



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
16 September 2013

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Group of Experts on Population and Housing Censuses

Fifteenth Meeting

Geneva, 30 September – 3 October 2013

Item 12 of the provisional agenda

Migration and ethno-cultural characteristics

Challenges in data collection and dissemination of migration and ethnic cultural characteristics from Montenegro's Census 2011¹

Note by the Statistical office of Montenegro

Summary

The 2011 Census was the first census the Montenegro Statistical office organized, conducted and disseminated from the first to final phase. The most interesting items during the data collection process were related to migration and ethnic-cultural characteristics.

During the data collection process, some challenges emerged related to the following questions on migration characteristics:

- Use of the term “abroad” in the question “Did you ever reside abroad one year and over?”
- Should students pursuing tertiary education report migration if they have studied abroad? How should we treat these cases?
- Do people who were in the army for at least one year and stationed outside the current borders of Montenegro have to report migration?

With regard to ethno-cultural characteristics, challenges emerged in relation to the following questions:

- Ethnic affiliation - In the data collection phase there were practical problems with open-ended question responses. In the data dissemination phase, there were challenges in the reporting of two ethnic affiliations.
- Religion - Challenges on the creation of classification categories and for dissemination.
- Mother tongue - The possibility of double declaration and classification for dissemination purposes was problematic and recognized as a sensitive issue.
- Other language – The treatment of languages of previous Yugoslav countries as «other» language in order to answer the question of knowledge of languages.

¹ Prepared by Snezana Remikovic.

I. Background

1. Montenegro is a small, southern European and Mediterranean country with 620 thousand inhabitants. It is situated in the south of the Balkan Peninsula on 13 thousand km². Since 2006 it has been an independent country. Before 2006 it was in a state union with Serbia and before this one of six Republics within Yugoslavia.
2. Census 2011 was the first Census that the Montenegro Statistical office organized, conducted and disseminated at all phases of operation.
3. Keeping in mind the lack of human capacity at the Statistical office of Montenegro, at the very beginning phase of Census preparation, it was decided to do the following:
 - (a) The Census would cover all EU regulation requested variables, which are the same as core topic UN recommended variables.
 - (b) The Census would cover other non-core topic variables which are requested by national laws.
4. Reflecting this decision and related to the issues covered in this paper:
 - (a) "Migration characteristics" as a core topic were included in the Montenegro census.
 - (b) Ethnic variables are obliged through the Law of national minority.

II. Challenges related to migration characteristics

5. According to the 2010 CES Recommendations "*for purposes of international comparability as well as for internal use, information on country of previous residence should be collected on the basis of international boundaries existing at the time of the census.*" Montenegro followed this recommendation.
6. During the data collection process, the first challenge was recognized during the pilot census conducted in 2009. This is related to the "ever reside abroad" item. The question was:

"Did you ever reside abroad one year and over?"
7. During the pilot census data collection phase it was found that the word "abroad" was not recognized in the proper way. Some respondents, especially from north of Montenegro, did not recognize some countries as "abroad". This was the case with all former Yugoslav countries, especially Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia.
8. Because of this we decided to change the "wording" used in the question. In the Census "abroad" became "out of Montenegro":

8. Has person lived/stayed out of Montenegro – one year or over?

1. Yes 2. No → 9.

8.1. Country where from the person has moved in / return in Montenegro?

8.2. Reason for last moving in/return in Montenegro?

1. Economic 4. Education
2. Family reasons 5. Other
3. War

8.3. When the person has moved in/return in Montenegro?

 |_|_|_|_| |_|_|
 year month

8.4. How long the person intends to stay in Montenegro?

 |_| |_|_|
 number of months number of years

9. With regards to migration characteristics a problem was reflected by people not understanding that someone who was a student participating in tertiary education outside of Montenegro should be reported as a migrant. This situation involved all cases and periods.

10. Additionally, this issue reflected a problem with the traditional approach of reporting students in tertiary education as members of their original household. Due to this problem we collected information for them also, and in the data processing phase they were removed from the population of Montenegro (according to collected information). In this manner we enumerated about 7 000 tertiary students who studied outside of Montenegro.

