and frequently geographic context”, whereas “ethnic group” is a “self-perceived conception of social group membership”. He then suggests that “ancestry” is a more stable concept that produces lower gross rates whereas self-identified “ethnic group” often yields to higher confusion and more inconsistent reporting.

It is precisely to minimize confusion and ensure high quality data, that the Australian Bureau of Statistics included - for the first time in 1986 (it has also been included in the 2000 round) - a question using the concept of “Ancestry”. In one of its publications (“ABS Views on Content and Procedures”), it was argued that “ancestry” had been chosen over other measures because the goal of such question was to “identify the respondents’ origin rather than a subjective perception of their ethnic background”. In the 2000 round of censuses, Canada, Kiribati, Niue, Puerto Rico, and the United States were the other countries that asked a question using the term “ancestry” and/or “ethnic origin”. The Special Administrative Region of Macao – which asked a question on the ethnicity of the respondent’s parents – was also included under the “ethnic origin” category.

#### *“Race”*

As it was discussed in the “ethnic group” section, at least 18 countries included a question on “ethnic group” with answer categories referring to race or a combination between race and other concepts. In addition, 11 (out of the 95 countries that included a question on ethnicity in their census) used the term “race” in the formulation of the question itself. These countries were: Anguilla, Canada, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, United States and the US Virgin Islands

(in North America); Brazil (in South America); and, American Samoa, Guam, Federated States of Micronesia, and Northern Mariana Islands (in Oceania). These last four countries included a question and output categories combining the concepts of “race” and “ethnic origin”.

The use of a racial classification in censuses to identify ethnic groups is a controversial issue currently being debated in some countries. It has been argued that using racial categories carry strong connotations from colonial times and do not take into account the heterogeneity within each group (Aspinall, 2001). However, it also has important advantages when identifying those groups that have been historically excluded and marginalized, groups that may be less easy to identify through self-reported open-ended ethnicity (Aspinall, 2001).

#### *“Nationality”*

Another major concept used in the 2000 round of censuses to identify the ethnic composition of a population was ethnic “nationality” (different from legal nationality or country of citizenship). As table 4 indicates, 19 of the 21 countries that asked a question on ethnic “nationality” are to be found in Asia and Europe. In Europe, with the exception of Malta, the countries that asked a question on “nationality” were Eastern European countries, and 5 of them are former Soviet Union Republics. In Asia, the 7 countries that included a question on ethnic “nationality” were all Commonwealth Independent States. Nauru (in Oceania) and Aruba (in North America) also ask a question on “nationality”. In Africa, although grouped under another category, Zambia and Kenya also asked a question on the foreigners’ nationality.

#### *“Aboriginal or Indigenous Groups”*

There has been a growing interest to include a question on indigenous groups in population censuses, for example it was included in the 2001 census of Argentina. Not only is the information relevant for economic, social and health policies, but it has also been used as a tool for indigenous communities to become more visible and to reinforce their identities.

Our classification identifies countries that have a specific separate question on indigenous identities. Therefore, it does not include under the “indigenous groups” category countries such as Puerto Rico, Saint Lucia, and the United States that ask general questions on ethnicity or race and include an output category for indigenous people. As table 4 shows, the inclusion of a specific indigenous question has taken place mainly in Latin American countries and in Oceania. In North America, Canada, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and Panama included a specific question on indigenous groups. In South America, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Suriname and Venezuela had also a question in their censuses. Peru – which is not counted in the table as belonging to this group – had a question on “ethnic group” with output responses that mixed racial and indigenous categories. The same was true for Belize in North America. Finally, in Oceania, New Zealand had a question on Maori descendants and Australia asked a question on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin.

#### *“Tribes” and/or “castes”*

The knowledge of tribal characteristics, as noted in the 1983’s DYB technical notes, is “essential to any study of economic and social development in societies where tribal population is important”. Our classification, set forth in table 4, does not reflect the measurement of such



characteristics. Most African census questionnaires that may have asked about tribal characteristics (i.e. Ghana, Senegal, and Zambia) had open-ended questions on “ethnic group”. Therefore, the lack of accessibility to the enumerator’s manual and to the list of response categories does not allow us to see whether the responses were measuring tribal affiliation or some other concept such as race. In Africa, only Kenya included a specific question with the term “tribe” in it. Nauru (in Oceania) and India (in Asia) also included a question on “tribes”. As for “castes”, India and Nepal were the only two countries that included a question in their censuses.

### **III.2.d. Question and response formats**

So far, we have explored the conceptual and terminology issues involved in the measurement of ethnicity in census questionnaires. This section will analyse the different formats of questions and response categories and their methodological implications.

The level of detail and the typology of response categories differ a lot from country to country. Racial classifications, for example, tend to imply fewer groupings (6 or 7 on average) than nationality<sup>2</sup>. Even when the concept and terminology used is apparently the same; countries may recognize some groupings and categories that others may not. All this variation tends to limit international comparability.

