CHAPTER 7

# Ethnic Diversity and Social Stratification in Suriname, 2012

TAMIRA SNO
HARRY B.G. GANZEBOOM
JOHN SCHUSTER

No matter how we came together here,
We are pledged to this ground.

(NATIONAL ANTHEM SURINAME)

## INTRODUCTION

The motto of this essay is a stanza from the Surinamese national anthem. Indeed, a great variety of ethnic groups, with origins in different parts of the world, are present in the country. According to internationally standardized measures (Alesina 2003; Fearon 2003), Suriname belongs to the most diverse countries in the world, with respect to ethnicities, languages and religions. Suriname has grown into such a highly diverse society due to her colonial past in which different ethnic groups have been transferred to or settled on Surinamese territory. A brief overview of the country's migration history is useful to introduce the six major ethnic groups that are locally known as *bevolkingsgroepen* ('population groups'): Natives, Maroons, Creoles, Hindustani, Javanese, and Chinese.

Natives (*Inheemsen*) are the descendants of the pre-Columbian inhabitants of the area and live primarily in the interior district. Once the sole inhabitants of the area, currently Natives form a relatively small segment of the Surinamese population (3.8 per cent in the Census 2012) (ABS 2014). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they were supplemented with enslaved Africans who

were imported into Suriname by the Dutch colonizers to work on the plantations. The resulting Afro-Surinamese community is commonly divided into Maroons and Creoles (14.7 per cent and 17.7 per cent respectively according to the Census 2012). Maroons are the descendants of runaway slaves, who settled far into the interior. With Creoles, Surinamese refer to the Afro-Surinamese, who are the descendants of those who stayed on the plantations and became mixed with Whites and other ethnic groups. After the abolition of slavery in 1863, the ex-slaves were obliged to do waged labour on the plantations for another ten years—the period of State Control. After 1873, only a small part of Creoles stayed on or in the neighbourhood of the plantations, while the majority migrated to the capital city of Paramaribo, where they became part of the urban population. Then, in order to meet the needs of the plantation owners for cheap labour, between 1853 and 1939, indentured labourers were brought to Suriname from China, British-India and the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia and Java). The descendants from the British-Indian (Hindustani) and Javanese indentured labourers nowadays form, respectively, 27 per cent and 14 per cent of the population (ABS 2014). Chinese migration to Suriname also started as indentured agricultural labour, but has continued to this date. The Hindustani, Creoles, Maroons and Javanese form the largest ethnic groups in Suriname. Chinese, despite their strong visibility in commerce, comprise only about 1-2 per cent of the population, slightly less than the Natives.

Next to these major ethnic groups, there exist a great variety of smaller ethnic groups: Whites (descendants from European immigrants, estimated 0.3 per cent), Lebanese and Portuguese, descended from early migrations; and Guyanese, Haitians and Brazilians, who are the most recent economic migrants. However, altogether, these groups comprise about 1 per cent of the total Surinamese population. We group them here as 'Others'.

Finally, in addition to the six recognizable ethnic groups, a large group has emerged that calls itself 'Mixed'. This designation (*Gemengd*) was first introduced in the Census of 2004, and then became chosen by 12 per cent of the population. In the 2012 Census, this had risen to 13 per cent (Menke 2016, 115). As a

group, it does not have a specific migration history, and little is known about when people prefer to identify themselves as Mixed.

The ethnic composition of Suriname is such that no ethnic majority exists and no group dominates the others. As a consequence, ethnic dynamics cannot be analysed from a perspective of 'integration', or 'assimilation': Suriname is an intrinsically multi-ethnic, multicultural and super diverse society (cf. Vertovec 2007). To a high degree, every ethnic group has managed to retain its own language, religion and customs. The groups have also remained endogamous; interethnic marriages occur only on a small-scale. In the past, this was because on the plantations Hindustani and Javanese were kept apart from each other and from the other ethnic groups, who were confined to the interior or the urban area. While the plantation system as such has disappeared, it is generally believed that its demography is still visible in the regional concentration of the ethnic groups.

At first glance, there seems to be much space for ethnic conflict in Suriname. A strong separation of ethnic groups often leads to strongly stratified societies with permanent tensions and struggle. However, in the literature on Suriname, it is often assumed that the country is, in fact, a relatively peaceful place because the ethnic groups keep each other in balance, numerically, but also socio-economically. This is the theory of Suriname as a 'plural society, (Lijphart 1977; Oostindie 2006), in which the separation and occupational specialization of ethnicities create a system of power balance and power exchange. This idea reminds us of the traditional social and political situation in the Netherlands, the former colonizing motherland, where none of the religious denominations had a clear majority and the social order was being retained by the balanced exchange of dominant positions in politics, combined with a strong 'pillarization', i.e. social separation of the denominational groups.

Many researchers have contributed supporting evidence for this idea. For instance, according to De Bruijne (2001), in Suriname, ethnicity has a strong influence on occupational choice and hence on socio-economic outcomes. This would be the case, both in the rural districts, where the farmers are mainly of Hindustani and

Javanese origins, as well as in Paramaribo where specific ethnic groups dominate in certain economic activities. This would not only be true for the smaller ethnic groups, such as Chinese and Lebanese, who, in particular, are commercially active. Creoles would be relatively strongly represented in the civil service, both in the higher and lower levels of the public administration. By contrast, Chinese and Hindustani would be relatively overrepresented in private businesses. The Hindustani would often be found in the import trade and the industrial sector, while the Chinese are active in the import and retail trade and catering (restaurants and snack bars). According to De Bruijne (2001, 40), the dominance of the Creoles in the civil service is most evident for women (70 per cent of the working Creole women work in public administration, against 52 per cent of the Hindustani and 40 per cent of the Javanese women). Gowricharn and Schuster (2001) also mention the dominance of Creoles in public administration. They explain this occupational specialization as the result of ethnic political strife, in particular, the election victory in 1973 of the NPS, the Creole political party. According to these authors, in the subsequent years, successive (ethnic) governments had their group members engaged in government services, which led to specific 'ethnic-ministries'.

However, at around the same time, research by Hassankhan et al. (1995) and Schalkwijk and De Bruijne (1999) suggested that ethnicity and occupational stratification in Suriname are, in fact, not so closely linked, in particular not in urban Suriname. Based on research in Greater Paramaribo, these authors conclude that there are only minor socio-economic differences between the three ethnic groups (Creoles, Hindustani and Javanese) that they examined.

Much of the discussion on ethnic diversity and ethnic stratification in Suriname refers to a somewhat distant past. The cited data on occupational stratification all refer to the 1990s, if not longer ago. Not only have slavery and indentured labour long-vanished, but so have plantations and much of Suriname's rural economy. Politically, ethnic policymaking has waned and has already in the late 1980s been replaced by a political party system that is no longer overtly ethnically based. Another striking feature

of the discussion has been that it focuses mostly on the two largest ethnic groups, i.e. Creoles and Hindustanis. The debate often boils down to claims about which of these two groups is economically or politically dominant. However, not only are neither Creoles nor Hindustanis a majority, but this is now also not the case when the two groups are counted together. In the discussion, there is little interest in the positions of the groups that used to be regarded as small and remained unacknowledged: Javanese, Maroon and Mixed.