11. Another challenge was the army. During the period of Yugoslavia every male was required to be in the regular army for some period, though this changed over time. For example, during 1960-1970 this was two years, then later reduced to 18 months and finally to one year. The place where someone could be stationed was over all Yugoslavia. After consultation, but without an answer from EUROSTAT by a reasonable deadline, we decided that periods in which someone spent one year and over in the army should not be considered migration. This decision was made using logic from the definition of usual place of residence. If someone is in the army, and stationed outside their country of usual residence, then these persons should not be considered migrants.

12. These problematic issues were recognized before conducting the census and special attention was given to these issues during training.

III. Challenges related to Ethnic-cultural characteristics

A. Data collection phase

1. Ethnic affiliation

13. Recommendations said:

Information on ethnicity should therefore always be based on the free self-declaration of a person, questionnaires should include an open question and interviewers should refrain from suggesting answers to the respondents.

14. We fulfilled this request with following question:

13. Ethnic affiliation

15. On the one hand this is good solution, but this method resulted in other challenges. Free self-declaration and open-ended questions are still susceptible to manipulation. Enumerators must input everything the respondent reports. This is OK. But in the data processing stage we ran into issues with the multitude of answers possible.

16. In our case, software for data entry to classify responses was programmed in advance and during data entry the operator used these classifications. In the event of new modalities, it was possible to enter new names and expand the number classification categories.

17. We discovered during field work that there were so many new names that we decided that this field would remain open during the data entry phase, meaning the operator entered responses directly from what was written on the Census form. After half of the census material was entered, we created a special team who worked on classifications which was created for dissemination purposes. So in this way we include in our database exactly what was collected in the field. So in our original database you can find the following:

- “Džedaj“: the result of a small public campaign where groups of young people promoted a new ethnic group called “Džedaj“
- Cartoon characters like Micky Mouse, the Smurfs, etc.
- Aliens from Mars or other planets.

18. In Montenegro we decided to disseminate each modality having at least 100 cases. This threshold was very near for some of answers mention above. Thus, the question we ask is: must we disseminate these cases?

19. In our database they are treated as “other.” And in the tables on our web site (<http://www.monstat.org/eng/page.php?id=392&pageid=57>) you can see that “other” is less than 1% of the population (See also Annex 1).

20. Another issue is double ethnic affiliation. The Recommendations say:

Respondents should be free to indicate more than one ethnic affiliation or a combination of ethnic affiliations if they wish so.

21. There was no problem following this recommendation in the data collection phase. Difficulties began when creating ethnicity classifications to be used for dissemination. In all previous censuses first modality was used for all double ethnic affiliations. For example, if someone declared as “Montenegrin –Serb” they were classified as “Montenegrin.” In the opposite case, if someone declared as “Serb –Montenegrin” they were classified as “Serb”. This practice was strongly discouraged by EU experts, but there was no agreed upon answer on how to disseminate double declaration. One of the dissemination proposals was to have a person with dual-ethnicity to be counted for both ethnicities. Using this method the total number of population would increase two-fold for those with dual-ethnicity. This was not an acceptable proposal for Montenegro. We finally decided that dual-ethnicity would be treated as a new category and dissemination would be determined by their frequency. As a result, six double modality ethnicities were published with the release of data. In Montenegro, dual-ethnicity was declared by 8% inhabitants.

In order to guarantee the free self-declaration of ethnicity, respondents should be allowed to indicate "none" or "not declared" when asked for their ethnicity.

22. Keeping in mind this recommendation during the pilot census, before questions related to ethnic-cultural characteristics, we included the sentence "person is not obliged to declare about following questions." Each enumerator read this during data collection. As a result, we found that more than 20% of respondents did not want to declare their ethnicity.

23. To avoid this situation in the Census we deleted this sentence from the questionnaire. Information about the possibility of non-declaration was included in the Manual instructions and staff was trained for this. Just before field work was to begin a NGO for human rights complained to the Court about this. This was despite the Manual instructions stating that the right to not declare ethnicity was guaranteed by the constitutional Law of Montenegro.

24. This situation started due to the obligation of enumerators to fill empty lines for all these questions. Due to these instructions the NGO believed that everyone was required to declare their ethnicity.

