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The inclusion of employment equity in the Ruling Party’s manifesto, followed by the overwhelming majority vote for it, is testimony that the majority of the people in South Africa still recognise employment equity as a potent force for their economic liberation. It is a well considered view of this Commission that this Act gives effect to the Constitutional provision as enshrined in the Bill of Rights, Section 9 (2) which states that, “Equality includes the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms. To promote the achievement of equality, legislative and other measures designed to protect or advance persons or categories of persons disadvantaged by unfair discrimination may be taken.” Focusing on Black people is not an antithesis of non-racialism but rather a fulfillment of it, for the society is still racially segregated.

In addition, our constitution gives expression to Convention 111 of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), which obliges signatory States, of which South Africa is one, to enact mechanisms of redress. Affirmative action, as a redress mechanism, is therefore not an end result by itself, but is a means to an end, which is the achievement of equality through an equitable environment that broadly reflect the national demographics of the Economically Active Population of South Africa. There are those people who see the Act as a piece of legislation that is both racist and in fact an instrument of reverse racism - some even go further to say that the implementation of this Act promotes nepotism and cronyism. Views that seek to bring this Act to an abrupt end have been expressed as it is alleged that the Act seems to be racially divisive and its application too mechanistic. Many attempts, albeit unsuccessful, have been waged by, amongst others, right wing elements, including some political parties, certain universities and analysts to discredit the Commission and individuals that promote the implementation of this Act.

This report will dispassionately detail the progress or lack thereof in achieving the policy objectives of equitable workplaces at all occupational levels. It will also show that the allegation surrounding the under representation of the so-called minority groups (i.e. Coloureds, Indians and Whites) is not true. In addition, the report will reflect the disproportionate over-representation of White people in general, White males in particular, at the top echelons in most organisations and the under-representation of people with disabilities, Coloureds and Africans.

It is disconcerting to observe from the DG Review, work that all 106 companies that were reviewed were found to be in breach of procedural and substantive compliance. The majority of these companies are in the top 100 JSE listing, which implies that they have the resources to implement the Act. This creates an impression that these companies are treating the Act with contempt even 10 years after its promulgation. The Commission for Employment Equity (CEE) will continue to monitor compliance with the agreed DG Review recommendations and will ‘name and shame’ those who fail to comply with the agreed recommendations.

Even more disappointing has been the behaviour of some beneficiaries of the Employment Equity Act, who are at the top echelons of some of these organisations and have now become proxy or worse than some of their untransformed White counterparts. These ‘reasonable’ beneficiaries have become complicit in frustrating transformation by not assisting their organisations to acquire the skills of other Black people - for some reason they seem to think transformation ended with their appointment. These Black people continue to discredit themselves by becoming very eloquent and poetic about transformation, yet have no substantive evidence to back up their poetry.
Furthermore, the Commission is seriously considering implementing a ‘name and shame’ strategy against structures such as the nomination committees, boards, human resources and, in particular, chairperson’s, chief executive officers and managing directors that have influence in the appointment of top and senior management personnel.

It is noted with disappointment that certain companies, especially in the financial sector, have missed the golden opportunities to transform the top echelons as seen in the recent highly publicised appointments.

The Commission is urging all South Africans to embrace this corrective piece of legislation as a fundamental, peaceful and just approach in order to achieve a non-racial society objectively. To date, there has not been any plausible alternative to this noble policy.

Equality is still under construction; the calls for a ‘sunset clause’ are still very premature and misplaced given the little progress made after ten years of the promulgation of the Act.

I express my gratitude to all Commissioners, including those who have left, for their unselfish contributions. A word of appreciation goes to the secretariat for their commitment, dedication and ongoing technical and administrative support. In conclusion, and on behalf of the Commission, I take this opportunity to express our gratitude and appreciation to the Minister for his unwavering support and commitment towards reaching the objectives of the Act.

Jimmy Manyi
Chairperson: Commission for Employment Equity
Section 28 of the Employment Equity Act (EEA) established the Commission for Employment Equity (CEE). According to section 29 (1) of the EEA, the CEE consists of a Chairperson appointed by the Minister and the following eight members nominated by NEDLAC, i.e. two representatives from the State; two representatives from organised business; two representatives from organised labour; and two representatives from the community constituency.

The Commission is pleased to welcome Ms Mpho Nkeli from organised business as a replacement to Ms Marlene Bossett who resigned in the previous financial year due to career opportunities. The current structure of the CEE is as follows:
1. Introduction

The Commission for Employment Equity, a statutory body established in terms of section 28 of the Act to advise the Minister, is required to submit an annual report to the Minister of Labour on the implementation of employment equity in terms of section 33 of the Act.

This report covers the period from 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009. It provides highlights for the period, the workforce distribution and an analysis of Employment Equity Reports received from employers in October 2008. The report also reflects on reporting and representivity trends of the designated groups over a defined period and concludes with observations and remarks by the Commission.