The objective of this study is to find out in which way ethnic differentiation in Suriname is still associated with ethnic stratification, and how this has developed in the recent past. For this, we use data from the recent Sur Mob 2012 general population sample survey, which allows for assessing change using intergenerational, cohort and life cycle comparisons. Our overall research question is: 'To what extent are ethnic diversity and social stratification in Suriname associated, and how has this changed over recent decades?' We aim to answer this question for all seven major ethnic groups in Suriname (i.e. including the Mixed). This overall research question is divided into the following subquestions:

- Where are different ethnic groups located in terms of the district of residence and district of birth? Have groups become more geographically dispersed in the period of study?
- To what extent are ethnic groups still endogamous? If exogamous, what pattern of mixture prevails?
- How are ethnic groups distributed over occupations, both in the first and last occupation?
- How are the ethnic groups stratified in terms of education?

With the answers to these questions we want to gain insight into the relative position of the different ethnic groups on the stratification ladder, and in the possible changes over time.

We adopt three different perspectives to study historical changes. First, using survey data collected in and around 2012, we compare respondents to their parents. Given the average age of becoming a parent, this comparison covers a 30-40-year period. While generations of respondents and parents are not strictly comparable samples of the underlying historical populations, the intergenerational

comparison gives a broad indication of long-time social change.[1] Secondly, we compare respondents from older cohorts and respondents from younger cohorts, which provides a valid historical comparison for attributes that do not change the life cycle, such as education, occupation at entry into the labour market and endogamy. Third and finally, we compare respondents in a life cycle perspective, i.e. how they changed between earlier and later stages in their lifetime. While life cycle comparisons do not generally inform us about historical changes, they may still give suggestions about such underlying dynamics.

This study is partly a replication and a renewal of the studies of Hassankhan et al. (1995), and Schalkwijk and De Bruijne (1999),[2] who asked similar questions about 25 years ago (both studies used data collected in 1992). However, there are significant differences between these two earlier studies and the present one. The survey of Hassankhan et al., concentrated on Greater Paramaribo and the largest three ethnic groups and used a very small sample. The study of Schalkwijk and De Bruijne was also restricted to Greater Paramaribo, but used a much larger sample. By contrast, our research involves the whole of Suriname and covers all ethnic groups. Our sample consists of 3,929 persons, which is much more than the 342 persons in Hassankhan's research. Our sample size is comparable to the study of Schalkwijk and De Bruijne, which covered 4,279 respondents. Another difference between the earlier studies and the present one is that we do not use income or a luxury goods wealth index to measure socio-economic position,

[1] There are two main reasons why parent-offspring comparisons may be misleading to examine historical changes (Duncan 1966). First, parents' attributes are not firmly located in time, e.g. for two persons of the same age, the time at which their father completed school may vary up to 30 years, depending upon birth order and birth timing. Second, everyone has two parents, but not all people have children or have an equal number of children. The distributions of parents (e.g. by occupation) in intergnerational data is strongly conditioned by fertility. Nevertheless, we believe that the intergenerational comparison gives a crude indication of underlying historical trends.

[2] These same analyses have also been reported by De Bruijne and Schalkwijk (2005).

but only education and occupation, to determine the relative socio-economic standing of Surinamese ethnic groups. This is because education and occupation allow for the historical comparisons between respondents and parents, as well as between earlier and later-born cohorts. Occupation can also be used to cover life cycle trends. None of this applies to income or consumption, which was the main focus of the earlier studies.

## DATA AND METHODS

This present study is part of a dissertation research project on *Status Attainment and Social Mobility in Suriname* (Sno 2010). The data were collected in a nationwide survey on the living conditions of Surinamese (Sno & Ganzeboom 2013a), the Sur Mob 2012 survey. This survey was conducted in 2011-13 (but mainly in 2012) amongst a stratified random sample of all inhabitants of Suriname between 21 and 74 years old ($N = 3929$). The questionnaire is a replica of the 2009 module on Social Inequality of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), with additional variables on social stratification (see Sno & Ganzeboom 2013b for a comprehensive description of the survey). For our analysis in this study, we selected all respondents between 25 and 74 years. The core variables used in this study are measures of education and occupation.

With respect to education, for the respondents, the survey provides information on the entire educational career, and, for the parents, on their highest attended level of education. Our education measure is divided into 15 categories (ranging between 0 = cannot read or write and 14 = university education). In a separate study on inequality in Surinamese education (Sno & Ganzeboom 2018), this highest level of education (completed or not completed) was (optimally) scaled into the Surinamese Level of Education (SRLED) index, which is comparable to the International Standard Level of Education (ISLED) (Schröder & Ganzeboom 2014).

For the respondents, information is available on their first occupation (i.e. the occupation in the first job after leaving education), and their current/most recent previous occupation. This information

is collected through an open question on the type of job and firm, supplemented with a crude question on the type of job. For the parents, we have information on their occupation at age 12 of the respondent, through an open question only. After coding the occupations into the International Standard Classification of Occupations, ISCO-88, they were scaled into SRSEI, the Surinamese variant of the International Socio-Economic Index of occupational status (ISEI) developed in an earlier study (Sno & Ganzeboom 2017).

## ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION: FINDINGS ETHNICITY BY THE DISTRICT OF RESIDENCE AND DISTRICT OF BIRTH

The entire Suriname is divided into three parts: urban, interior, and rural. Most of the population (70 per cent) lives in the *urban* districts of Paramaribo and Wanica. Also, parts of Nickerie and Commewijne, although geographically separated from Paramaribo/ Wanica, are regarded as urban. The vast *interior* is composed of the districts Sipaliwini, Brokopondo and parts of Marowijne. About 10 per cent of the population lives in these interior districts, almost exclusively in villages along Suriname's mighty rivers; a significant portion of this population can only be reached by boat or aeroplane. The remainder of Suriname is regarded as *rural*, and contains the districts of Para, Coronie, Saramacca, and the remote parts of Commewijne, Marowijne and Nickerie.

As a consequence of the ethnic policies in the 1930s and 1940s, when village communities were built especially for the Javanese and Hindustani (Buddingh 2012), the two ethnic communities were concentrated in the rural districts and performed agricultural labour. The Natives and Maroons were traditionally concentrated in the interior, where the only means of subsistence are small scale agriculture, hunting, fishing and gold-digging. By contrast, it can also be expected that the majority of all ethnic groups lives in the capital Paramaribo and surroundings (Wanica), because of the concentration of education and employment there. Because of a lack of secondary education and adequate employment in the

interior and the rural districts, migration to the city and surroundings would have been strong among the original inland residents—the Natives and Maroons.

Table 7.1 shows where the different ethnic groups are living according to the Sur Mob 2012 survey. Table 7.2 displays where these respondents were residing at their time of birth. By comparing the two tables, we obtain a life cycle comparison of changes in Suriname.

According to the 2012 Census data of the General Bureau of Statistics (ABS 2014), in 2012, approximately 44 per cent of the Surinamese population was living in Paramaribo. In our survey, approximately 45 per cent of the respondents are living in Paramaribo. In particular, Chinese, Mixed, Creoles and Others live in Paramaribo by a majority (over 50 per cent). For the other four ethnicities, less than 50 per cent lives in Paramaribo. Note, however, that for most ethnic groups, the largest portion lives in the capital, the only exception being the Natives, whose largest representation is in the interior district of Sipaliwini. A critical pattern emerges when we compare this current representation in Paramaribo to the district of birth. According to this life cycle comparison, the relative share of the largest groups in the capital has diminished. In contrast, the representation of smaller groups had increased: this applies in particular to Chinese and Natives. If we take this life cycle comparison as an indication of changes in the geographical distribution of the population, the conclusion is that the capital city in which about half of the population lives has become more diverse.