25. However they missed a very important part of the instructions: the enumerators obligation to fill empty lines was to avoid having enumerators answer the question for those who did not wish to declare their ethnicity. If someone did not want to declare the enumerator was to put in the empty line "Does not want to declare." This answer was treated as the correct answer.

26. According to present situation the Court decided that we can continue with preparation of the census.

27. During the public advertising campaign we sent messages to the public that every citizen of Montenegro should have the same information, provided in the same manner, and be completely free to answer to all questions in the questionnaire. They were told that it was their right as Census participants to not be obliged to answer questions on nationality, i.e. ethnical affiliation, as well as religion, but if they did not want to report these items they should answer with the statement "I do not want to declare myself".

28. Below is a picture of the instructions for enumerators from the instruction Manual.

Text to use the following:

"Good afternoon, I am the representative of Statistical Office of Montenegro. My name is..... (He/she shows the ID card and Authorisation for Enumerators). I am here to perform the enumeration of population, households, and dwellings. Aim of the census is to collect demographic, education, economic, and other data on persons, as well as basic data on households, and dwellings. The data I collect represent the official secret and they will be used for the purposes of statistics only. I should speak with an adult person who is first of all informed on the data related to all household members".

- Enumerator should inform citizens on the fact that they are obliged to give the data requested by the census, and that he/she with other participants of the census is obliged to keep all collected data as the official secret.

In accordance with United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Conference of European Statisticians Recommendations for the 2010 Censuses of Population and Housing (ISSN 069-8458) prepared in cooperation with the Statistical Office of the European Communities (EUROSTAT), a person is not obliged to respond to the questions on national, i.e. ethnical affiliation, religion or mother tongue. If a person does not want to respond to these questions, then the answer "He/she does not want to declare himself/herself" is entered. This is considered as an accurate and complete answer.

- To inform enumerated persons on possible control of his/her work.
- After the finished enumeration of all persons in the dwelling, the enumerator should express his/her gratitude for participating in the enumeration.
- Enumerator should fill the forms strictly with data based on the statements of persons providing the data.
- Enumerator is not allowed to influence on respondents in terms of suggesting and to induce them when providing the answers.

Classification

29. Recommendations said: Classifications of ethnic groups should be comprehensive and include at the finest level, ethnic groups, self-perceived groups, regional and local groups as well as groups that are usually not considered to be ethnic groups (for example religious groups, groups based on nationality in the sense of citizenship etc.). Classifications at the highest level depend on national conditions and concepts and no internationally comparable classification is recommended.

30. We have already mentioned the classification of ethnicity a few times, as well as challenges in their creation. We would like feedback from experts in this meeting to discuss the following.

- How to decide which “group” is an ethnicity and which is not?
- Should Statistical Offices simply recognize different “words” and classify results based on their frequency?
- Should we treat “Dzedaj” as an ethnicity?

31. There are many examples of Balkan countries where some ethnic groups are not treated the same as other ethnic groups. For example, in Bosnia there is an official request to treat Muslims as Bosniaks. At the same time in Montenegro, the national Muslim council and the national Bosniak council exist as two separate institutions. Who will decide whether Muslims should be treated as religion, while in the previous censuses of Yugoslavia Muslims existed as an ethnicity, as can be found in all Census publications since 1961.

32. Similarly, in Montenegro some people treat Montenegrins as an ethnic group.

33. Clasification of ethnicity is a very sensitive issue and the Statistical Office must be very careful to keep in mind the recommendation that says: *Classifications of ethnic groups should be comprehensive and include at the finest level, ethnic groups, self-perceived groups, regional and local groups as well as groups that are usually not considered to be ethnic groups (for example religious groups, groups based on nationality in the sense of citizenship etc.).*

34. A historical approach can show what was done previously in the former country of Yugoslavia.

35. Analysing censuses from 1948 to 2003, the following table shows the ways in which issues of ethnic characteristics have been considered in the territory of Montenegro (all countries of the former Yugoslavia).