The level of detail and consistency of responses may also depend on the structure of the question itself. In this study, we have elaborated another classification that divides countries into five different groupings, based on the question format: open-ended question, question with output categories that do not include an open-ended “Other” box, question with output categories with the option of specifying what “Other” is, a Yes/No question, and finally an “unknown” type of answer for those countries for which the full questionnaire or the code book for possible answers was not available. Overall, 95 countries asked 107 questions on ethnicity. Forty-six out of the 107 questions (43%) had pre-established output categories with an empty “Other” box (to be filled in by the respondent when appropriate). Twenty-one questions (20%) had pre-established categories without an open-ended “Other” category. Twenty-three out of the 107 (21%) were open-ended questions, 4 (4%) were a yes/no question, and 13 questions (12%) did not offer enough information on answers’ typology.

Another factor that may affect the accuracy of responses is the selection of answer categories or examples. For instance, an “example” effect happens when the inclusion or exclusion of one of the example categories generates wide differences in the reporting. In 1993, the Canadian census included a “Canadian” category as an example in the ancestry question, resulting in an increase of self-reported Canadians from 763,000 to 5,193,000 (Aspinall, 2001). Therefore, the selection of answer categories or examples has to be carefully planned in order to achieve an accurate reporting of ethnicity data. In addition, when the examples included in a question or the answer categories change, data users should be careful when comparing data from one census to another.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Russian Federation, for example, recognized as many as 191 nationalities in the 2002 census

### **III.2.e. Multiple ethnic identities**

Migratory movements and intermarriage are two social phenomena that have increased the difficulty of measuring ethnicity. As a consequence of these demographic trends, multiple identities have increased, as well as the likelihood of reporting them, adding to the complexity of ethnic data (Waters, 2000). In the 2000 round of censuses, only 11 countries from the 95 that included a question on ethnicity allowed the option of selecting multiple ethnic identities.

In North America, for example, Canada, United States and the US Virgin Islands included the multiple options. In the Canadian census, respondents can mark as many identities as applicable both in the ancestry and race question. The United States and US Virgin Islands – which have a common question on race – also allowed for more than one categorisation. In addition, in the case of the United States, an open-ended ancestry question provided the possibility of filling in one or two answers. In Oceania, 7 countries allowed for multiple ethnic identities in the following questions: ethnic origin or race (in American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands and Tokelau) and ancestry (in Australia). In Europe, only Hungary offered the option of selecting up to three ethnic nationalities. Responding to the demands of several minority representatives, the 2001 Hungarian census was the first one to include the possibility of giving multiple answers on ethnicity,<sup>3</sup>.

As multiethnic identities become more common and more visible, there will be a growing need to adapt the census questions so that such phenomena are reflected in the results. For instance, the Russian Federation is facing increasing demands to include multiple ethnic identities in the 2012 census, that would recognize ethnicities such as Russian Jews or a Tatar-Russians that are currently not reflected in the census results (Tishkov, 2001).

## **III.2. International Compilation and Dissemination of Data on Ethnicity: The Demographic Yearbook**

Since 1948, the United Nations has disseminated social and demographic data through the Demographic Yearbook. The Yearbook, which is published annually, is a unique source for detailed information on availability, timeliness, quality, reliability and coverage of national demographic and social statistical sets. The sources of data reported by countries are population and housing censuses, surveys and administrative records. The United Nations Statistics Division has processed and disseminated information, including data on ethnicity in the reporting countries and areas to a wide range of users all over the world through the Demographic Yearbook.

In 1956, the Demographic Yearbook<sup>4</sup> included for the first time statistics on five different types of data used to identify the ethnic composition of a population. These were: country-of-birth, country of citizenship, language, ethnic group (race), and religion. This section is based on the analysis of the “ethnic group” data that was included as a special topic in the following DYBs: 1963, 1964, 1971, 1979, 1983, 1988 and 1993. Next, we will discuss issues related to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Extracted from the Hungarian Statistical Office publication on ethnic affiliation. See references.

<sup>4</sup> From here on, this report will refer to the Demographic Yearbook as DYB.

data, focusing primarily on the definitions, usage, limitations and coverage set forth in the DYB's technical notes.

### *Description of 'Ethnicity' Data*

In 1956, the DYB's technical notes referred to these statistics as "ethnic group or race". In 1963, the term race was dropped and such statistics were generally defined as "ethnic composition". In 1979, the technical notes grouped these statistics under the title of "national and/or ethnic group" and this terminology has been used until present. The statistics on 'Ethnicity' presented in the DYBs are collected from population censuses and data refers to *de facto* population, unless otherwise stated. Since 1956, the technical notes have emphasized the heterogeneous character of such statistics, defining them as a "single or combined categories of race, religion, colour, stock, ethnic origin, or ethnic nationality". Later on, in 1963, "religion" and "stock" were dropped from the categories and "tribe" was added. Data was organized in this manner in all subsequent DYBs. In 1983, the categories were expanded by adding that some of the bases on which ethnic groups are identified include: ethnic nationality, race, colour, language, religion, customs of dress or eating, tribe or various combinations of these.