A district where also relatively many respondents are living is Wanica. According to the Census 2012 data (ABS 2014, 21), the district of Wanica has experienced an immense growth between 2004 and 2012 (+ 37.5 per cent), more than the neighbouring districts, Para (+ 31.7 per cent) and Commewijne (+ 27.5 per cent). This growth also becomes apparent, when we compare district of residence to district of birth in the Sur Mob 2012 survey, which covers a much more extended period. Between the district of birth and the district of residence, Wanica has almost tripled. This influx into Wanica has come from all ethnicities, and as a

TABLE 7.1: ETHNICITY BY DISTRICT OF RESIDENCE

(*Figures in %*)

| *District* | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| Paramaribo | 28.0 | 24.2 | 36.0 | 43.1 | 61.3 | 61.2 | 74.2 | 64.9 | 44.4 |
| Wanica | 15.5 | 10.0 | 26.1 | 22.2 | 17.5 | 21.8 | 12.9 | 16.2 | 20.5 |
| Commewijne | 0.6 | – | 7.2 | 16.7 | 0.9 | 2.3 | – | 2.7 | 5.2 |
| Saramacca | – | 2.5 | 8.6 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 4.6 | – | 2.7 | 4.1 |
| Coronie | – | – | – | 0.3 | 7.5 | 1.3 | – | – | 1.8 |
| Nickerie | 0.3 | 2.5 | 21.3 | 8.6 | 2.7 | 4.0 | 12.9 | 10.8 | 8.8 |
| Para | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 7.7 | 3.8 | – | – | 3.4 |
| Brokopondo | 22.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | – | 0.1 | 0.2 | – | – | 4.0 |
| Marowijne | 13.2 | 25.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 | – | 2.7 | 3.6 |
| Sipaliwini | 17.4 | 33.3 | – | 0.2 | 0.1 | – | – | – | 4.2 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 703 | 120 | 1,115 | 594 | 852 | 477 | 31 | 37 | 3,929 |

Cramers V: 0.324

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.2: ETHNICITY BY DISTRICT OF BIRTH

(*Figures in %*)

| *District* | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| Paramaribo | 26.7 | 19.2 | 46.8 | 42.2 | 66.7 | 70.6 | 29.0 | 25.0 | 48.5 |
| Wanica | 1.3 | 1.7 | 13.2 | 12.5 | 3.9 | 6.9 | – | 2.8 | 7.6 |
| Commewijne | 0.9 | – | 6.7 | 23.3 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 6.5 | – | 6.2 |
| Saramacca | 0.1 | 6.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 3.2 | – | 3.0 |
| Coronie | – | – | – | 0.2 | 10.0 | 1.3 | – | – | 2.3 |
| Nickerie | 0.6 | 3.3 | 20.8 | 11.5 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 9.7 |
| Para | 1.3 | 6.7 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 6.8 | 2.1 | 3.2 | – | 2.8 |
| Brokopondo | 24.3 | – | – | – | 1.2 | – | – | – | 4.6 |
| Marowijne | 19.8 | 25.0 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.7 | – | – | 5.5 |
| Sipaliwini | 23.8 | 26.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | – | – | 5.3 |
| NA, Abroad | 1.3 | 10.8 | 7.1 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 4.2 | 51.6 | 66.7 | 4.5 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 703 | 120 | 1,115 | 593 | 851 | 477 | 31 | 36 | 3,926 |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

result, the district of Wanica has a more even distribution of all ethnic groups than Paramaribo has.

Of the Maroons and Natives, as expected, more than half live in the interior districts of Brokopondo, Marowijne and Sipaliwini altogether. However, upon closer inspection, in particular the over-representation of Maroons in the interior districts has declined between birth and the time of survey. Of the Hindustani, approximately one-fifth lives in the district of Nickerie (which is closest to Guyana). A similar share of Javanese respondents lives in the district of Commewijne. There has not been much change in this distribution, apart from the influx to Wanica that we already noticed above.

Overall, the comparison of Tables 7.1 and 7.2 shows a very strong resemblance between the district of residence and district of birth. However, if we look at the total association between ethnicity and respectively district of birth and district of residence (Cramers V: 0.371 and 0.324), we notice that there has been a change towards more dispersion. As adults, Surinamese ethnicities live more in each other vicinities than at birth. At the same time, we notice that the association is not extremely strong to begin with, not even at birth. Paramaribo and Wanica, where more than 70 per cent of the population lives, are, and always have been ethnically very diverse.

## PARTNER CHOICE BY ETHNICITY

In Tables 7.3 and 7.4, we show ethnic homogamy for respondents and their parents. To what extent are Surinamese married within their own ethnic group, and where does mixing take place? Although the majority of the respondents and their parents have a partner of the same ethnicity, we notice that the next generation of the respondents marries much less often within the same ethnicity than their parents. Of the respondents, about 78 per cent marries within the own ethnic group, among the parents this percentage is much higher (approximately 90 per cent). This can also be seen in the association (Cramers V) that is much stronger between father and mother than between the respondent and his/her

TABLE 7.3: ETHNICITY OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARTNERS

| | *Partners* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Respondents* | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| Maroon | 419 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 484 |
| Natives | 1 | 73 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Hindustani | 2 | 2 | 768 | 19 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 9 | 847 |
| Javanese | 4 | 2 | 18 | 418 | 5 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 490 |
| Creole | 27 | 15 | 16 | 12 | 398 | 78 | 2 | 5 | 553 |
| Mixed | 13 | 10 | 40 | 46 | 84 | 125 | 5 | 4 | 327 |
| Chinese | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 25 |
| Others | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 26 |
| | 467 | 105 | 850 | 505 | 557 | 305 | 26 | 35 | 2,850 |

Cramers $V = 0.689$; 78 per cent on diagonal.

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.4: ETHNICITY OF FATHER AND MOTHER OF RESPONDENTS

| | *Mothers* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Fathers* | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| Maroon | 694 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 712 |
| Natives | 1 | 111 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 139 |
| Hindustani | 0 | 2 | 1,105 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 1,142 |
| Javanese | 0 | 2 | 4 | 585 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 611 |
| Creole | 8 | 20 | 26 | 12 | 778 | 58 | 1 | 4 | 907 |
| Mixed | 5 | 21 | 18 | 24 | 64 | 169 | 2 | 5 | 308 |
| Chinese | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 31 | 1 | 47 |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 36 | 48 |
| | 709 | 161 | 1,159 | 639 | 886 | 275 | 37 | 48 | 3,914 |

Cramers $V = 0.808$; 90 per cent on diagonal.
*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.5: ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS THAT CONSIDER THEMSELVES MIXED

| | *Fathers* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Mothers* | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| Maroon | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Natives | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Hindustani | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 35 |
| Javanese | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 26 |
| Creole | 2 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 4 | 36 | 0 | 1 | 93 |
| Mixed | 1 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 38 | 161 | 2 | 4 | 256 |
| Chinese | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| | 5 | 43 | 47 | 45 | 77 | 242 | 6 | 7 | 472 |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

partner. Endogamy is strongest for Hindustani (90 per cent), Maroon (89 per cent) and Javanese (83 per cent), but even these numbers are higher among the parents. Notice that Natives, despite their similar geographical location in the interior districts, are much less homogamous (75 per cent) than Maroons.