36. It is obvious that this issue was treated differently in all censuses with different explanations.

1948	1953	1961	1971	1981	1991	2002/3
Ethnicity (Narodnost): Every person noted what their ethnicity was: examples Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrin, Hungarians, Albanians, Rumanian, etc. Muslims were called Serb-Muslim, Croat-Muslim, defined-Muslim.	Ethnicity(Narodnos) : All persons noted what their ethnicity was. For example, Serb, Croat, Slovene, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Hungarian, Shiptar, German, Italian, Czech, Slovak, Turkish, Gypsy itd. Person with Yugoslav origin without ethnicity, could declare as: Yugoslav-undeclared. For other who did not declared enter: undeclared. For children up to 10 years of age parents will declared.	Ethnicity(Narodnost) :Each person entered ethnicity, for example, Serb, Croat, Slovene, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Muslim (in the sense of ethnicity) Shiptar, Hungarian, German, Italian, Czech, Slovak, Turkish, Gypsy, etc.	Ethnicity(Narodnost ili etnička pripadnost): Enter the nationality or ethnicity according to the statement of the interviewed person. For children younger than 15 years use a statement given by the parents. (According to Article 41 of the Constitution of the SFRY a person could enter not declared.)	Ethnicity(Nacionalnost) (Belonging to a nation, nationality or ethnic group): (under Article 170 of the Constitution of the SFRY a person could enter not declared.)	Ethnicity(Nacionalnost) (nationality or ethnic group) (under Article 170 of the Constitution of the SFRY person could enter not declared.)	EthnicityEthnicity (Nacionalnost) (nationality or ethnic group) (under Article 34. of the Constitution of the Montenegro a person could enter not declared.)

2. Religion

37. Recommendations said:

Data should always be based on the free self-declaration of a person and questionnaires should include open questions to allow small groups, break-off groups and local denominations to identify.

38. We fulfilled this request with the following question:

14. Religion (Montenegro Constitution, article 41, the person is not obliged to respond the question)

39. *Classifications should be comprehensive. They should include at the finest level: groups of religions, religions, and subsets of religions, such as, religious denominations, administrative and organizational groupings, groups of churches, churches, and breakaway groups as well as belief systems that may not generally considered being religions.*

40. The use of an open-ended question again has both pros and cons. As with the ethnicity question, the open-ended format allows the opportunity for free declaration, but we are again faced with the same problems when it comes to classification. These challenges are more or less the same as those we faced for ethnicity:

- Who will decide what responses are religions and what are not?
- Are Statistical Offices just technical institutions that should disseminate all reported answers according to frequency?

41. As with the classification of ethnicity, for the classification of religion the Statistical office of Montenegro played the role of technical institution. In this sense we have produced the table in Annex 2. It can be noted that 16% of the population of Montenegro reported the religion “Islam” and 3% of the population of Montenegro have the religion “Muslim”.

42. The question is: Are these two categories the same? Who should make the decision that they are the same? The Statistical Office? Religions institutions?

43. If someone has freely declared that his/her religion is “Muslim,” can the Statistical Office change this to “Islam”? From the technical point of view the letter “M” is different from “I”, “u” is different from “s,” and moreover Muslim has six letters while Islam five.

44. In addition, please consider the connection between religion with ethnicity, as we have previously mentioned that there is a group of persons who declared Muslim as their ethnicity.

45. In Montenegro the situation was solved like this: After input from the Islamic community in Montenegro, when we publish short tables with main religion we merge Muslim and Islam. In the detailed tables you can find both modalities.

3. Mother tongue

46. Recommendations said:

.....It is therefore recommended that an open answer box. Classifications should be comprehensive and include on the finest level language groups.

47. We fulfilled this request with the following question:

15. Mother tongue (Montenegrin, Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian, Croatian or other language)

48. There was no problem with this recommendation in the sense of an open-ended response and classification.

49. In Census 2011 we can say that one of the most sensitive questions was the question about mother tongue. The challenge started early on when the Law of Census was first adopted. The first version of the Law of Census defined “Mother tongue” as “the first language spoken in early childhood at home.” A party in the Parliament of Montenegro found this definition problematic and adopted an amendment with the following changes: “MOTHER TONGUE (Montenegrin, Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian, Croatian or other language)”. Languages in brackets are the languages mentioned in the constitutional Law of Montenegro. Namely, the Montenegrin language was for the first time collected and published in Census 2003, but the majority of population still declared their mother tongue as Serbian.

50. Similar to ethnicity, but with fewer cases, double declaration for mother tongue was reported by 0.3% inhabitants of Montenegro.