Highlights cover some key activities that impact on the implementation of the Act. The workforce distribution supplies information on the total population and the Economically Active Population (EAP) of the country’s four major population groupings in terms of their race and gender, which is crucial for the setting of EE numerical goals. The trends analysis provides a snapshot of changes in the top four occupational levels for the years 2004, 2006 and 2008. Focus is placed on these specific reporting periods because it is when all designated employers, both large and small, were expected to submit employment equity reports to the Department of Labour. Trends on the representivity levels is centred around the first three occupational levels, i.e. Top Management, Senior Management and Professionally Qualified levels, as this is where the designated groups are most under-represented.

According to the Act, employers with 150 or more employees (i.e. large employers) are required to submit reports to the Department on an annual basis. While those employers with fewer than 150 employees (i.e. small employers) are expected to report every two years. A further requirement is for employers with fewer than 50 employees but have a turnover exceeding that of a small business (as stipulated in Schedule 4 of the Act) to report. Employers who are not designated to report in terms of the afore mentioned requirements have the option to voluntarily comply with the reporting requirements. The Employment Equity Regulations goes even further in order to ensure effective data collection; it requires small employers to report within 12 months of being designated and thereafter on every year that ends with an even number.

An exciting development is that for the first time in this report workforce profile data will be provided separately for all employers, government and for the private sector.
2. Highlights for the period

This area of the report covers key highlights for the 2008/09 reporting period.

2.1 Interaction with key stakeholders on employment equity

The Commission presented its 8th Annual Report to the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Labour on 28 May 2008 and to Cabinet on 28 January 2009. A key request was the need to also include separate data for government and the private sector. Data shows that government’s progress in terms of equitable representation is masking the little achievements made by all employers in implementing employment equity. Disappointment was expressed at the slow progress being made in implementing employment equity - the current progress rate will take employers approximately one hundred years to achieve equitable representation in workplaces.

2.2 Road shows

During the months of July and August 2008, the Commission jointly with the Department embarked on road shows in all nine provinces covering 2 711 participants. The primary focus was to interact with employers and other interest groups to share information on the following:

- Code of Good Practice on Preparing, Implementing and Monitoring Employment Equity Plans
- Code of Good Practice on Key Aspects of HIV and AIDS and employment
- Code of Good Practice on the Employment of People with Disabilities
- Online reporting
- Observations made during Director-General (DG) Reviews conducted by the Department.

Information gathered from the road shows indicated, amongst others, that completing the reporting forms contained in the Regulations was highly administrative and time consuming – a number of participants wanted a form that was much simpler and less time consuming. Many found the occupational categories in the reporting forms contained in the regulations did not fit well with the nature of their businesses. Stakeholders therefore requested the Commission to revisit and consider amending the employment equity forms in the Regulations.

2.3 Amendments to Employment Equity Regulations

The Commission completed the amendments to the EE Regulations in March 2009. The main intention for amending the Regulations is to make reporting on employment equity to the Department much easier for employers without compromising the quality of the data collected. The amended format will make it much easier for employers to report online.

In order to consult broadly and gather additional information, the proposed draft amendments were published and circulated to stakeholders, including employers and NEDLAC constituencies on 8 December 2008 for public comment. Stakeholders were given until 6 February 2009 to submit their comments to the Commission. The Commission considered each and every comment before finalising
the amended Regulations. The amended Regulations will be gazetted and made available to the public in time for reporting in October 2009.

2.4 Status of DG Reviews conducted (section 43)

Sections 43, 44 and 45 of the Employment Equity Act empower the Director General to assess the extent to which an employer is complying with the Act and make recommendations. According to these sections, failure to comply with these recommendations may result in an employer being referred to the Labour Court.

In order to effect these provisions of the Act, six companies were reviewed in 2006; 26 companies were reviewed in 2007 and 74 companies in 2008. All of these companies (inclusive of their subsidiaries) are either directly or indirectly listed on the Johannesburg Securities Exchange (JSE).

The observations made of companies reviewed showed that none of them were fully complying with the Employment Equity Act and its Regulations. These companies were found to be violating either one or a combination of the following provisions of the Act:

- Preparing and implementing an employment equity plan with annual objectives as prescribed in section 20 of the Act
- Assigning one or more senior manager(s) (section 24)
- Consulting with employees (section 16)
- Conducting an analysis of their workplaces (section 19).

Employers were also found not to be considering the workplace environment and the Economically Active Population of the various groups in terms of race and gender when setting their numerical goals. A number of employers were aligning their employment equity numerical goals to their respective Sector Charters and Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) Codes, rather than to the provisions of the Employment Equity Act. This resulted in companies showing total disregard to meet the requirements of the Act.

All of the companies reviewed thus far, except for one that has been referred to the Labour Court, have fully accepted the recommendations and are in different stages of implementing them. Companies reviewed in 2006 and 2007 have reached the stage where they have prepared their EE Plans for the approval of the Director-General.