### *Usage of 'Ethnicity' Data*

As for the usage of this type of statistics, the DYB's technical notes suggests applications in the analysis of data at the national level, stressing the limitations of international comparability imposed by the heterogeneity of the concept. In particular, the 1956's technical notes mention three types of statistics and their applications. First, statistics on population groups (such as "Negro and white") are essential in analyzing demographic data, projecting the population, and planning for the future development of resources. Second, statistics on "ethnic origin" or "stocks" constitute a framework for demographic analyses and social studies. Finally, the DYB mentions a third type of data – aboriginal or indigenous data – useful in the study of the indigenous composition of countries, although knowledge on subgroups may be needed for the study of tribal composition. In 1983, the above-mentioned typology was excluded from the technical notes and instead there was only a mention to the importance of the knowledge on tribal characteristics as an essential part in the study of economic and social development in specific countries.

In addition, the 1956 DYB included a section describing the advantages and drawbacks of using ethnicity data over country-of-birth or citizenship data. The main advantage of using ethnicity data, as it is mentioned in the technical notes, is that ethnic groups are not variable concepts because they are based on attributes that do not change (except maybe for ethnic nationality), although their interpretation might. As its main drawback, the heterogeneity across countries was again mentioned.

### *Limitations of ethnicity data*

The DYB's technical notes describe three main limitations involved when measuring and comparing data on "national and/or ethnic groups". As it has already been mentioned, the heterogeneity of the criteria and concepts used is its main shortcoming, resulting in lack of international comparability. In some cases, the resulting classification involves more than one concept. The example given in the DYBs is the inclusion of terms such as "French" and "Negro"

in the same distribution. Even when countries apparently use the same criterion (i.e. race), the definition of such concept and the amount of detail may differ significantly among countries, which in turn may further diminish the degree of international comparability.

A second limitation is the wide differences in the reliability of the data. The self-identification with a certain ethnic group may be clear and well defined in some cases, such as for indigenous groups that have existed for many generations. However, in other cases the person may feel that he/she does not fit into one particular group or he/she might identify with more than one ethnic group, all of which may lead to confusion. The clarity of the question may also influence the accuracy of the responses. In 1983, the technical notes added an explanation of the main factors affecting the reliability of “ethnicity” data obtained through the census: “1) whether the response is provided by a family member (for example, when a census employs the self-enumeration method) or is entered by the census enumerator on the basis of his or her observation; 2) whether legal rights or acquired benefits may be perceived as affected by the response given; and 3) whether changes have occurred over time in patterns of ethnic identification”. Finally, the third limitation set forth in the DYBs refers to census methodological issues, such as the amount of underenumeration. In addition, starting with the 1979 issue, the DYB’s technical notes include coverage and content errors as part of the methodological limitations. This is however for the whole country and may not reflect coverage errors in small areas.

#### *Coverage of ethnicity data<sup>5</sup>*

Data on “national and/or ethnic group” was included as a special topic in 8 DYB issues. The coverage – as measured by the number of countries or areas that reported on ‘Ethnicity’ – is the following: 74 countries in 1956; 93 distributions for 77 countries or areas in 1963; 18 countries in the supplementary table in 1964; 43 distributions for 40 countries in 1971; 24 countries or areas in 1979; 30 countries or areas in 1983; 40 countries or areas in 1988; and 29 countries or areas in 1993.

Table 1 presents the information obtained from the DYBs to show the number of countries that reported on “national and/or ethnic groups” for each census round and by region. It is to be noted that countries that held more than one census in a given round have been counted only once. In addition, countries that reported to more than one DYB, as indicated in column 2, were also counted once. Due to changes in geographical boundaries, these numbers cannot be compared from one census round to another.

Census round	DYB	AFRICA	AMERICA, NORTH	AMERICA, SOUTH	ASIA	EUROPE	OCEANIA	TOTAL
1950 (1945-1954)	1956	23	18	3	13	2	15	74
1960 (1955-1964)	1971, 1964, 1963	44	20	2	10	6	18	100

<sup>5</sup> A list of countries and areas that provided information on “national and/or ethnic groups” in 1956 and for subsequent DYBs is included in Appendix A of this report.

1970 (1965-1974)	1988, 1979, 1973, 1971	17	12	1	10	7	17	64
1980 (1975-1984)	1988, 1983, 1979	10	19	2	10	9	16	66
1990 (1985-1994)	1993, 1988	6	5	1	7	5	5	29

In all of the above-mentioned issues of the DYB, most countries reported the statistics on “National and/or ethnic group” by sex. However, in each census round there was a small group of countries for which a breakdown by sex was not available. In appendix A, information on all these countries for all DYBs is included.

In addition, starting in the 1971 DYB, a new classification with an urban/rural variable was included. The following are the countries or areas that reported on “National and/or ethnic group” by sex and by urban/rural residence: Guatemala, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia (in the 1971 DYB); United States, Australia, and Macao (in the 1973 DYB); Sri Lanka (in the 1979 DYB); and Belize and Romania (in the 1993 DYB). In 1983 and 1988, there were no countries that included an urban/rural classification.

#### **IV. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The heterogeneity and complexity involved in the measurement of ethnicity – as confirmed by this report’s findings – leads to the conclusion that no international criteria can be recommended. Instead, countries should determine their own informational needs and select the criteria according to those needs. In doing so, countries should clearly define the underlying concepts and formulate the questions accordingly, always trying to minimize the ambiguity surrounding the concept of ethnicity. Output categories should be chosen carefully, taking into consideration that they can affect the accuracy and quality of the responses. In order to better reflect certain populations, countries should consider allowing multiple answers, while recognising that it may increase the administrative burden of analysing and disseminating the data at that level of detail. In general, population censuses – which are a vital source to collect ethnicity data - should reflect, both methodologically as well as conceptually, the changing character of ethnic identities.

