

Working Paper No. 18
11 November 2004

ENGLISH ONLY

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE (UNECE)**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
(EUROSTAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

Joint UNECE-Eurostat Work Session on Population Censuses
Organized in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 23-25 November 2004)

Supporting paper

**DIFFERENCES IN TREATMENT OF THE PLACE OF RESIDENCE FOR WORKING
MIGRANTS IN POSTWAR CENSUSES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS ON NUMBER
AND STRUCTURE OF HOUSEHOLDS**

Submitted by Statistical Office of Republic of Serbia *

1. Regarding the methodological treatment of some economically active population categories, there were minor differences between population censuses carried out in 1953-1971 periods, which are, otherwise, considered as methodologically comparable censuses. However, with the 1981 Census, some radical solutions were involved in census practice, which justification is still being judged.
2. One of the radical changes is certainly different "presence" treatment of economically active persons working outside of their family's permanent residence place and who do not return every day to the place of family's residence. Namely, with minor differences abstracting in methodological instructions of 1953, 1961 and 1971 censuses, active persons who worked outside of their family's permanent residence place and who lived in the work place, were enumerated as resident population there. On the contrary, in 1981 those workers were enumerated

* Paper prepared by Dr. Dragan Vukmirovic and Vladimir Stankovic .

as resident population in the family's residence place regardless of whether they returned every day there or not.

3. Leaving the resident population concept from previous censuses was primarily motivated on keeping households homogeneity as primary socio-economic collectivities, and families, within their composition. Moreover, methodology that denies enumeration of persons within their basic households is exposed to a bigger risk from a viewpoint of resident population completeness coverage, and that is well known from many reports of direct participators in former probationary and regular censuses. Further on, we shall illustrate presented postures by 1971 and 1981 censuses results, carried out on the former SFR Yugoslavia territory.

4. In 1981 Census, data on about 400 000 active persons absent from the place of residence because of work, that is, from the family's permanent residence place, were recorded. At the same time, only 173 000 of these persons were temporarily present at their work place. According to that, much more than a half of working migrants (57%) weren't covered in the work places at the moment of census.

5. Presented data clearly show that, applying the concept of 'presence' from the 1971 Census, in the 1981 Census we would obtain significant number of households and incomplete families, and unreal number of single-person and other incomplete households in places where active persons stay because of work. But, excluding households' main members from its structure, whose work is essential for normal family life, would surely create the most negative efficiency. With a such mechanistically approach, composition of a large number of households would be deprived from active persons and it is opposite to the known theoretical households' definitions, where economic function is considered as dominant function of each household as primary social supplying union of relatives and others. Breaking the monolithic households would automatically create artificial increases in the number of incomplete families ("mother with children" and "father with children"), which would completely distorted social and demographic picture of a great number of households and families as social life primary cells.

6. In 1971 Census, 70,000 households having members with whom they "spend incomes jointly" and who were enumerated as inhabitants of other places, that is, places where they worked and lived at the time of census, were recorded. 90% of these (62,000) households had only one member working in other place and with whom the income was spent jointly; from the total number of persons excluded from family composition, 77% became "single". If that representation, according to the concept of presence from 1971 Census, had been applied on 1981 censuses results, 350,000 households from which one or more members were excluded from their composition because of work in other place, should have been enumerated. Simultaneously, on supposition of total coverage realization, in those persons' work places equal number of households of this type should be noted. This hasty calculation shows that, under total coverage realization condition, 11% of "incomplete" households would be enumerated on the Yugoslavia level, and some more percentage of incomplete families. Of course, noticeable difference on coverage of temporarily absent persons from their family's residence place and temporarily present in the work places, tells us that, if enumeration had been carried out by the previous presence conception, in the 1981 Census, the real number of single-person and multi-members households consisted of working migrants would not be enumerated.

7. Thus, in regard to the evident failure of coverage of temporarily present persons (because of work) in the place of census, it's hard to believe that at the time of 1971 Census there were only 69,315 households, in which working migrants who went to their basic households once a week or less, included households that were formed in the place of work by those same persons.

Current experiences, as well as earlier postwar censuses experiences (e.g. during war prisoners enumeration in 1948 census) on population readiness, especially in patriarchal regions to “deny” their family members that are, as a rule, holders of main economical functions in those households, both spread rendered doubt.

8. At the end, if the choice is to be made, isn't the “recast” of the permanent residence place for hardly 2% of Yugoslav population, less harmful than obtaining imaginary pictures on structure for more than 11% households and families, as well as an enormous increase in the number of single-person households; all that, of course, under the condition of total or at least optimum coverage providing for temporarily present persons in the places where they stay because of work?

9. The working migrants ‘presence’ concept from 1981 was applied in the last Yugoslav Census (1991) and in the 2002 Census in the Republic of Serbia. This last census also shows that only 59% persons working or schooling in the other place (from which they do not come back every day) of the total number of persons of this category enumerated in their family households, were covered. Also, among working migrants who do not return to the family's residence place every day, 60% were enumerated in their households as referent members. So, if the census had been carried out according to the 1971 concept, over 18 000 (1%) households would have been without its referent member, who is, as a rule, main economic factor in the household.