The Department will continue to monitor whether these companies are procedurally and substantively complying with the provisions of the Act.

1. Comair Ltd has a pending Labour Court case.
A broad objective of the Employment Equity Act is to achieve an equitable representation of the designated groups that mirrors their Economically Active Population (EAP). The Economically Active Population includes people from 15 to 64 years of age who are either employed or unemployed and seeking employment. Please note that Statistics South Africa changed the ages for the EAP from 15 to 65 years to 15 to 64 years of age.

The data below provides a picture of the national demographics and the EAP in terms of race and gender. This data provides vital benchmark information for the setting of employment equity numerical goals and targets.

**Table 1:** Profile of the national population by race and gender and profile of the Economically Active Population by race and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>National population distribution (Census 2001)</th>
<th>Economically active (QLFS, September 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>16 887.830</td>
<td>18 528.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>1 920.426</td>
<td>2 074.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>545.050</td>
<td>570.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 080.734</td>
<td>2 212.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 434.040</td>
<td>23 385.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** shows on the one hand that Africans constitute the largest group (79%) of the national population in South Africa; followed by Whites (9.6%); Coloureds (8.9%) and Indians (2.5%). In terms of gender, females constitute 52.2% and males 47.8% of the national population.

On the other hand, **Table 1** shows that Africans constitute the largest group (74.1%) of the EAP in South Africa; followed by Whites (12.1%); Coloureds (10.8%) and Indians (3%). In terms of gender, males and females are relatively evenly distributed at 54% and 46% respectively. Africans are the only group where their EAP lags behind their National Population Distribution (NPD).
4. Analysis of Employment Equity Reports received in 2008

4.1 Extent of reporting on employment equity by employers

Employers are deemed to have reported only if they fully and accurately complete their employment equity forms when submitting their reports to the Department. Table 2 outlines the status of reporting for the 2008 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reports received</th>
<th>Reports excluded</th>
<th>Reports included in analysis</th>
<th>Number of employees covered in analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10 580</td>
<td>3 351</td>
<td>7 229</td>
<td>2 977 862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that 10 580 reports were received in 2008 and 7 229 were analysed covering 2 977 862 employees. Please note that all employers, i.e. both large employers and small employers were expected to report in 2008.

4.2 Workforce profiles for all employers, government and the private sector

The workforce profile provides the representation of employees in an employer’s workplace in terms of race, gender and occupational level. Below are tables that cover the workforce profiles for all employers, government and for the private sector separately. Observations are then made on the data contained in each of these tables. Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local government. The private sector is inclusive of private entities, parastatals, academic institutions and non-profit organisations.

4.2.1 Workforce profile for all employers

This area of the report provides a snapshot of the employee representation for all employers in terms of race, gender, disability and occupational level.

---

2 Large employers are those with 150 or more employees and small employers are those employers with fewer than 150 employees. Large employers are expected to report every year and small employers are expected to report on the first working day of October of every year that ends with an even number.
Table 3: Representation of employees (including people with disabilities) for all employers in each occupational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>2 090</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1 018</td>
<td>13 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>6 160</td>
<td>2 375</td>
<td>3 086</td>
<td>24 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>32 254</td>
<td>9 561</td>
<td>10 837</td>
<td>64 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>223 698</td>
<td>47 265</td>
<td>27 143</td>
<td>134 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>524 360</td>
<td>71 359</td>
<td>22 824</td>
<td>45 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>330 555</td>
<td>31 240</td>
<td>3 770</td>
<td>4 648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>1 230 902</td>
<td>179 026</td>
<td>74 122</td>
<td>302 073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>111 785</td>
<td>16 482</td>
<td>5 444</td>
<td>15 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1 230 902</td>
<td>179 026</td>
<td>74 122</td>
<td>302 073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that at the skilled level Africans constitute nearly 50%, yet at the next level (professionally qualified / mid management) their representation is far less. This indicates that the opportunity to move up is disproportionately favouring the White group.
Figure 1: Percentage representation of top management employees by race and gender

Top Management

At Top Management, African males, African females and Coloured females show the largest deficit gap when comparing their representation to their EAP at this level. Proportionally, White males have the highest over-representation at this level, followed by White females and Indian males.

Figure 2: Percentage representation of senior management employees by race and gender

Senior Management

Proportionally at the Senior Management level, African males, African females and Coloured females show the largest deficit gap when comparing their representation to their EAP at this level. Proportionally, White males have the highest over-representation at this level, followed by White females and Indian males.
show the largest deficit gap when comparing their representation to their EAP. White males on the other hand have the highest surplus at this level, followed by White females, Indian males and Indian females.