Among both respondents and parents, it is to be noticed that the category Mixed marries outside the own group most often, compared with other ethnic groups. This seems self-evident, if we would assume that this group is a mixture of different ethnic groups. However, a more striking observation about the Mixed is that they still show a noticeable degree of endogamy: Mixed prefer to marry Mixed (for the respondents 38 per cent, for the parents 58 per cent). When Mixed marry other ethnicities, Creoles are their first choice. Table 7.5 gives more information on the ethnic origins for those who declare themselves as Mixed. About half of the Mixed claim to have two Mixed parents. The other Mixed are either persons with one Mixed parent, or with one Creole parent. Infact, significantly few Mixed Surinamese originate from different ethnic combinations, such as between the three Asian groups. Taken together, this may indicate that Mixed Surinamese are most similar to Creoles and can be regarded as Afro-Surinamese.

Our results are in line with Schalkwijk and De Bruijne (1999, 57). According to their study, over 90 per cent of the Javanese and Hindustani had a partner of the same ethnic group; for the Creoles they reported 81 per cent. Our 2012 numbers are generally lower than for their 1992 data. This also suggests historical changes and confirms the conclusions from the intergenerational comparison we make here.

## OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY GENDER: RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

In the Sur Mob 2012 survey, occupation is primarily measured by an open-ended question, on the first and current/most recent occupation of the respondents and the occupation of their parents when the respondent was 12-year-old. The answers were coded according to the *International Standard Classification of Occupations*

ISCO-88 (ILO 1990). The ISCO-88 classification is composed of four digits; the first digit includes nine major groups, varying from managers (1,000) to elementary occupations (9,000);[3] the second digit defines submajor groups (43 codes), the third digit contains a further specification of the submajor groups into minor groups (129 codes), and the last digit (435 codes) defines the unit groups. In Table 7.6, we limit ourselves to the first digit, with the exception of the agricultural occupations, where we have merged the major group of the skilled and subsistence farmers (6,000) with the submajor group of agricultural labourers (9,200). Before making ethnic distinctions, we compare the respondents by gender in their first and last/current occupation. Then, we make a comparison with the occupations of their father and mother (at age 12 of the respondent).

In Table 7.6, first, the relatively large number of missing values of the female respondents compared to the men stands out, both in the first and in the most recent occupation. The gender disparity in employment is even stronger for the parental generation. More than half of the mothers are reported not to be employed when the respondent was young. A plausible explanation is that the disparity is due to women in older cohorts, who left school at a time when women usually did not have a job, not even before they started partnering. However, a second explanation could be that these women did have jobs, but that the interviewers did not ask for this effectively enough. In particular, in the agricultural sector, it is common that women work on the land or sell products, but do not consider this as an occupation.

It then appears that the respondents have also indicated relatively often that their father never had a job. This needs an explanation because the number of missing occupations for father is high compared to international numbers;[4] also for Suriname, it is to be

[3] In ISCO-88, the armed forces form a separate category (0000); we have subsumed them with 3000 (officers) and 5000 (soldiers), together with police and related security workers.

[4] For the ISSP-2009 worldwide, the percentage of missing fathers' occupations is about 12 per cent.

TABLE 7.6: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY GENDER: RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

(*Figures in %*)

| | *First occupation* | | *Current/last occupation* | | *When respondent was 12 years* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Man* | *Women* | *Man* | *Women* | *Father* | *Mother* |
| 1,000 Managers and Senior Officials | 3.4 | 3.3 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 3.9 |
| 2,000 Professionals | 4.4 | 14.4 | 6.2 | 15.0 | 3.5 | 9.5 |
| 3,000 Technicians, Associate Professionals | 8.4 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 5.5 | 2.8 |
| 4,000 Clerks | 7.6 | 20.3 | 7.5 | 19.0 | 4.9 | 8.1 |
| 5,000 Service and Sales Workers | 12.3 | 25.1 | 13.2 | 20.5 | 9.2 | 15.4 |
| 7,000 Craft Workers | 28.4 | 4.1 | 25.4 | 3.8 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| 8,000 Machine Operators and Assemblers | 10.9 | 0.8 | 11.6 | 0.8 | 11.1 | 0.3 |
| 9,000 Elementary Occupations | 10.3 | 19.8 | 5.9 | 21.5 | 8.5 | 31.7 |
| 9,200 Agricultural, Fishery Workers | 14.2 | 4.7 | 12.4 | 4.4 | 29.4 | 23.4 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 1,404 | 1,543 | 1,398 | 1,530 | 2,017 | 1,793 |
| Missing | 145 | 837 | 151 | 850 | 1,912 | 2,136 |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

expected that almost all fathers of 12-year-olds are in gainful employment. A plausible explanation could be that respondents did not know their father and, therefore, did not know their father's occupation. This explanation may, of course, also apply to the mothers.

## FIRST OCCUPATION

In their first occupation, the working male respondents were mainly employed in the sectors skilled manual labour (7,000), and agriculture (9,200); the women worked in the service (5,000), as office workers (4,000: clerks) and in the non-agricultural elementary occupations (9,000), such as cleaning and mining and construction labourers. An interesting question is whether men or women in Suriname have better jobs. Table 7.6, however, does not allow an unambiguous conclusion on this because the occupational classes are not scaled by status. This will be discussed below.

## CURRENT/MOST RECENT OCCUPATION

The distribution of the current/most recent occupations is very similar to that of the first occupations. However, compared to the first occupation, there are relatively more men than women who in their current/most recent occupation are in Management (1,000) category. Unsurprisingly, management occupations are not attained at entry into the labour market, but later in the career. As far as management occupations have a higher status, this will imply (intragenerational) upward mobility. For men, we see that the percentage that has an elementary occupation in the most recent job has decreased, since the first job; for women, by contrast, we observe a small increase of elementary occupations between first and most recent job. In the category of service workers, we also see a slight decrease for women. Altogether this suggests that Surinamese men advance more during their career than Surinamese women. However, we would only be allowed to draw this conclusion, as far as the occupations are ranked from high to low.

## THE PARENTS

The fathers were relatively more often employed in agriculture and as craft worker than their sons. The mothers more often practised elementary occupations and to a lesser extent, more in agricultural occupations than their daughters. As could be expected, there are relatively more fathers than mothers working as manager, associate professionals and machine operators. On the other hand, more mothers work as office clerks and in the service sector than fathers. Somewhat surprisingly, we see more mothers than fathers working as professionals. This is mainly due to a few typical female occupations, such as teachers and nurses.

## OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY ETHNICITY

Tables 7.7 and 7.8 show the relationship between the ethnicity of the respondents and occupational class for men and women combined. As shown above, occupational distributions are very different between men and women, but this turns out to be not so different between the ethnicities. The overrepresentation of women in clerical and sales work, as well as elementary (= cleaning) jobs, and their underrepresentation in skilled and semi-skilled manual work is closely reflected in all ethnic groups. Table 7.7 shows the ethnic distribution of occupational classes for the first occupations. Table 7.8 shows this for current occupations.