At the international level, the United Nations should continue its key role in the collection and dissemination of ethnicity data. In this sense, the Demographic Yearbook should continue to present data periodically, specifying when available the underlying concepts used by each country to define “national and/or ethnic groups”. In addition, information should also be made available in the website to increase the accessibility to a larger number of users. Users should interpret the data cautiously because the heterogeneity of concepts limits international comparability. Even when using data for the same country, changes in the question design and/or underlying concepts might lead to non-comparable results from one census to another.

In this context, the United Nations Statistics Division can play an important role by providing technical assistance to countries that wish to include or change a question on ethnicity. In addition, the United Nations Statistics Division could also provide an appropriate setting for

countries to meet and share successful national practices and challenges faced when trying to collect data on ethnicity.

## **V. CONCLUSION**

There is much uncertainty surrounding the measurement of ethnicity. This ambiguity stems from the subjective nature inherent to all social constructs, and in this case ethnicity, as well as the heterogeneity of concepts and terminology used to capture this social feature. More research is needed in order to meet the challenges involved in the collection of ethnic data. As suggested in this report, analysing the 1990 round of censuses could provide interesting information on: the inclusion or exclusion of ethnicity questions from one census round to the next; changes in the format and composition of response categories; modifications of the underlying concepts; and, adaptations of the question design to new realities such as multiple ethnic identities. In addition, present research efforts should be continued. Results should be updated by including the rest of the countries that have conducted a census in the 2000 round and for which a questionnaire was not available at the time of this paper. Finally, a similar analysis to the one presented in this report should be performed for data on citizenship, language, and religion, all of which add new dimensions to the ethnic composition of a population.

## REFERENCES

Aspinall, Peter J. Operationalising the collection of ethnicity data in studies of the sociology of health and illness, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 2000, 23, 6, 829-862.

Demographic Yearbook. United Nations Publication, New York. Issues of 1956, 1963, 1964, 1971, 1973, 1979, 1983, 1988, and 1993.

Edwards, R. W. ABS Views on Content and Procedures. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, Australia, July 2003.

Tishkov, Valery. *Ethnicity and Language in Russia's 2002 Census*. Paper presented in the International Symposium "Population Census – XXIst Century: Experience – Problems – Prospects", Moscow, Russian Federation, 27-28 November 2001.

Population Census 2001: Ethnic affiliation. Prepared by the Population Census Department from the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, 2002.

United Nations (1998). Principles and recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses. Statistical Papers, No.67, Sales No E.98.XVII.8.

Waters, Mary C. Immigration, Intermarriage, and the Challenges of Measuring Racial/Ethnic Identities, *American Journal of Public Health*, November 2000, 90, 11, pp. 173-175.

## APPENDIX A – Coverage of ‘ethnicity’ in the Demographic Yearbook

Table A.1. Coverage of 'Ethnicity' in the DYB - 1950 round of censuses (1945-1954)			
Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
AFRICA	Angola	30 XII 1950	1956
	Basutoland	7 V 1946	1956
	Bechuanaland	7 V 1946	1956
	Cape Verde Islands	15 XII 1950	1956
	Gambia*	4 XI 1951	1956
	Gold Coast (Ivory Coast)	I-II 1948	1956
	Kenya	II-VIII 1948	1956
	Mauritius	29 VI 1952	1956
	Morocco	31 XII 1950	1956
	Mozambique		
	-- Indigenous population	16 IX 1950	1956
	-- Non-indigenous population	21 IX 1950	1956
	Portuguese Guinea	15 VI 1950	1956
	Rhodesia and Nyasaland		
	-- Indigenous population	30 VI 1950	1956
	-- Non-indigenous population	15 X 1946	1956
	-- Non-indigenous population	8 V 1951	1956
	Southern Rhodesia		
	-- Indigenous population	31 VIII 1948	1956
	-- Non-indigenous population	15 X 1946	1956
	-- Non-indigenous population	8 V 1951	1956
	Sao Tome and Principe	15 XII 1950	1956
	Seychelles	21 XII 1947	1956
	South West Africa	7 V 1946	1956
	South West Africa	8 V 1951	1956
	Spanish Guinea	31 XII 1950	1956
	Swaziland	7 V 1946	1956
	Tanganyika	13 II 1952	1956
	Togoland	1 II 1948	1956
	Uganda	II-VIII 1948	1956
	Union of South Africa	7 V 1946	1956
	Union of South Africa	8 V 1951	1956
	Zanzibar and Pemba*	25 II 1948	1956
AMERICA, NORTH	Alaska	1 IV 1950	1956
	Bahama Islands	6 XII 1953	1956
	Barbados	9 IV 1946	1956
	Bermuda	22 X 1950	1956
	British Honduras	9 IV 1946	1956
	Canada	1 VI 1951	1956
	Canal Zone	1 IV 1950	1956
	Costa Rica	22 V 1950	1956
	Cuba	28 I 1953	1956
	Dominican Republic	6 VIII 1950	1956
	Guatemala	18 IV 1950	1956
	Honduras	24 VI 1945	1956
	Leeward Islands	9 IV 1946	1956
	Puerto Rico	1 IV 1950	1956
	Trinidad and Tobago	9 IV 1946	1956
	United States	1 IV 1950	1956
	Virgin Islands - US	1 IV 1950	1956
Windward Islands (UK)	9 IV 1946	1956	
AMERICA, SOUTH	Bolivia	5 IX 1950	1956
	Brazil	1 VII 1950	1956
	British Guiana	9 IV 1946	1956
ASIA	Aden Colony	8 X 1946	1956
	Brunei	27 XI 1947	1956
	Burma	1 II 1953	1956
	Ceylon	19 III 1946	1956
	Ceylon*	20 III 1953	1956
	Macau	4 VI 1950	1956
	Malaysia, Federation of (UK)	23 IX 1947	1956
	Maldives Islands	19 III 1946	1956
	North Borneo	4 VI 1951	1956
	Philippines	1 X 1948	1956
	Portuguese Timor	IX-XII 1950	1956
	Sarawak	26 XI 1947	1956
	Singapore	23 IX 1947	1956
	Thailand	23 V 1947	1956
	EUROPE	Vatican	30 IV 1948
Yugoslavia		31 III 1953	1956



Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
OCEANIA	American Samoa	1 IV 1950	1956
	Australia	30 VI 1947	1956
	Cook Islands	25 IX 1945	1956
	Cook Islands	25 IX 1951	1956
	Fiji Islands	8 X 1946	1956
	Gilbert and Ellice Islands	9 VI 1947	1956
	Guam	1 IV 1950	1956
	Hawaii	1 IV 1950	1956
	Nauru	30 VI 1947	1956
	Nauru	30 VI 1954	1956
	New Guinea	30 VI 1947	1956
	New Guinea	30 VI 1954	1956
	New Zealand	25 IX 1945	1956
	New Zealand	17 IV 1951	1956
	Niue	25 IX 1945	1956
	Niue	27 IX 1951	1956
	Norfolk Island	30 VI 1947	1956
	Norfolk Island	30 VI 1954	1956
	Papua	30 VI 1947	1956
	Papua	30 VI 1954	1956
	Tokelau*	25 IX 1945	1956
	Tokelau	25 IX 1951	1956
	Western Samoa	25 IX 1945	1956
	Western Samoa	25 IX 1951	1956

\*No breakdown by sex was available

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
AFRICA	Algeria*	15 IX 1960	1963
	Angola	1 IX-30 XII 1960	1964
	Basutoland	8 IV 1956	1963
	Bechuanaland	8 IV 1956	1963
	Botswana	15 I-VI 1964	1971
	Burundi	3 I 1958	1963
	Central African Republic*	1959-1960	1964
	Comoro Islands*	VII-IX 1958	1963
	Congo (Brazzaville)*	VIII-XI 1960	1964
	Congo (Leopoldville)		
	-- African population	1955-1957	1963
	-- Non-african population*	3 I 1955	1963
	-- Non-african population	3 I 1958	1963
	Dahomey	25 V-30 IX 1961	1964
	French Somaliland	12 XII 1956	1963
	Gabon	XII 1960-IV 1961	1964/1963^
	Gambia	17 IV 1963	1971
	Ghana	20 III 1960	1963
	Guinea	15 I-31 V 1955	1963
	Ivory Coast* (rural population)	XI 1957-1958	1963
	Kenya	15 VIII 1962	1971/1963
	Ifni	31 XII 1960	1964
	Mauritius		
	-- Island	30 VI 1962	1971/1963
	-- Rodrigues	30 VI 1962	1971/1963
	Mozambique	1955	1963
	Niger	X 1959-III 1960	1964/1963
	Nigeria	5-8 XI 1963	1971
	Northern Rhodesia		
	-- African population*	IV-V 1963	1963
	-- Non-african population	8 V 1956	1963
	-- Non-african population	26 IX 1961	1963
	Nyasaland	8 V 1956	1963
Nyasaland	26 IX 1961	1963	
Rwanda	3 I 1958	1963	
Sao Tome and Principe	15 XII 1960	1963	
Senegal	IV 1960-VIII 1961	1963	
South Africa	6 IX 1960	1963	
South West Africa	6 IX 1960	1963	
Southern Rhodesia			
-- African population*	IV-V 1962	1964/1963	
-- Non-african population	8 V 1956	1963	
-- Non-african population	26 IX 1961	1963	