**Figure 3: Percentage representation of professionals and middle management by race and gender**

**Professionally Qualified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Professionally Qualified level, White males and White females show a huge surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP, followed by Indian males and Indian females. African males and African females on the other hand have the highest deficit gap when comparing their representation to their EAP.
Figure 4: Percentage representation of skilled employees by race and gender

Skilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that at the skilled level Africans constitute nearly 50%, yet at the next level (professionally qualified / mid management) their representation is far less. This raises a concern that skilled Africans are over-looked for recruitment and promotions. This data debunks the skills shortage rhetoric and is independently backed up by the 2008 Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) study on skills supply.

Figure 5: Percentage representation of non-permanent employees by race and gender

Non-permanent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that at the skilled level Africans constitute nearly 50%, yet at the next level (professionally qualified / mid management) their representation is far less. This raises a concern that skilled Africans are over-looked for recruitment and promotions. This data debunks the skills shortage rhetoric and is independently backed up by the 2008 Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) study on skills supply.
At the Non-permanent level, African males, Coloured males, Indian males, Coloured females and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females on the other hand reflect the highest deficit gap at this level, with White males and White females very close to their EAP.

Table 4: Representation of employees with disabilities for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>1 254</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1 734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>3 092</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>2 904</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>7 638</td>
<td>1 409</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>7 688</td>
<td>1 409</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3 900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation of employees with disabilities by race and gender

People with disabilities accounted for nearly 0.7% of the total number of employees reported by all employers. Notwithstanding that people with disabilities were represented across all occupational levels, most of their representation was concentrated in the lower levels, i.e. the Skilled level downwards. The population distribution of their representation in terms of race and gender highly reflected the population distribution of all employees. The most under-represented groups were Blacks and females, particularly Africans. Whites dominated from the Skilled level upwards.
4.2.2 Workforce profile for all government employers

This area of the report provides a snapshot of the employee representation for government employers only in terms of race, gender and disability. Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local government.

Table 5: Representation of employees (including people with disabilities) for government employers only in each occupational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>2 078</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists</td>
<td>11 675</td>
<td>1 526</td>
<td>1 355</td>
<td>5 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mid-management</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>98 455</td>
<td>11 839</td>
<td>4 407</td>
<td>21 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>78 390</td>
<td>10 400</td>
<td>2 264</td>
<td>3 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>36 317</td>
<td>3 286</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>227 304</td>
<td>27 410</td>
<td>8 783</td>
<td>32 557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>8 103</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>235 407</td>
<td>28 344</td>
<td>9 187</td>
<td>33 796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 5 are illustrated below.
Figure 6: Percentage representation of top management employees for government by race and gender

Top Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportionally at the Top Management level, White males, Coloured males and Indian males show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females on the other hand lag behind with the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by White females, Coloured females, African males and Indian females.

Figure 7: Percentage representation of senior management employees for government by race and gender

Senior Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Workforce profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% EAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the Senior Management level, White males, White females, Indian males and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females on the other hand shows a large deficit gap at this level, followed by African males, Coloured females and Coloured males.

**Figure 8: Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees for government by race and gender**

### Professionally Qualified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Professionally Qualified level, White males, White females, Coloured females, Indian females and Indian males show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African males on the other hand show the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by African females and Coloured males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Workforce profile</th>
<th>% EAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 9: Percentage representation of skilled employees for government by race and gender

**Skilled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportionally at the Skilled level, White females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP, followed by Indian females, White males and African males. African females on the other hand have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by Coloured females, Coloured males and Indian males.

Figure 10: Percentage representation of non-permanent employees for government by race and gender

**Non-permanent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportionally at the Skilled level, White females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP, followed by Indian females, White males and African males. African females on the other hand have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by Coloured females, Coloured males and Indian males.
At the Non-permanent level, African males, White females, Coloured females, Indian females and Indian males show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females and White males on the other hand have the lowest surplus at this level.

Table 6: Representation of employees with disabilities for government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation of employees with disabilities for government by race and gender

People with disabilities accounted for 0.6% of the total number of employees reported by government employers. Notwithstanding that people with disabilities were represented across all occupational levels, most of their representation was concentrated in the middle-to-lower levels, i.e. the skilled level downwards. The population distribution of their representation in terms of race and gender highly reflected the population distribution of all employees. Generally, the most under-represented groups were Blacks and females. Proportionally, Whites dominated at the senior management, professionally qualified and skilled levels. Blacks were reasonably represented at the top management, semi-skilled and unskilled levels. Women were grossly under-represented at every occupational level.
### 4.2.3 Workforce profile for the private sector

This area of the report provides the representation levels for the **private sector only** in terms of race, gender and disability.