Among the Maroons, the largest group has elementary and agricultural occupations. Other occupations that are performed by a not insignificant part of the Maroons are in craftwork and the service sectors. Of the Natives, approximately one-third is working in the service sector and sales. We also find elementary and clerical occupations relatively more often within this group. When taken together, it is clear that both Natives and Maroons are concentrated in jobs with low status. The Hindustani are scattered over the various occupational groups, while the Javanese and Creoles are relatively more often found in sales and clerical positions. The Mixed are relatively often found in sales and clerical work. Of the Chinese, a relatively large number is working in commerce; either

TABLE 7.7: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY ETHNICITY, FIRST OCCUPATION

(*Figures in %*)

| | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| 1,000 Managers and Senior Officials | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 32.1 | 13.8 | 3.4 |
| 2,000 Professionals | 7.0 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 11.7 | 12.5 | 10.7 | 24.1 | 9.6 |
| 3,000 Technicians, Associate Professionals | 3.3 | 3.9 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 10.5 | 7.1 | 10.3 | 7.9 |
| 4,000 Clerks | 4.8 | 13.2 | 14.0 | 17.3 | 15.5 | 20.9 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 14.3 |
| 5,000 Service and Sales Workers | 16.3 | 32.9 | 17.2 | 21.1 | 18.9 | 19.4 | 35.7 | 17.2 | 19.0 |
| 7,000 Craft Workers | 18.7 | 10.5 | 12.9 | 15.6 | 17.9 | 15.3 | 7.1 | 10.3 | 15.7 |
| 8,000 Machine Operators and Assemblers | 5.3 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 4.2 | 5.4 | – | 6.9 | 5.6 |
| 9,000 Elementary Occupations | 25.1 | 15.8 | 15.4 | 10.1 | 16.2 | 9.4 | – | 3.4 | 15.2 |
| 9,200 Agricultural, Fishery Workers | 17.4 | 10.5 | 15.2 | 6.3 | 4.1 | 2.8 | – | 6.9 | 9.3 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 455 | 76 | 758 | 473 | 736 | 392 | 28 | 29 | 2,947 |

Cramers *V*: 0.133 Men: 0.160, Women: 0.139.

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.8: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY ETHNICITY, CURRENT/LAST OCCUPATION

(*Figures in %*)

| | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| 1,000 Managers and Senior Officials | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 13.1 | 46.4 | 31.0 | 8.8 |
| 2,000 Professionals | 8.4 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 12.6 | 10.7 | 24.1 | 10.8 |
| 3,000 Technicians, Associate Professionals | 3.5 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 7.1 | | 7.6 |
| 4,000 Clerks | 6.6 | 10.4 | 13.0 | 15.5 | 15.6 | 17.4 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 13.5 |
| 5,000 Service and Sales Workers | 15.0 | 23.4 | 14.2 | 19.1 | 17.5 | 19.2 | 25.0 | 17.2 | 17.0 |
| 7,000 Craft Workers | 18.8 | 13.0 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 13.3 | 3.6 | 6.9 | 14.1 |
| 8,000 Machine Operators and Assemblers | 6.4 | 5.2 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 3.4 | 6.2 | – | – | 5.9 |
| 9,000 Elementary Occupations | 23.0 | 9.1 | 14.4 | 11.1 | 15.5 | 6.9 | – | – | 14.0 |
| 9,200 Agricultural, Fishery Workers | 13.0 | 16.9 | 14.5 | 6.2 | 2.7 | 2.1 | – | 13.8 | 8.3 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 453 | 77 | 751 | 470 | 730 | 390 | 28 | 29 | 2,928 |

Cramers *V*: 0.128 Men: 0.146, Women: 0.134.

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

as a manager or as a salesman. The Others often work as a professional.

Despite significant differences between the ethnic groups in occupational distributions for both men and women, these variances are by no means very strong. This is best reflected by the low values of the Cramers *V* association measures, which are 0.16 for men and 0.14 for women. For current/most recent jobs these associations are very similar to first jobs (0.14 for men and 0.13 for women), and—if anything—indicates a slightly lower association between ethnicity and occupation in the later career.

Tables 7.9 and 7.10 show that for fathers (0.14), and, in particular, for mothers (0.20), the association between ethnicity and occupation is somewhat stronger than for respondents. Again, this intergenerational comparison suggests that, historically, ethnicity has become less critical for socio-economic outcomes.

## AVERAGE OCCUPATIONAL STATUS (SRSEI) BY ETHNICITY FOR RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

All of the previous analyses on occupations refer to nominal occupational categories that have no intrinsic hierarchical scaling. Hence, it is not possible to evaluate the results in terms of high and low, and to determine whether and how ethnic groups are hierarchically stratified. A more conclusive result can be obtained by scaling the occupation by a status scale. A Surinamese Socio-Economic Index of occupational status (SRSEI) was developed by Sno and Ganzeboom (2017). It runs from 7 for agriculture labourers without a contract ('hustlers') to 70 for professionals like medical doctors and engineers.

Table 7.11 shows the average SRSEI scores for the occupations of men and women, fathers and mothers, by ethnicity. The bottom line gives the average occupational status scores, irrespective of ethnicity. In their first job, men and women have occupations of almost equal status. We see changes in average status between first and current/last job; the men have gone up, and the women have remained almost at the same level. The greatest difference is between

TABLE 7.9: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY ETHNICITY, FATHER'S OCCUPATION

(*Figures in %*)

| | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| 1,000 Managers and Senior Officials | 3.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 54.2 | 13.3 | 7.5 |
| 2,000 Professionals | 3.9 | 8.6 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 7.2 | – | 13.3 | 3.5 |
| 3,000 Technicians, Associate Professionals | 3.0 | 8.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 9.0 | 12.5 | 4.2 | 10.0 | 5.5 |
| 4,000 Clerks | 2.6 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 7.8 | – | 3.3 | 4.9 |
| 5,000 Service and Sales Workers | 6.0 | 8.6 | 7.7 | 9.3 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 12.5 | 20.0 | 9.2 |
| 7,000 Craft Workers | 17.8 | 8.6 | 17.2 | 21.5 | 26.4 | 24.9 | 4.2 | 13.3 | 20.4 |
| 8,000 Machine Operators and Assemblers | 12.7 | 10.0 | 11.7 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 3.3 | 11.1 |
| 9,000 Elementary Occupations | 13.1 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 9.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | – | 8.5 |
| 9,200 Agricultural, Fishery Workers | 37.0 | 35.7 | 39.3 | 34.2 | 15.4 | 10.2 | 12.5 | 23.3 | 29.4 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 465 | 70 | 961 | 503 | 603 | 361 | 24 | 30 | 3,017 |

Cramers *V*: 0.142.

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.10: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS BY ETHNICITY, MOTHER'S OCCUPATION

(*Figures in %*)

| | *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Maroon* | *Natives* | *Hindustani* | *Javanese* | *Creole* | *Mixed* | *Chinese* | *Other* | *Total* |
| 1,000 Managers and Senior Officials | 1.2 | – | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 50.0 | 4.8 | 3.9 |
| 2,000 Professionals | 2.2 | 13.3 | 10.1 | 4.7 | 11.9 | 18.1 | – | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 3,000 Technicians, Associate Professionals | 0.9 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 5.3 | – | 4.8 | 2.8 |
| 4,000 Clerks | 1.5 | 10.0 | 3.6 | 13.4 | 9.3 | 16.6 | – | 4.8 | 8.1 |
| 5,000 Service and Sales Workers | 8.6 | 16.7 | 15.1 | 20.5 | 15.6 | 18.5 | 20.0 | 14.3 | 15.4 |
| 7,000 Craft Workers | 3.4 | 6.7 | 3.6 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 6.8 | – | 23.8 | 5.0 |
| 8,000 Machine Operators and Assemblers | – | – | – | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | – | – | 0.3 |
| 9,000 Elementary Occupations | 32.4 | 33.3 | 30.0 | 21.3 | 42.8 | 25.7 | 15.0 | 23.8 | 31.7 |
| 9,200 Agricultural, Fishery Workers | 49.7 | 16.7 | 31.7 | 26.0 | 8.2 | 4.2 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 23.4 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| *N* | 324 | 30 | 416 | 254 | 463 | 265 | 20 | 21 | 1,793 |

Cramers *V*: 0.204.