Table A.2. continued - 1960 round of censuses (1955-1964)			
	Spanish Equatorial Region	31 XII 1960	1963
	Spanish North Africa - Melilla	31 XII 1960	1963
	Spanish Sahara	31 XII 1960	1964
	Sudan	17 I 1956	1963
	Swaziland	17 VII 1956	1963
	Tanganyika	II-VIII 1957	1963
	Togo*	XI 1958-XII 1960	1963
	Tunisia	1 II 1956	1963
	Uganda	25 III & 18 VIII 1959	1963
	Upper Volta*	30 IX 1960-22 IV 1961	1963
	Zambia	V-VI 1963	1964
	Zanzibar	19 III 1958	1963
AMERICA, NORTH	Antigua	7 IV 1960	1963
	Barbados	7 IV 1960	1963
	Bermuda	23 X 1960	1963
	Canada	1 VI 1961	1963
	Canal Zone	1 IV 1960	1963
	Cayman Islands	7 IV 1960	1963
	Dominica	7 IV 1960	1963
	Grenada	7 IV 1960	1963
	Guatemala**	18 IV 1964	1971
	Jamaica	7 IV 1960	1963
	Montserrat	7 IV 1960	1963
	Netherlands Antilles - Aruba	27 VI 1960	1963
	St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla	7 IV 1960	1963
	St. Lucia	7 IV 1960	1963
	St. Vincent	7 IV 1960	1963
	Trinidad and Tobago	7 IV 1960	1963
	Turks and Caicos Islands	7 IV 1960	1963
	United States	1 IV 1960	1963
	Virgin Islands - UK	7 IV 1960	1963
	Virgin Islands - US	1 IV 1960	1963
AMERICA, SOUTH	British Guiana	7 IV 1960	1963
	Surinam	31 III 1964	1971
ASIA	Aden Colony	7 II 1955	1963/1956 <sup>A</sup>
	Brunei	9 VIII 1960	1963
	Ceylon	8 VII 1963	1971
	Cyprus	11 XII 1960	1963
	Malaysia		
	-- Federation of Malaysia	17 VI 1957	1963
	-- Sabah	9 VIII 1960	1963
	-- Sarawak	14 VI 1960	1963
	Singapore	17 VI 1957	1963
	Mongolia*	5 I 1963	1971
	Viet Nam North	1 IV 1960	1963
EUROPE	Albania*	2 X 1955	1963
	Bulgaria	1 XII 1956	1963
	Romania	21 II 1956	1963
	USSR	15 I 1959	1963
	USSR - Byelorussian SSR*	15 I 1959	1964/1963
	USSR - Ukrainian SSR*	15 I 1959	1963
OCEANIA	American Samoa	25 IX 1956	1963
	American Samoa	1 IV 1960	1963
	Australia	30 VI 1961	1964
	British Solomon Islands	9 XI 1959	1963
	Christmas Island	30 VI 1961	1964
	Cocos (Keeling) Island	30 VI 1961	1964/1963 <sup>A</sup>
	Cook Islands	25 IX 1956	1963
	Fiji Islands	27 IX 1956	1963
	French Polynesia	9 XI 1962	1971
	Gilbert and Ellice Islands	30 IV 1963	1971/1964
	Guam	1 IV 1960	1963
	Nauru	30 I 1961	1964
	New Caledonia	6 XII 1956	1963
	New Caledonia	2 V 1963	1971
	New Zealand	17 IV 1956	1963
	New Zealand	18 IV 1961	1963
	Niue	25 IX 1956	1963
	Niue	25 IX 1961	1963
	Norfolk Island	30 VI 1961	1964
	Tokelau Islands	25 IX 1961	1963
	Tonga	26 IX 1956	1963
	Western Samoa	25 IX 1956	1963
	Western Samoa	25 IX 1961	1963

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
OCEANIA	American Samoa	25 IX 1956	1963
	American Samoa	1 IV 1960	1963
	Australia	30 VI 1961	1964
	British Solomon Islands	9 XI 1959	1963
	Christmas Island	30 VI 1961	1964
	Cocos (Keeling) Island	30 VI 1961	1964/1963^
	Cook Islands	25 IX 1956	1963
	Fiji Islands	27 IX 1956	1963
	French Polynesia	9 XI 1962	1971
	Gilbert and Ellice Islands	30 IV 1963	1971/1964
	Guam	1 IV 1960	1963
	Nauru	30 I 1961	1964
	New Caledonia	6 XII 1956	1963
	New Caledonia	2 V 1963	1971
	New Zealand	17 IV 1956	1963
	New Zealand	18 IV 1961	1963
	Niue	25 IX 1956	1963
	Niue	25 IX 1961	1963
	Norfolk Island	30 VI 1961	1964
	Tokelau Islands	25 IX 1961	1963
Tonga	26 IX 1956	1963	
Western Samoa	25 IX 1956	1963	
Western Samoa	25 IX 1961	1963	