#### Table 7: Representation of employees (including people with disabilities) for the private sector only in terms of occupational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-permanent employees</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Foreign national</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>1 971</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1 032</td>
<td>13 538</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>129.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>5 500</td>
<td>2 378</td>
<td>2 916</td>
<td>25 589</td>
<td>2 922</td>
<td>2 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>20 240</td>
<td>7 907</td>
<td>9 405</td>
<td>57 668</td>
<td>11 380</td>
<td>5 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>124 604</td>
<td>35 163</td>
<td>22 631</td>
<td>111 026</td>
<td>58 159</td>
<td>29 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>444 173</td>
<td>60 724</td>
<td>20 423</td>
<td>41 723</td>
<td>183 324</td>
<td>66 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>291 955</td>
<td>27 727</td>
<td>3 408</td>
<td>4 253</td>
<td>134 157</td>
<td>26 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>888 443</td>
<td>134 674</td>
<td>59 815</td>
<td>253 797</td>
<td>390 794</td>
<td>129 997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>103 683</td>
<td>15 548</td>
<td>5 040</td>
<td>14 144</td>
<td>69 261</td>
<td>17 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>992 126</td>
<td>150 222</td>
<td>64 855</td>
<td>267 941</td>
<td>460 055</td>
<td>147 020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 7 are illustrated below.
Figure 11: Percentage representation of top management employees for private sector employers by race and gender

**Top Management**

AM - African male  
CM - Coloured male  
IM - Indian male  
WM - White male  
AF - African female  
WF - White female  
IF - Indian female  
 CF - Coloured female  
FM - Foreign male

Proportionally at the Top Management level, White males, White females, Indian males and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females on the other hand have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by African males, Coloured females, and Coloured males.

Figure 12: Percentage representation of senior management employees for private sector employers by race and gender

**Senior Management**

AM - African male  
CM - Coloured male  
IM - Indian male  
WM - White male  
AF - African female  
WF - White female  
IF - Indian female  
 CF - Coloured female  
FM - Foreign male
At the Senior Management level, White males, White females, Indian males and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. Proportionally, African females have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by African males, Coloured females and Coloured males.

Figure 13: Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees for private sector employers by race and gender

Professionally Qualified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportionally at the Professionally Qualified level, White males, White females, Indian males and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females on the other hand lag behind with the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by African males, Coloured females and Coloured males.
Figure 14: Percentage representation of skilled employees for private sector employers by race and gender

**Skilled**

At the Skilled level, White males, White females, Indian males and Indian females, Coloured males and Coloured females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. Proportionally, African females have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by African males.

Figure 15: Percentage representation of non-permanent employees for private sector employers by race and gender

**Non-permanent**
Proportionally at the Non-permanent level, African males, Coloured males, Indian males, Coloured females and Indian females show the highest surplus when comparing their representation to their EAP. African females have the highest deficit gap at this level, followed by White males and White females.

Table 8: Population representation of employees with disabilities for private sector only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>2 671</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>2 618</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>6 121</td>
<td>1 174</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>6 262</td>
<td>1 203</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3 303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation of employees with disabilities for private sector employers by race and gender

People with disabilities accounted for 0.7% of the total number of employees reported by the private sector. Notwithstanding that people with disabilities were represented across all occupational levels, most of their representation was concentrated in the middle-to-lower levels, i.e. the skilled level downwards. The population distribution of their representation in terms of race and gender highly reflected the population distribution of all employees. Generally, the most under-represented groups were Blacks and females. Proportionally Whites dominated in the Top management, Senior
management, Professionally Qualified and Skilled levels. Blacks were reasonably represented at the Semi-skilled and Unskilled levels. Females were grossly under-represented at every occupational level, particularly Black females.

4.2.4 Core operation functions and support functions by occupational level for all employers

Job evaluation or grading systems are used to measure a job in terms of content in order to establish its worth or value in relation to other jobs in an organisation. The worth or value of a job is represented on a vertical axis as an occupational level. A job could either be a core operation function or a support function. Core operation function positions are those that directly relate to the core business of an organisation and may lead to revenue generation, e.g. sales, production, etc. Whereas support function positions provide infrastructure and other enabling conditions for revenue generation, e.g. human resources, corporate services, etc.

Table 9 cover employees in core operation function positions and in support function positions for all employers. Observations are then made on the data contained in Table 9.
Table 9: Representation of employees, including people with disabilities, in core operation functions by occupational level for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>1 264</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>8 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>3 920</td>
<td>1 572</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>16 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>21 481</td>
<td>6 453</td>
<td>6497</td>
<td>12 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>181 504</td>
<td>36 333</td>
<td>18985</td>
<td>101 001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>434 196</td>
<td>56 697</td>
<td>17225</td>
<td>35 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>270 671</td>
<td>24 255</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>3 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>1 000 603</td>
<td>138 605</td>
<td>52534</td>
<td>218 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>87 567</td>
<td>12 830</td>
<td>4111</td>
<td>10 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1 000 603</td>
<td>138 605</td>
<td>52534</td>
<td>218 426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 9 are illustrated below:

Percentage representation of top management employees for all employers in core functions by race and gender