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

TABLE 7.11: AVERAGE OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL (SRSEI) BY ETHNICITY FOR RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

| | *Parents* | | *First* | | *Current* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Fathers* | *Mothers* | *Men* | *Women* | *Men* | *Women* |
| Maroon | 30.8 | 17.8 | 34.1 | 27.9 | 38.9 | 29.0 |
| Natives | 37.0 | 29.2 | 31.5 | 32.8 | 33.6 | 32.8 |
| Hindustani | 31.7 | 25.5 | 35.2 | 37.1 | 37.7 | 37.5 |
| Javanese | 32.9 | 28.6 | 39.2 | 39.6 | 42.9 | 39.4 |
| Creole | 39.5 | 29.6 | 40.3 | 39.1 | 44.0 | 41.0 |
| Mixed | 42.9 | 35.7 | 41.6 | 43.3 | 45.3 | 44.8 |
| Chinese | 40.5 | 35.5 | 44.4 | 43.8 | 49.2 | 45.7 |
| Other | 40.9 | 29.1 | 47.0 | 41.7 | 47.9 | 43.6 |
| Average | 35.0 | 27.3 | 37.8 | 37.4 | 41.3 | 38.4 |
| *N* | 3,017 | 1,793 | 1,416 | 1,557 | 1,413 | 1,552 |
| Adj *R2* | 7.6% | 12.7% | 4.8% | 8.7% | 5.0% | 8.6% |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

fathers and mothers, in favour of the fathers. However, the scores of both parents are much lower than that of the offspring, and it is safe to conclude that the Surinamese occupational structure has upgraded, both by the intergenerational and by the life cycle evidence.

We can now compare the ethnic groups with respect to the mean level of occupational status. In the first jobs, as could be anticipated from the nominal analysis above, the Maroon and Native men and women have occupations with the lowest socio-economic status. In the first occupations, for both men and women, going up in the hierarchy, the next groups are Hindustani, Javanese and Creoles, in rising order. At the top of the occupational ladder, we find the Chinese and the Mixed (next to the Others); this is the case both in the first and in the current/last occupation. The Creoles and the Mixed are higher on the occupational ladder than the Javanese and the Hindustani. These differences between the Mixed and Creoles on the one, and Hindustani, on the other hand, are statistically significant.

There is little change in this hierarchy, when we move to current/last occupation, with men gaining 2-3 point on average, and women

making very little progress on the SRSEI scale. However, some shifts have occurred. In particular, Maroon men have achieved more status between first and current job than the other groups, which may be attributable to their migration to the urban areas. At the same time, we see that for both the fathers and the mothers, Maroons and Hindustani have the lowest occupational status. For the Hindustani mothers, an explanation could be that Hindustani women often are employed as family workers on the family farm.

Measuring occupational status for first jobs makes it possible to add another historical perspective to our analysis: by birth cohort. Respondents born earlier report historically more distant events, when they report their first occupation than respondents born later. A cohort analysis is, in fact, the most informative way to see changes in the occupational hierarchy of ethnicities. Table 7.12 displays the trend in term of the expected level of occupation for the eight ethnic groups.

Although different, the six distributions show a strongly consistent pattern of ethnic stratification. In all cases, the Maroons, Natives

TABLE 7.12: MEAN FIRST OCCUPATION BY ETHNICITY, GENERATION, GENDER AND COHORT. MULTIPLE REGRESSION POOLED OVER GENERATIONS OF PARENTS AND RESPONDENTS. OCCUPATION VARIES BETWEEN (7) SUBSISTENCE FARMING AND (68) PROFESSIONAL

| | *A* | *B* | *C* | *D* | *E* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Baseline Father, cohort 1940* | *Generational Parents→ Respondents* | *Gender Male→ Female* | *Cohort 1940→ 1990* | *Result Men, cohort 1990* |
| Maroon 19% | 23.3 | 7.4 | -12.7 | 10.5 | 41.2 |
| Native 3% | 29.6 | -0.6 | -6.4 | 11.1 | 40.2 |
| Hindustani 29% | 25.1 | 7.4 | -5.2 | 10.4 | 42.9 |
| Javanese 16% | 25.5 | 8.9 | -5.4 | 14.2 | 48.5 |
| Creole 20% | 35.0 | 5.6 | -8.4 | 6.0 | 46.7 |
| Mixed 12% | 39.3 | 3.4 | -5.7 | 3.3 | 46.1 |
| Chinese 1% | 46.7 | 6.7 | -4.0 | -14.2 | 39.2 |
| Other 1% | 43.4 | 8.5 | -9.9 | -9.2 | 42.7 |
| AVERAGE | – | 6.5 | -7.3 | 8.6 | – |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

and Hindustani have a position with a status that is lower than the average. The Chinese, Mixed and Others hold jobs with an occupational status that is clearly above the average, while the Creoles and Javanese take a middle position. The interval level of measurement of occupational status makes it possible to express the strength of association in a multiple correlation *R*, or rather its square, the percentage explained variance by ethnicity. These coefficients are also shown in Table 7.13 and range between 4.8 per cent for men in first jobs and 12.7 per cent for mothers. The first conclusion about these coefficients is that the association between ethnicity and occupation is at best moderate, but even more on the weak side. The intergenerational comparison indicates that this association used to be much stronger, in particular for mothers compared to women in their first or most recent jobs; for respondents, the ethnicity-occupation link is also stronger for women than for

TABLE 7.13: EDUCATION BY GENDER, RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

| | *Men* | *Women* | *Fathers* | *Mothers* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 ILLITERATE | 30.8 | 17.8 | 34.1 | 27.9 |
| 1 LITERATE | 1.2 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 7.3 |
| 2 BO | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 3 GLO | 24.4 | 24.2 | 34.4 | 36.4 |
| 4 EBO | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| 5 LBGO | 12.7 | 16.6 | 8.0 | 10.3 |
| 6 LTO | 13.3 | 0.4 | 7.1 | 0.3 |
| 7 MULO | 14.2 | 17.8 | 8.9 | 9.0 |
| 8 PI | 2.5 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 4.4 |
| 9 NATIN | 9.5 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 0.5 |
| 10 IMEO | 4.0 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| 11 HAVO | 3.2 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| 12 VWO | 3.4 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| 13 HBO | 3.8 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| 14 WO | 4.5 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1,541 | 2,377 | 2,791 | 3,160 |
| Missing | 8 | 3 | 1,138 | 769 |

*Source:* Own Field Research, 2012.

men. However, over the life cycle, we see virtually no change between early and late careers.