10. The concept of households (single- and several-persons) presented in the Recommendations for the 2000 Censuses of Population and Housing in the ECE Region, (New York and Geneva, 1998) is the result of analytical abstraction which insists too much on the separation of living (in the separate housing unit, part of dwelling or separate room) and providing food and some other means of subsistence as well. But, the statement in Recommendations that those members of multi-member households “can invest their incomes less or more”, can lead us to the essence of a household as a real socio-economic unit more than the way of living and providing food.

11. So, what can the “inequality” of households' members' investment of income be based on? Max Weber that in the absence of “calculation system”, that is, “rational market principle” explains it in the following way:

“The home communis m principle, with no calculation, but with contribution of an individual according to its possibilities and taking according to its needs (if the goods supply is sufficient), even today is the most important characteristic of home community of our family, but mostly limits on the consumption in the household”.¹

“A household is the community that satisfies everyday needs for goods and work”²

“In our times, home community normally consists of community of parents and their children, with personal servants and mostly with some unmarried cousin, that is, unmarried kinswoman”³

12. Following the historical process on minimizing the scope of home community because of individual purchasing development, Weber determines that “household is no more the place of common production but common consumption” and that contemporary home community

¹ Max Weber, *Economy and Society*, No.1 Proseta, Belgrade 1976, page 296.

² *Ibid*, page 297.

³ *Ibid*, page 302.

“normally covers family consisted of parents and children”.⁴ Following the historical tendentious after the period of Weber’s work, we could notice that today household is not always the place of consumption, that is the place of common share of living expenses, because it is very often that some family members eat and live out of the place of permanent family residence, in shorter or longer time intervals. This appearance is also the result of local separating of “occupation” and “household”, which Weber punctuated as the cause of loosing of households function as common production place. But, nevertheless, a household does not loose the characteristic of strong commune, because it is based on family “which (according to the international recommendations) presents the group of “two or more persons related by blood, marriage (including illegitimate communes) or by adoption”.

13. It is obvious that “home communism” today in satisfying living needs could begin on the relative relations between households’ members that make the family nucleus and their strong family relations with other members of households. “Common pot” and “common roof” are, after all, appearance characteristics only, and thus, accompanying characteristics of “home communism”. Unlimited solidarity and readiness for unselfish mutually economical support with no “calculation attitude” only develop on the close blood and deep emotional relations, which, as a rule, curve around family nucleus.

14. This digression is made in the aim of emphasizing the theoretical adequacy and empirical basis of households’ definition, which has been applied in our country since 1981 Census. First of all, it emphasizes household as family commune and insists on comprehension the household as more lasting and more homogenous socio-economic entirety, because it neglects the longer absence of some households’ members from the place of residence because of work or schooling in other place. According to that, giving an advantage to a family nucleus residence, the disturbing of the entirety of basic households is avoided at the one hand, and artificial forming of non-authentic single-person or several-persons non-family households in the places of work, that is schooling, at the other hand. For example, if the husband works in one place and mostly lives there, and the wife with the kids lives in another, then the husband should be enumerated within the basic family, that is, household, because motivation basis of his working migration is closely connected to a vital function of a household consisted of jointly spending incomes for living needs, including of course, residence need. At the end, a household as an elementary socio-economic union, could not be amounted to a distributive-economic function only (“spending incomes jointly”); the relation to income providing must be considered also, whether one or several members provide it in the aim of jointly spending, or all family members depend on it (the cases when none family members are economically independent).

15. Thus, a household (as primary and “nature” economic union) should be observed as a whole, with all individual characteristics and economic functions of its members, distributive and productive. If, because of some households’ definition elements strict comprehension, came to excluding some members of family nucleus, especially persons representing the head of the concrete household, in censuses results many unreal situations would manifested such as existing of single households: with no active members, with above average living conditions; with incomplete family composition; twisted distribution of agricultural households according to the income sources, etc. Given reasons are in favor to the methodological solutions from 1991 Census, by which subtenants, maids and other marginal categories of persons are not covered as members of landlords’ household, that is employer, regardless on common living and perhaps, common eating. Their “togetherness” is based on contractual relation (formal or informal) and corresponding material compensation (cash or in kind). By “clear” economic calculation not only

⁴ Ibid, page 313.

households of the group of non-relatives in the same living unit have been divided, but more often, the groups of closest relatives (e.g. parents household with married son /daughter, and similar) as well.

16. But, with abstracting of these, after all unessential differences, it could be determined that our household and family concept is in a great extent in the spirit of international recommendations. The basis of this claim is the fact that almost all characteristics and classifications noted in Recommendations could be derived on the basis of applied methodological solutions in domestic censuses practice.