At the Top Management level, Black representation accounted for 22.3% which is almost three times below their EAP which stands at 87.9%. Whites represented 74.7% which is about five times above their EAP (12.1%). Female representation at this level accounted for 15.5% which is almost two times below their EAP (46%). White male representation is 64.3% which is about eight times above their EAP (6.8%) and White female representation is 10.4% which is almost double their EAP (5.3%) at this level. Proportionally Africans are the least represented at this level where they are 12.3% which is approximately six times below their EAP (74.1%).
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Percentage representation of senior management employees for all employers in core functions by race and gender

At the Senior Management level, Black representation accounted for 31.6% which is approximately two times below their EAP. White representation at this level was 66% which is about four-and-a-quarter times above their EAP. Female representation at this level accounted for 24.7% which is almost two times below their EAP. White male representation at 50.1% is about six-and-a-quarter times above their EAP and White female representation at 15.9% is two times above their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans are the least represented at this level where they are 16.6% which is virtually three-and-a-quarter times below their EAP.

Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees of all employers in core functions by race and gender

At the Professionally Qualified level, Black representation at 45.4% is almost half of their EAP. White representation at this level accounted for 52.4% which is about three-and-a-quarter times above their EAP. Female representation at this level accounted for 35.1% which is almost equal to their EAP. White male representation accounted for 35% which is about four-and-a-quarter times above their EAP and White female representation at 17.4% is two-and-a-quarter times above their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans were the least represented group at this level at 27.5% which is virtually two-and-a-half times below their EAP.

Percentage representation of skilled employees for all employers in core functions by race and gender

At the Skilled level, Black representation is 70.3% which is approximately a quarter below their EAP. White representation at this level accounted for 28.6% which is about one-and-a-quarter times above their EAP. Female representation at this level at 33.0% is nearly a quarter below their EAP. White male representation accounted for 19.7% which is about three times above their EAP and White female representation at 8.9% is almost double their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans were the least represented group at this level at 53.3% which is virtually a quarter below their EAP.

Percentage representation of non-permanent employees for all employers in core functions by race and gender

Black representation accounted for 89.8%, which nearly equals their EAP. White representation is 8.9% which is about one quarter below their EAP. Female representation at this level at 41.4% is nearly a quarter below their EAP. White male representation accounted for 5.1% which is about a quarter below their EAP and White female representation at 3.8% which is about a quarter below their EAP at this level. Proportionally Whites were the least represented at this level where they are 8.9% which is virtually a quarter below their EAP.
Table 10: Representation of employees, including people with disabilities, in Support Functions by occupational level for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>2 292</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1 135</td>
<td>8 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced</td>
<td>11 476</td>
<td>3 134</td>
<td>4 365</td>
<td>21 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>42 220</td>
<td>10 767</td>
<td>8 152</td>
<td>32 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision</td>
<td>90 521</td>
<td>14 635</td>
<td>5 503</td>
<td>10 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>60 072</td>
<td>7 276</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>230 299</td>
<td>40 421</td>
<td>21 588</td>
<td>83 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>22 857</td>
<td>3 522</td>
<td>1 394</td>
<td>5 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>230 299</td>
<td>40 421</td>
<td>21 588</td>
<td>83 647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 10 are illustrated below.

Percentage representation of top management employees for all employers in support functions by race and gender

At the Top Management level, Black representation accounted for 27.6% which is approximately a third of their EAP which stands at 87.9%. White representation at this level accounted for 69.2% which is about five times above their EAP which is 12.1%. Female representation at this level stood at 22.5% which is approximately half of their EAP (46%). White males represented 54.6% which is seven times above their EAP (6.8%) and White female representation at 14.6% is nearly two times above their EAP (5.3%) at this level. Proportionally, Africans are the least represented at this level where they accounted for 16.3%, which is three-and-a-half times below their EAP (74.1%).
Percentage representation of senior management employees for all employers in support functions by race and gender

At the Senior Management level, Blacks represented 34.2% which is one-and-a-half times below their EAP. White representation at this level accounted for 63.6% which is about four-and-a-quarter times above their EAP. The representation of women at this level at 33.1% is a quarter below their EAP. White male representation at 42.7% is about five-and-a-quarter times above their EAP and White female representation at 20.9% is almost three times above their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans are the least represented at this level where they stood at 18.6% which is virtually four times below their EAP.

Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees for all employers in support functions by race and gender

At the Professionally Qualified level, Blacks represented 48.7% which is approximately half of their EAP. White representation at this level accounted for about 49.5% which is three times above their EAP. Female representation at this level at 42.6% is slightly below their EAP. White males represented 29.5% which is about three-and-a-quarter times above their EAP and White female representation at 20% is almost three times above their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans are the least represented at this level at 30.0% which is virtually two-and-a-quarter times below their EAP.

Percentage representation of skilled employees of all employers in support functions by race and gender

At the Skilled level, Black representation stood at 62.4% which is approximately a quarter below their EAP. White representation at 36.8% is two times above their EAP at this level. Female representation at 54.8% is about a quarter above their EAP. White male representation stood at 15.4% which is about one-and-a-quarter times above their EAP and White female representation at 21.4% is three times above their EAP at this level. Proportionally Africans are the least represented at this level where they are 41.5% which is virtually half of their EAP.