The trends are generally upward, but complex. In column A, we see the starting point, the mean levels of occupational status of the fathers. The most significant gap (almost 10 points) is between Javanese and Creoles. When we move to the respondents in column B, we see an average increase of 6.5 points, but also that the big gap between the Hindustanis and Javanese on the one hand, and the Creoles ahead of them, has closed somewhat. Maroons have also made up some of their arrears, but Natives have been intergenerationally stable. Column C displays the differences between men and women, which summarizes gender effects in both the parental and the respondents' generations. Women clearly have lower status jobs than men, on average by -7.3 point, and the gender gap is particularly strong for Maroons. Finally, the cohort differences come in column D. These are on average the strongest of all the compared effects (8.6 points), but take the striking form that the lower status groups have progressed much more than the higher status groups. The largest gains have been made by the Javanese, while in the small groups of Chinese and Others, the cohort differences are in fact negative. In both groups, this striking pattern is probably caused by a change in migration pattern: earlier cohorts migrated into commercial occupations, later cohorts into production, primary mining and construction.

Column E shows the occupational hierarchy of the eight ethnicities at entry into the labour market for the most recent cohort, born around 1990. The most striking pattern is that the occupational differences have become much smaller, and have led to a different grouping. Creoles, Javanese and Mixed hold jobs with a status score around 47; Maroons, Natives and Hindustanis hold, on average, jobs with status around 41, so the major gap has closed.

## EDUCATION BY GENDER: RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

An essential factor in the study on social stratification is the level of education. This makes it essential to analyse Suriname's educa-

tional stratification, in which a comparison can be made between the parents and the respondents, as well as between cohorts. The question is whether there is a difference in the education of respondents and their parents, but also whether there is a difference between the educational level of the male and female respondents. Based on the worldwide pattern, we can safely assume that, on average, the respondents will be more highly educated than their parents, that younger cohorts are more highly educated than older cohorts, and that women have made up their arrears over time. The more interesting question to answer is whether there has been a change in ethnic stratification in all of this. In the survey, education has been divided into 15 categories that can be ranked by level. This (optimal) ranking was established in a separate study (Sno & Ganzeboom 2018). Together, the categories 0 till 3 forms primary education and lower, categories 4 to 7 are lower secondary education (VOJ: secondary education for juniors), categories 8 to 12 are higher secondary education (VOS: secondary education for seniors), and categories 13 to 14 are tertiary education.

Table 7.13 gives an overview of the highest attained education level by gender and generation. About one-third of the fathers and mothers did not have any formal education. Among the respondents, this is, respectively, approximately 4 per cent (men) and 7 per cent (women). Most respondents are educated at VOJ level. Here, the men are somewhat in the majority (41 per cent) relative to the women (37 per cent). Approximately, 25 per cent is educated at the primary level. The percentage of men and women educated at VOS level is about the same as the percentage that is educated at primary level. At the tertiary level, there are slightly more women (9 per cent) than men (8 per cent). These figures are considerably lower for the parents. Noteworthy again is the large number of missing values for both the mothers, and especially the fathers. The explanation would be similar to the one given for the missing occupations. But, notice that there are more occupations associated with the fathers than education. For the mothers, it is the opposite. The missing education values probably concern mainly parents, who have not received any school education.

Table 7.14 quantifies the educational level using the average

category number,[5] which ranges between 0 (no education, illiterate) and 14 (University completed). The average education of the respondents (6.5 for men and 6.3 for women) is considerably higher than that of the fathers and the mothers (respectively 3.6 and 3.3). Contrary to expectations, the average level of the men is still slightly higher than that of the women. A source of explanation for this could be that the women of the older cohorts (whether or not under the influence of current traditions) dropped out more quickly to pick up family responsibilities. Later on, we will examine to what extent there is a shift per cohort.

If we look at the average educational level of the different ethnic groups in Table 7.14, we notice the following: on average, as expected, the Maroons and Natives have the lowest education (4.9 for men and 4.2 for women); the same applies to their fathers and mothers, whose education, on average, is considerably lower than

TABLE 7.14: AVERAGE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (0.14) BY ETHNICITY FOR RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

| | *Fathers* | *Mothers* | *Men* | *Women* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maroon | 1.6 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 4.2 |
| Natives | 2.0 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 4.8 |
| Hindustani | 3.5 | 3.1 | 6.3 | 6.2 |
| Javanese | 3.0 | 2.7 | 6.5 | 6.6 |
| Creole | 4.9 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 7.1 |
| Mixed | 6.1 | 5.1 | 8.1 | 8.4 |
| Chinese | 3.5 | 3.5 | 7.7 | 8.3 |
| Other | 7.5 | 5.2 | 10.1 | 6.6 |
| TOTAL | 3.5 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| *N* | 2,791 | 3,160 | 1,541 | 2,377 |
| Adj *R2* | 20.7% | 17.9% | 9.6% | 12.1% |

*Source*: Own Field Research, 2012.

[5] In the dissertation project, a separate paper has been devoted to the optimal scaling of educational qualifications and Surinamese Standard Level of Education [SRLED] has been developed. The study showed that the optimal scaling is so closely related to the numbering of the categories in the questionnaire that no substantive loss of information arises.

their children's (respectively 1.6 for the father and 1.4 for the mother), as we already noticed. Of all distinguished groups, the Others, Chinese and Mixed respondents have the highest level of education. This applies to both men and women. The group of Others, which is relatively small and very diverse, also has a significant advantage over the other ethnic groups.

Table 7.15 traces how the level of education has changed between the generation of fathers for the oldest cohort, into the distribution for respondents in the youngest cohorts. Major upward change has appeared both between the generations of parents and respondents, and between the oldest and youngest cohort. The ethnic hierarchy has more or less remained the same, with the Maroon and Natives at the bottom and Mixed and Others at the top, but the distances have shrunk dramatically. Striking again is the relatively strong gains of the Javanese, for whom the father's generation was almost entirely uneducated, while in the youngest cohort, the Javanese are among the highest educated.

TABLE 7.15: MEAN EDUCATION BY ETHNICITY, GENERATION, GENDER AND COHORT. MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS POOLED OVER GENERATIONS OF PARENTS AND RESPONDENTS. EDUCATION VARIES BETWEEN (0) ILLITERATE AND (14) UNIVERSITY

| | *A* | *B* | *C* | *D* | *E* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Baseline Father, cohort 1940* | *Generational Parents→ Respondents* | *Gender Male→ Female* | *Cohort 1940→ 1990* | *Result Men, cohort 1990* |
| Maroon 19% | -0.2 | 2.9 | -0.7 | 3.4 | 6.1 |
| Native 3% | 0.4 | 2.6 | -0.3 | 3.3 | 6.3 |
| Hindustani 29% | 1.4 | 0.3 | -0.7 | 3.8 | 8.2 |
| Javanese 16% | 0.7 | 3.7 | -0.6 | 4.7 | 9.1 |
| Creole 20% | 3.3 | 2.5 | -0.6 | 0.3 | 8.7 |
| Mixed 12% | 4.6 | 2.7 | -0.8 | 2.1 | 9.4 |
| Chinese 1% | 3.2 | 4.5 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 8.0 |
| Other 1% | 7.2 | 1.8 | -3.3 | 1.9 | 10.8 |
| Average | – | 2.9 | -0.7 | 3.4 | – |

*Source:* Own Field Research, 2012.

If we compare these outcomes with the position on the occupational ladder, we see clear similarities. However, there is also a clear difference between the ethnic stratification by occupation and education. Comparing the explained variances in Tables 7.11 and 7.12, we can conclude that the stratification in education is much stronger than in occupation. But a similarity between education and occupation is that the rank order of ethnicity by education and occupation has largely remained the same, but the degree of stratification has clearly diminished.