\*Breakdown by sex non-available

\*\* Breakdown by urban/rural residence

^ Provisional results

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
AFRICA	Angola	15 XII 1970	1979
	Congo	7 II 1974	1988
	Gambia	21 IV 1973	1988
	Kenya	24-25 VIII 1969	1971
	Lesotho	14/24 IV 1966	1971
	Malawi	9 VIII 1966	1971
	Mauritius		
	-- Island	30 VI 1972	1979
	-- Rodrigues	30 VI 1972	1979
	Morocco*	20 VII 1971	1979
	Rwanda	30 IX 1970	1979
	South Africa	6 V 1970	1971
	Southern Rhodesia**	IV V 1969	1971
	Spanish Sahara	31 XII 1970	1973
	Swaziland	24 V 1966	1971
	Togo	1 III 1970	1979
	Uganda	18 VIII 1969	1971
	United Republic of Tanzania	26 VIII 1967	1971
	Zambia	22-30 VIII 1969	1971
	AMERICA, NORTH	Antigua	7 IV 1970
Barbados		7 IV 1970	1979
Bermuda		29 X 1970	1973
British Virgin Islands		7 IV 1970	1973
Cayman Islands		7 IV 1970	1971
Montserrat		7 IV 1970	1973
Panama		10 V 1970	1973
St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla		7 IV 1970	1979
Saint Lucia		7 IV 1970	1979
Trinidad and Tobago		7 IV 1970	1979
Turks and Caicos Islands		29 X 1970	1973
United States**	1 IV 1970	1973/1971	
AMERICA, SOUTH	Guyana	7 IV 1970	1979
ASIA	Bahrain*	13 II 1965	1971
	Brunei	10 VIII 1971	1973/1971
	Hong Kong	9 III 1971	1973
	Macau**	15 XII 1970	1973
	Malaysia (East) - Sabah	24-25 VIII 1970	1973
	Malaysia (East) - Sarawak	24-25 VIII 1970	1973
	Malaysia (West)	24-25 VIII 1970	1973
	Philippines	6 V 1970	1979
	Singapore	22 VI 1970	1971
	Sri Lanka	9 X 1971	1979

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
EUROPE	Channel Islands	4 IV 1971	1971
	Czechoslovakia	1 XII 1970	1973
	Gibraltar	6 I 1970	1979
	Yugoslavia	31 III 1971	1973
	USSR*	15 I 1970	1971
	USSR - Byelorussian SSR*	15 I 1970	1971
	USSR - Ukrainian SSR*	15 I 1970	1971
OCEANIA	American Samoa	25 IX 1974	1983/1979
	Australia**	30 VI 1966	1973
	Australia	30 VI 1971	1973
	British Salomon Islands	7 II 1970	1971
	Christmas Islands	30 VI 1966	1971
	Christmas Islands	30 VI 1971	1973
	Cocos (Keelings) Islands	30 VI 1966	1971
	Fiji	12 IX 1966	1971
	Gilbert and Ellice Islands	6 XII 1968	1971
	Kiribati	8 XII 1973	1979
	Nauru	30 VI 1966	1971
	New Hebrides	28 V 1967	1971
	New Zealand	23 III 1966	1971
	New Zealand*	23 III 1971	1973
	Niue Island	28 IX 1966	1971
	Norkolk Island	30 VI 1966	1971
	Norkolk Island	30 VI 1971	1973
	Papua New Guinea	7 VII 1971	1973
	Tokelau Islands	21 II 1972	1973
Tonga	30 XI 1966	1971	
Western Samoa	21 XI 1966	1971	

\*Breakdown by sex non-available

\*\* Breakdown by urban/rural residence

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
AFRICA	Benin	20-30 III 1979	1988
	Congo	22 XII 1984	1988
	Gambia	15 IV 1983	1988
	Kenya	24 VIII 1979	1983
	Lesotho	12 IV 1976	1988
	Rwanda	16 VIII 1978	1983
	South Africa	6 V 1980	1988
	Swaziland	25 VIII 1976	1983
	Zambia	25 VIII 1980	1988
	Zimbabwe	18 VIII 1982	1988
	AMERICA, NORTH	Aruba	1 II 1981
Barbados		12 V 1980	1988
Belize		12 V 1980	1988
Bermuda		12 V 1980	1983
British Virgin Islands		12 V 1980	1988
Canada		3 VI 1981	1983
Dominica		7 IV 1981	1988
Grenada		30 IV 1981	1988
Jamaica		8 VI 1982	1988
Montserrat		12 V 1980	1988
Netherlands Antilles		1 II 1981	1988
Panama		11 V 1980	1988
Saint Kitts and Nevis		12 V 1980	1988
Saint Lucia		12 V 1980	1988
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		12 V 1980	1988
Trinidad and Tobago	12 V 1980	1988/1983	
Turks and Caicos Islands	12 V 1980	1988	
United States	1 IV 1980	1988/1983**	
United States Virgin Islands	1 IV 1980	1988	
AMERICA, SOUTH	Brazil	1 IX 1980	1988
	Guyana	12 V 1980	1988
ASIA	Brunei	26 VIII 1981	1983
	China	1 VII 1982	1988/1983
	Hong Kong	9 III 1981	1983
	Israel	4 VI 1983	1988
	Malaysia	10 VI 1980	1988
	Sabah	10 VI 1980	1988
	Sarawak	10 VI 1980	1988
	Singapore	24 VI 1980	1983
	Sri Lanka	17 III 1981	1988/1983
	Viet Nam	1 X 1979	1988