4. Other language

16. Foreign languages the person is using				
	understands	speaks	reads and writes	
1. _____	1	2	3	
2. _____	1	2	3	
3. _____	1	2	3	

51. As a very interesting issue, for the first time in a Census we collected information about “Foreign languages the person is using (understands, speaks, reads and writes).” The expected challenge was that the majority of answers could be a person who declared knowledge of Montenegrin, Serbian, Bosnian or Croatian languages. Results from the pilot Census were satisfactory. Final results from the Census showed that only 0.2% declared knowledge of a foreign language as “other.” Additionally, 26% of the population in Montenegro knows English, 9% of population knows Russian, 5% knows Italian and German, and French in known by 3% of population. Detailed information can be found at: <http://www.monstat.org/userfiles/file/popis2011/saopstenje/znanje%20stranijih%20jezika.pdf>

B. Dissemination phase

52. A new challenge is disclosure control measures during the dissemination phase.

53. It is recommended:

Special care, therefore, may be required in census procedures and outputs relating to ethnic group and religion in order to demonstrate to respondents that appropriate data protection and disclosure control measures are in place.

54. All individual answers of citizens given under the Census will be protected, will be only used for statistical purposes, and they will remain confidential, as defined by Article 20 of the Law on Census. Any act against Article 20 or misuse of individual data will be punished in accordance with Article 27 of the same Law.

55. Procedures and measures of protection were adopted during all phases of census operation from data collection to dissemination.

56. At the level of the Statistical Office it was decided to apply disclosure control and protect all cells with frequency under six for ethnic-cultural variables at the settlement level. In this manner, due to primary and secondary confidentiality we protected about 8% of the cells in tables for ethnicity at the settlement level.

57. The same rules applied for disclosure control for mother tongue and religion. The percent of protected cells was little bit higher, as it was 9% for mother tongue and 11% for religion. In addition to the large percent of protected cells (cells with “z”) there are many cells with “-“, which means there are no cases. Below, is a picture of excel tables available on our web site: <http://www.monstat.org/cg/page.php?id=536&pageid=322>

Tabela N1 [Compatibility Mode] - Microsoft Excel

Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Developer

F4 fx Bošnjaci/

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	Tabela N1. Stanovništvo prema nacionalnoj odnosno etničkoj pripadnosti po naseljima, Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova u Crnoj Gori 2011. godin															
2	Table N1. Population by ethnicity by settlement, Population Census in Montenegro 2011															
3																Nacionaln
4	Opština / Municipality	Naselje / Settlements	Ukupno / total	Albanci / Albanians	Bosanci / Bosnians	Bošnjaci / Bosniaks	Bošnjaci - Muslimani / Bosniaks - Muslims	Crnogorci / Montenegrins	Crnogorci - Muslimani / Montenegrins - Muslims	Crnogorci-Srbi / Montenegrins-Serbs	Egipćani / Egyptians	Goranci / Gorani	Hrvati / Croats	Italijani / Italians	Jugoslaveni / Yugoslavs	Mađari / Hungarians
5																
1095	Podgorica	Radovce	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1096	Podgorica	Rakica Kuće	279	143	-	30	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	z	-
1097	Podgorica	Releza	7	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1098	Podgorica	Rijeka Piperska	97	-	-	-	-	71	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-
1099	Podgorica	Selište	47	45	-	-	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1100	Podgorica	Seoca	13	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1101	Podgorica	Seoštica	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1102	Podgorica	Sjenice	22	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1103	Podgorica	Skorac	137	137	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1104	Podgorica	Slacko	21	-	-	-	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1105	Podgorica	Spinja	39	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1106	Podgorica	Srpska	880	z	-	-	-	567	-	-	-	-	z	-	-	z
1107	Podgorica	Staniselici	20	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1108	Podgorica	Stanjevica Rupa	211	-	z	-	-	128	-	z	-	-	z	-	7	-
1109	Podgorica	Stijena	457	11	-	-	-	238	-	z	-	-	z	-	z	-
1110	Podgorica	Stjepovo	24	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1111	Podgorica	Stupovi	17	-	-	-	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1112	Podgorica	Šušunja	267	z	-	-	-	221	-	z	-	-	z	-	-	-
1113	Podgorica	Trbojin	48	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1114	Podgorica	Trmanje	6	-	-	-	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1115	Podgorica	Tuzi Ljevorečke	z	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1116	Podgorica	Ubli	227	-	-	-	-	73	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-
1117	Podgorica	Velje Brdo	319	-	z	-	-	199	-	7	-	-	z	-	z	-
1118	Podgorica	Veruša	40	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1119	Podgorica	Vidjenje	64	-	-	-	-	26	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-
1120	Podgorica	Vilac	25	z	-	-	-	7	-	z	-	-	-	-	-	-