Percentage representation of non-permanent employees of all employers in support functions by race and gender

Black representation accounted for 80.4% which is almost equal to their EAP. Whites represented 18.2% which is almost a third above their EAP. Female representation at this level at 44.1% is slightly below their EAP. White male representation at 8.6% is nearly half above their EAP and White female representation at 9.6% is nearly double their EAP at this level.
4.2.5 Observations on workforce profiles

Observations are made to determine whether more progress on employment equity is being made in the government sector or in the private sector below.

**Top Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM - African male</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM - White male</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF - Indian female</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representation of employees in terms of race for government employees at this level is much closer to the EAP for the various groups when compared to the private sector. Black representation at this level is more than three times and female representation is almost one-and-a-half times in government when compared to the private sector.

**Senior Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM - African male</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM - White male</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF - Indian female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% EAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% EAP
The representation of employees in terms of race and gender for government employees at this level is much closer to the EAP of the various groups. Black representation in government at this level is nearly three times that of the private sector. African female representation is more than double that of White females in government and White female representation is about four times that of African females in the private sector.

**Professionally Qualified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportionally, Blacks and females seem to be doing much better at this level in government when considering their EAP. The same cannot be said of the private sector where White males and females continue to dominate at this level by a huge margin, particularly when one considers their EAP.

**Skilled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% EAP</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>% EAP</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportional representation of the various groups at this level appears to be reasonable for government at this level. However, much more needs to be done to increase the representation of Africans, especially African females, at this level in the private sector.

**People with disabilities**

People with disabilities accounted for nearly 0.7% of the total number of employees reported by all employers. They accounted for 0.6% of the total number of employees reported by government and 0.7% of the total number of employees reported by the private sector. Notwithstanding that people with disabilities are represented across all occupational levels, most of their representation is concentrated in the lower levels, i.e. the skilled level downwards. The population distribution of their representation in terms of race and gender highly reflects the population distribution of all employees. The most under-represented groups are Blacks and females.

**4.3 Workforce movement for all employers**

This area of the report provides information on workforce movements, i.e. recruitment and promotions for **all employers**.

**4.3.1 Recruitment in terms of race and gender for all employers**

This area of the report provides the population representation in terms of recruitments for **all employers**.
Table 11: Representation of employees recruited, including people with disabilities, by occupational level for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>3 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>6 121</td>
<td>1 544</td>
<td>1 840</td>
<td>10 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>32 065</td>
<td>7 830</td>
<td>4 860</td>
<td>25 848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>109 836</td>
<td>17 496</td>
<td>5 825</td>
<td>13 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>103 885</td>
<td>12 400</td>
<td>1 930</td>
<td>2 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>332 667</td>
<td>53 212</td>
<td>18 438</td>
<td>65 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>79 483</td>
<td>13 497</td>
<td>3 501</td>
<td>9 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>332 667</td>
<td>53 212</td>
<td>18 438</td>
<td>65 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 11 are illustrated below.
The recruitment of Whites at this level accounted for almost one-and-a-half times that of Blacks and nearly twice that of Africans. Male recruitment at this level accounted for almost three-and-a-half-times that of females, even though females are grossly under-represented at this level. The representation and recruitment of White males at this level continue to overshadow other groups by a huge margin.

Figure 17: Percentage representation of senior management employees for all employers recruited by race and gender

Senior Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Recruitment</th>
<th>% Workforce profile</th>
<th>% EAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recruitment of Whites at this level accounted for almost twice that of Blacks and nearly three times that of Africans. Recruitment of White females at this level is more than African, Coloured and Indian females combined. White male recruitment is the highest, although they dominate in terms of their representation at this level.

**Figure 18: Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees for all employers recruited by race and gender**

**Professionally Qualified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recruitment of Whites at this level is approximately one-and-a-half times that of Blacks and almost two-and-a-quarter times that of Africans at this level. Once again, the recruitment of White females is nearly equal to that of African, Coloured and Indian females combined and approximately the same when compared to African males.
Figure 19: Percentage representation of skilled employees for all employers recruited by race and gender

More recruitment opportunities accrued to Blacks at this level when compared to the top management, senior management and professionally qualified levels. Nevertheless, proportionally more White females and White males were recruited at this level than any other group in terms of race and gender.

Figure 20: Percentage representation of non-permanent employees for all employers recruited by race and gender

More recruitment opportunities accrued to Blacks at this level when compared to the top management, senior management and professionally qualified levels. Nevertheless, proportionally more White females and White males were recruited at this level than any other group in terms of race and gender.
Recruitment opportunities at the Non-permanent level mainly accrued to Blacks (i.e. Africans, Coloureds and Indians). This could be an encouraging sign only if it results in permanent employment opportunities. Male recruitment is nearly one-and-a-half times that of females at this level.