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
EUROPE	Czechoslovakia	1 XI 1980	1983
	Hungary	1 I 1980	1983
	Monaco	4 III 1982	1983
	Romania*	5 I 1977	1983/1979
	Yugoslavia	31 III 1981	1988
	USSR*	17 I 1979	1983
	USSR* - Byelorussian SSR	17 I 1979	1983
	USSR* - Ukrainian SSR	17 I 1979	1983
OCEANIA	American Samoa*	1 VI 1980	1988
	Australia	30 VI 1976	1983
	Australia	31 VI 1981	1988
	Christmas Island	30 VI 1981	1983
	Cocos (Keeling) Islands	30 VI 1981	1983
	Cook Islands	1 XII 1976	1983/1979
	Cook Islands	1 XII 1981	1983
	Fiji	13 IX 1976	1983/1979
	Guam*	1 IV 1980	1988
	Kiribati	12 XII 1978	1983
	Nauru	22 I 1977	1983
	New Caledonia	23 IV 1976	1983/1979
	New Caledonia	15 IV 1983	1988
	New Zealand	23 III 1976	1983/1979
	New Zealand	24 III 1981	1983
	Niue	29 IX 1976	1983/1979
	Pacific Islands*	15 IX 1980	1988
	Solomon Islands	7 II 1976	1983/1979
	Tokelau	25 X 1976	1983
	Tonga	30 XI 1976	1983/1979
Vanuatu	15 I 1979	1988	

\*Breakdown by sex non-available

Continent	Name of country	Census date	DYB issue
AFRICA	Benin	15 II 1992	To be published
	Chad**	8 IV 1993	To be published
	Cote d'Ivoire	1 III 1988	1993
	Ethiopia**	11 X 1994	To be published
	Gabon*	1 VII 1993	To be published
	Rwanda	15 VIII 1991	1993
	Senegal	27 V 1988	1993
	Seychelles	17 VIII 1987	1993
	Seychelles	26 VIII 1994	To be published
	South Africa	5 III 1985	1993/1988
	Uganda	12 I 1991	1993
	Zimbabwe*	18 VIII 1992	To be published
	AMERICA, NORTH	Aruba	6 X 1991
Belize		12 V 1991	1993
Bermuda		20 V 1991	1993
British Virgin Islands		12 V 1991	To be published
Canada		3 VI 1986	1993/1988
Canada		4 VI 1991	1993
Jamaica		7 IV 1991	To be published
Panama		13 V 1990	1993
Saint Kitts-Nevis		12 V 1991	To be published
Saint Lucia		12 V 1991	To be published
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 V 1991	To be published
Trinidad and Tobago	15 V 1990	To be published	
United States	1 IV 1990	To be published	
AMERICA, SOUTH	Brazil	1 IX 1991	To be published
	Chile	22 IV 1992	1993
ASIA	Brunei Darussalam	7 VIII 1991	1993
	China	1 VII 1990	1993
	Kazakhstan	12 I 1989	1993
	Kyrgyzstan	12 I 1989	1993
	Macao	30 VIII 1991	1993
	Malaysia	14 VIII 1991	To be published
	Nepal	22 VI 1991	To be published
	Singapore	30 VI 1990	1993
	Tajikistan	12 I 1989	To be published
	Viet Nam	1 IV 1989	1993
	Yemen**	16 XII 1994	To be published

Continent	Name of country	Census date	Status
EUROPE	Belarus	12 I 1989	To be published
	Bosnia and Herzegovina*	31 III 1991	To be published
	Former Czechoslovakia*	3 III 1991	1993
	Gibraltar	14 X 1991	To be published
	Hungary	1 I 1990	To be published
	Latvia	12 I 1989	1993
	Republic of Moldova	12 I 1989	1993
	Romania	7 I 1992	1993
	Slovakia	3 III 1991	To be published
	Slovenia	3 III 1991	To be published
	The former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	31 III 1991	To be published
	The former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	20 VI 1994	To be published
	United Kingdom	21 IV 1991	To be published
Yugoslavia*	31 III 1991	1993	
OCEANIA	Fiji	31 VIII 1986	1993/1988
	Micronesia, Federated States of	18 IX 1994	To be published
	New Caledonia	4 IV 1989	1993
	New Zealand	4 III 1986	1993/1988
	New Zealand*	5 III 1991	1993
	Tonga	28 XI 1986	1993
	Tuvalu	17 XI 1991	To be published
	Vanuatu	16 V 1989	1993

\*Breakdown by sex non-available

Continent	Name of country	Census date
AFRICA	Ghana*	26 VI 2000
	South Africa	10 X 1996
AMERICA, NORTH	Anguilla*	9 V 2001
	Netherlands Antilles	12 I 2001
	United States*	1 IV 2000
ASIA	Azerbaijan	27 I 1999
	Hong Kong (SAR)	15 III 2001
	Indonesia**	30 VI 2000
	Kazakhstan	26 II 1999
	Kyrgystan^^	24 III 1999
	Malaysia**	5 VII 2000
	Mongolia**	5 I 2000
	Occupied Palestinian Territory	10 XII 1997
EUROPE	Belarus	16 II 1999
	Czech Republic*	1 III 2001
	Latvia*	31 III 2000
	Lithuania*	6 IV 2001
	Slovakia	26 V 2001
OCEANIA	Cook Islands	10 XII 1996
	Fiji	25 VIII 1996
	New Zealand	5 III 1996
	Northern Mariana Islands*	9 IX 1995
	Palau	9 IX 1995
	Tonga	30 XI 1996

\*Breakdown by sex non-available

\*\* Breakdown by urban/rural residence

^ Provisional results