58. On the discussion of dissemination it is important to stress one more issue. On the question on ethnicity 4.9% of inhabitants gave as an answer “do not want to declare” and this was also given by 4% for mother tongue and 2.6% for religion.

IV. Conclusions

59. There many open questions and I would invite for discussion for the next round of Census 2020 to at least clarify the following questions.

What should Statistical institutions do?

- Are we simply technical institutions or we should we make some decisions related to classification?
- How should we treat a new “ethnic group”- like Dzedaj or something else?
- How to disseminate double modality?

Annex 1- Ethnic structure of population in Montenegro, Census 2011

Table 4a. Structure of population by ethnicity per municipalities, in %

	Ukupno Total	Nacionalna, odnosno etnička pripadnost / ethnicity											
		Crnogorci/ Montenegrins	Srbi/ Serbs	Bošnjaci/ Bosniaks	Albanci/ Albanians	Muslimani/ Muslims	Hrvati/ Croats	Bosanci/ Bosnians	Bošnjaci – Muslimani/ Bosniaks- Muslims	Crnogorci- Muslimani/ Montenegrins- Muslims	Crnogorci- Srbi/ Montenegrins- Serbs	Egipćani/ Egyptians	Goranci/ Gorani
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	44.98	28.73	8.65	4.91	3.31	0.97	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.30	0.33	0.03
	Ukupno Total	Nacionalna, odnosno etnička pripadnost / Ethnicity											
		Crnogorci/ Montenegrins	Srbi/ Serbs	Bošnjaci/ Bosniaks	Albanci/ Albanians	Muslimani/ Muslims	Hrvati/ Croats	Bosanci/ Bosnians	Bošnjaci – Muslimani/ Bosniaks - Muslims	Crnogorci- Muslimani/ Montenegrins -Muslims	Crnogorci- Srbi/ Montenegrins Serbs	Egipćani/ Egyptians	Goranci/ Gorani
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	278865	178110	53605	30439	20537	6021	427	181	175	1833	2054	197

Table 4a. Structure of population by ethnicity per municipalities, in %

	Nacionalna, odnosno etnička pripadnost / ethnicity														
	Italijani / Italians	Jugosloveni / Yugoslavs	Mađari / Hungarians	Makedonci / Macedonians	Muslimani- Bošnjaci / Muslims- Bosniaks	Muslimani- Crnogorci / Muslims- Montenegrins	Njemci / Germans	Romi / Roma	Rusi / Russians	Slovinci / Slovenians	Srbi- Crnogorci / Serbs- Montenegrins	Turci / Turkish	Ostalo / Other	Regionalna pripadnost / Regional qualification	Ne želi da se izjasni / Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	0.02	0.19	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.04	0.02	1.01	0.15	0.06	0.34	0.02	0.54	0.19	4.87
	Nacionalna, odnosno etnička pripadnost / ethnicity														
	Italijani / Italians	Jugosloveni / Yugoslavs	Mađari / Hungarians	Makedonci / Macedonians	Muslimani Bošnjaci / Muslims- Bosniaks	Muslimani- Crnogorci / Muslims- Montenegrins	Njemci / Germans	Romi / Roma	Rusi / Russians	Slovinci / Slovenians	Srbi- Crnogorci / Serbs- Montenegrins	Turci / Turkish	Ostalo / Other	Regionalna pripadnost / Regional qualification	Ne želi da se izjasni / Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	135	1154	337	900	183	257	131	6251	946	354	2103	104	3358	1202	30170

Annex 2. Structure of population by religion in Montenegro, Census 2011

Table 6a. Structure of population by religion, per municipalities, in %.