## CONCLUSION

1. In Suriname, six major ethnic groups can be distinguished that derive from the country's complicated history of (forced) migration: Natives, Maroons, Creoles, Chinese, Hindustani and Javanese. In addition, we distinguish a group that label themselves as Mixed, and as mall group of Others.
2. Each group is characterized by a strong degree of endogamy. Endogamy is strongest among the Asian Surinamese, but also surprisingly strong for the Mixed category. However, when members of the Mixed category choose a partner outside their own group, they do so with Creoles. While endogamy remains strong, it decreases between the generations of the parents and their offspring.
3. When compared over cohorts, there is a significant change toward less endogamy.
4. It appears that compared to where they were born, the respondents in our Sur Mob 2012 survey have become more dispersed. We derived this from the fact that the association between ethnicity and the current district of residence has decreased relative to the association between ethnicity and district of birth. The geographical concentration of ethnic groups has, therefore, declined over the years. The most important location of this shift is the influx of people to the suburban district of Wanica, where all ethnic groups are more or less well represented.
5. Like anywhere else in the world, in Suriname, occupations are strongly gendered, with women being overrepresented in welfare and service occupations (teaching, care, public administration,

sales), and men overrepresented in manual work and business. Occupations are also ethnically differentiated, but not as strong as suggested by the earlier literature. We noticed a significant change between mothers and daughters concerning the asso-ciation between ethnicity and occupation: for the mothers, occupations are strongly differentiated by ethnicity, but this does not apply anymore to their daughters. For both fathers and sons, there is a comparable ethnic differentiation.

6. If we scale the occupations by their socio-economic status, a more explicit ethnic stratification becomes apparent. At the bottom, we see the Natives and Maroons; at a considerable distance, above them is the Hindustani. Mixed and Creoles form the upper middle part of Surinamese society; the Javanese are slightly below them. The occupations with the highest status are taken by the Chinese and Others. In other words, we find a clear ethnic stratification in the division of labour.
7. However, the ethnic hierarchy by occupation is stronger for the parents than for the respondents. Between the first and the current occupation, ethnic stratification decreases somewhat. There is consistent evidence that ethnic stratification with respect to occupations has decreased over time.
8. The association between the level of education and ethnicity is much stronger than between the status of occupations and ethnicity. The order and distance by ethnicity are almost the same with occupations.
9. With regard to education, there is a development between parents and their offspring. Amongst the parents, ethnic stratification by education was much stronger than for the respondents. The difference is mainly caused by the Maroons and Natives having closed in on the other groups.
10. The ethnic stratification of Suriname is clear and has a solid structure. The order and the relative distances are stable between fathers and mothers and between the generations of the parents and that of their offspring. However, there is consistent and overwhelming evidence (from the cohort, intergenerational and life cycle comparisons) that the distances between ethnic groups on the socio-economic ladder have become much less than commonly assumed.

## REFERENCES

ABS (*Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek*) (2014). *Resultaten Achtste Volks-en Woningtelling in Suriname (Volume lll) Huishoudens, Woonverblijven en Gezinnen, Milieu, Criminaliteit. Suriname in Cijfers no. 300/2014-1* [Results of Eighth Population and Housing Census in Suriname (Vol. III) Households, Housing and Families, Environment, Crime. Suriname in Figures no. 300/2014-1]. Paramaribo: ABS/Censuskantoor.

Alesina, Alberto et al. (2003). 'Fractionalization', *Journal of Economic Growth, 8*(2): 155-94.

Buddingh', Hans (2012). *De Geschiedenis van Suriname* [The History of Suriname] (4th revised edn.). Amsterdam: Nieuw Amsterdam NRC Boeken.

De Bruyne, Adriaan (2001). 'A City and a Nation: Demographic Trends and Socioeconomic Development in Urbanising Suriname', in R. Hoefte and P. Meel (eds.), *Twentieth Century Surinam: Continuities and Discontinuities in a New World Society.* Amsterdam: KTLV Press: 23-47.

De Bruijne, Adriaan and A. Schalkwijk (2005). 'The Position and Residential Patterns of Ethnic Groups in Paramaribo's Development in the Twentieth Century', *New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids, 79*(3-4): 23902-71.

Duncan, Otis D. (1966). 'Methodological Issues in the Analysis of Social Mobility', in N.J. Smelser and S.M. Lipset (eds.), *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development.* London: Routledge: 51-79.

Fearon, James D. (2003). 'Ethnic and Cultural Diversity by Country', *Journal of Economic Growth, 8*(2): 195-222.

Gowricharn, Ruben and J. Schuster (2001). 'Diaspora and Transnationalism: The Case of the Surinamese in the Netherlands', in R. Hoefte and P. Meel (eds.), *Twentieth Century Surinam: Continuities and Discontinuities in a New World Society.* Amsterdam: KITL: 155-73.

Hassankhan, Maurits, M. Ligeon and P. Scheepers (1995). *De Sociaal-Economische Verschillen tussen Creolen, Hindoestanen en Javanen: 130 jaar Na Afschaffing van de Slavernij*, in L. Gobardhan-Rambocus, M. Hassankhan and J. Egger (eds.), *De erfenis van de slavernij.* Paramaribo: Anton de Kom Universiteit: 249-74.

Hoefte, Rosemarijn and Peter Meel (2001). *Twentieth Century Surinam: Continuities and Discontinuities in a New World Society.* Amsterdam: KLTV Press.

International Labour Office (ILO) (1990). *International Standard Classification of Occupations ISCO-88.* Geneva.

Lijphart, Arend (1977). *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Menke, Jack K. (2016). *Mozaïek van het Surinaamse volk. Volkstellingen in demografisch, economisch en sociaal perspectief* [Mosaic of the Surinamese People. Population Censuses in a Demographic, Economic and Social Perspective]. Paramaribo: ADEK University of Suriname/IGSR.

Oostindie, Gert J. (2006). 'The Study of Ethnicity in the Dutch Caribbean', *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies,* 1(2): 215-30.

Schalkwijk, Aart and A. De Bruijne (1999). *Van Mon Plaisir tot Ephraïmszegen. Welstand, etniciteit en woonpatronen in Paramaribo* [From Mon Plaisir to Ephraïmszegen. Prosperity, Ethnicity and Living Patterns in Paramaribo]. Paramaribo: Leo Victor.

Schröder, Heike and Harry B. Ganzeboom (2014). 'Measuring and Modelling level of education in European Societies', *European Sociological Review, 30*(1): 119-36.

Sno, Tamira E. (2010). 'Status Attainment and Social Mobility in Suriname' (Ph.D. Project Proposal, Vrije University Amsterdam, 31 May 2010). Retrieved from http://www.harryganzeboom.nl/Surimob/T. Sno_Research_proposal_31_mei_2010.pdf.

Sno, Tamira E. and Harry B.G. Ganzeboom (2018). *De structuur van het Surinaamse onderwijs: schaling van onderwijskwalificaties, Working Paper.* Paramaribo: Anton de Kom University of Suriname.

—— (2017). *De Beroepenstratificatie van Suriname: Hotdog of Broodje Pom?, IGSR Academic Journal of Suriname, 8*: 771-93.

—— (2013a). Status Attainment and Social Mobility in Suriname, 2011-13 [*Statusverwerving en Sociale Mobiliteit in Suriname, 2011-13*]. [MRDF]. Paramaribo: ADEK University of Suriname.

—— (2013b). 'Sur Mob 2012: Family and Social Inequality in Suriname 2012' [data documentation]. Amsterdam: Vrije University.

Vertovec, Steven (2007). 'Super-diversity and its Implications', *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6): 1024-54.