	Ukupno/ Total	Vjeroispovijest / Religion												
		Pravoslavna/ Orthodox	Katolička/ Catholics	Islamska/ Islam	Muslimanska/ Muslims	Adventist/ Adventist	Agnostik/ Agnostic	Ateista/ Atheist	Budisti/ Buddhist	Hrišćani/ Christians	Jehovini svjedoci / Jehovah witness	Protestant/ Protestants	Ostale vjeroispovijesti/ Other religions	Ne želi da se izjasni/ Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	72.07	3.44	15.97	3.14	0.14	0.07	1.24	0.02	0.24	0.02	0.02	1.02	2.61

Table 6. Population by religion, per municipalities

	Ukupno/ Total	Vjeroispovijest / Religion												
		Pravoslavna/ Orthodox	Katolička/ Catholics	Islamska/ Islam	Muslimanska/ Muslims	Adventist/ Adventist	Agnostik/ Agnostic	Ateista/ Atheist	Budisti/ Buddhist	Hrišćani/ Christians	Jehovini svjedoci / Jehovah witness	Protestant/ Protestants	Ostale vjeroispovijesti/ Other religions	Ne želi da se izjasni/ Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	446858	21299	99038	19439	894	451	7667	118	1460	145	143	6337	16180

Annex 3. Population by mother tongue in Montenegro, Census 2011

Table 5a. Population by mother tongue per municipalities, in%

	Ukupno Total	Maternji jezik / Mother tongue										
		Crnogorski/ Montenegrin	Srpski/ Serbian	Bosanski/ Bosnian	Albanski/ Albanian	Hrvatski/ Croatian	Crnogorsko- Srpski/ Montenegrin- Serbian	Engleski/ English	Hrvatsko- Srpski/ Croatian - Serbian	Bošnjački Bosniaks	Mađarski/ Hungarian	Makedonski/ Macedonian
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	36.97	42.88	5.33	5.27	0.45	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.59	0.04	0.09
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	620029	229251	265895	33077	32671	2791	369	185	224	3662	225	529

Table 5a. Population by mother tongue per municipalities, in%

	Maternji jezik / Mother tongue										
	Maternji/ Mother tongue	Njemački/ German	Romski/ Roma	Rumunski/ Romanian	Ruski/ Russian	Slovenački/ Slovenian	Srpskohrvatski/ Serbo-Croat	Srpsko- crnogorski/ Serbo- Montenegrin	Ostali/ Other	Regionalni jezici/ Regional languages	Ne želi da se izjasni/ Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	0.54	0.02	0.83	0.02	0.17	0.02	2.03	0.10	0.47	0.07	3.99

Table 5. Population by mother tongue per municipalities

	Maternji jezik / Mother tongue										
	Maternji/ Mother tongue	Njemački/ German	Romski/ Roma	Rumunski/ Romanian	Ruski/ Russian	Slovenački/ Slovenian	Srpskohrvatski/ Serbo-Croat	Srpsko- crnogorski/ Serbo- Montenegrin	Ostali / Other	Regionalni jezici/ Regional languages	Ne želi da se izjasni/ Does not want to declare
CRNA GORA / MONTENEGRO	3318	129	5169	101	1026	107	12559	618	2917	458	24748

Annex 4 Ethnic structure of population in Montenegro according Censuses from 1961 to 2003

<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>1961</i>	<i>1971</i>	<i>1981</i>	<i>1991</i>	<i>2003</i>
Total	468852	528156	584310	615035	620145
Montenegrins	383988	355576	400488	380467	267669
Serbs	14087	39514	19407	57453	198414
Yugoslavs	1559	10943	31243	26159	1860
Albanians	25803	35674	37735	40415	31163
Bosnians	-	-	-	-	48184
Egyptian	-	-	-	-	225
Italians	80	70	45	58	127
Macedonians	593	723	875	1072	819
Hungarians	-	-	238	205	362
Muslims	30665	70236	78080	89614	24625
Germans	95	109	107	124	118
Roma	183	396	1471	3282	2601
Russian	141	116	96	118	240
Slovenians	819	658	564	369	415
Croatian	10664	9192	6904	6244	6811
Other	3042	1452	816	437	2180
Do not want to declare	0	521	301	1944	26906
Regional affiliation	0	1204	1602	998	1258
Unknown	175	3224	4338	6076	-