4.3.2 Promotions in terms of race and gender for all employers

This area of the report provides the population representation in terms of promotions for all employers.

Table 12: Representation of employees promoted, including people with disabilities, by occupational level for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>1 080</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced</td>
<td>5 738</td>
<td>1 429</td>
<td>1 643</td>
<td>6 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>28 549</td>
<td>6 920</td>
<td>2 830</td>
<td>10 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision</td>
<td>41 321</td>
<td>5 024</td>
<td>1 467</td>
<td>2 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>11 551</td>
<td>1 075</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>90 334</td>
<td>15 219</td>
<td>6842</td>
<td>22 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>1 907</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>90 334</td>
<td>15 219</td>
<td>6842</td>
<td>22 730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 12 are illustrated below.
**Figure 21: Percentage representation of top management employees promoted for all employers**

Top Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the promotions at this level accrued to Whites, i.e. both male and female. Proportionally the least amount of promotions accrued to African males and African females.

**Figure 22: Percentage representation of senior management employees promoted for all employers**

Senior Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet again, most of the promotions at this level accrued to Whites. Proportionally, the least amount of promotions accrued to African males and African females at this level.

Figure 23: Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees promoted for all employers

Professionally Qualified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WF - White female</td>
<td>FF - Foreign female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the promotions at this level are moving in the right direction, i.e. towards achieving equitable representation. The concern, however, is the small number of promotions for African females especially when one considers their EAP.
Figure 24: Percentage representation of skilled employees promoted for all employers

Skilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WM - White female</td>
<td>IF - Indian female</td>
<td>FM - Foreign male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promotions at this level are largely equitable. However, much more could be done to improve the aspirations of African females and Coloured females.

Figure 25: Percentage representation of non-permanent employees promoted for all employers

Non-Permanent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM - African male</th>
<th>WM - White male</th>
<th>IF - Indian female</th>
<th>FM - Foreign male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM - Coloured male</td>
<td>AF - African female</td>
<td>WM - White female</td>
<td>IF - Indian female</td>
<td>FM - Foreign male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM - Indian male</td>
<td>CF - Coloured female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The promotions at this level are encouraging and are generally prone towards the achievement of equitable representation for males only. Promotions at this level for Black females, especially Africans and Coloureds, lag far behind the other groups.

4.3.3 Observations on workforce movements

Observations are made to determine whether employers are adopting recruitment and promotion strategies to achieve their employment equity numerical goals below.

### Top Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce profile all employers</td>
<td>2 090</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1 018</td>
<td>13 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment for all employers</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion for all employers</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though Whites have always dominated at this level, their recruitment and promotion rate continues to be much higher than the other groups. The same could be said for females, particularly African and Coloured females.

### Senior Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce profile all employers</td>
<td>6 160</td>
<td>2 375</td>
<td>3 086</td>
<td>24 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment for all employers</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>3 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion for all employers</td>
<td>1 080</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high recruitment and promotion rate of Whites at this level is no different when compared to the Top Management level. More could be done to recruit and promote females at this level, especially African and Coloured females.
Whites continue to dominate in terms of representation, recruitment and promotion at this level. Males also appear to have an all-round domination at this level. More could be done for African and Coloured females at this level as it would serve as a feeder to increase their representation at the Senior and Top Management levels.

**Skilled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce profile for all employers</td>
<td>223 698</td>
<td>47 265</td>
<td>27 143</td>
<td>134 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment for all employers</td>
<td>32 065</td>
<td>7 830</td>
<td>4 860</td>
<td>25 848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion for all employers</td>
<td>28 549</td>
<td>6 920</td>
<td>2 830</td>
<td>10 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recruitment and promotions at this level are encouraging and are generally prone to equitable representation for all groups. However, more could be done for Africans.

**4.4 Skills development for all employers**

Below are tables that cover employee training information for all employers and observations are made on the data contained in them below.
4.4.1 Population representation for skills development for all employers

Table 13: Representation of employees, including for people with disabilities, and not the number of training courses attended, who received training in each occupational level for all employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational levels</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Foreign national</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2 735</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>4 273</td>
<td>1 295</td>
<td>1 513</td>
<td>10 428</td>
<td>2 913</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management</td>
<td>41 379</td>
<td>5 471</td>
<td>6 439</td>
<td>33 386</td>
<td>20 565</td>
<td>6 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>98 283</td>
<td>22 200</td>
<td>14 646</td>
<td>59 379</td>
<td>53 879</td>
<td>19 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>260 360</td>
<td>35 360</td>
<td>11 798</td>
<td>26 283</td>
<td>115 562</td>
<td>34 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>108 311</td>
<td>9 303</td>
<td>1 651</td>
<td>2 097</td>
<td>61 060</td>
<td>11 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent</td>
<td>542 157</td>
<td>78 640</td>
<td>37 376</td>
<td>137 129</td>
<td>278 837</td>
<td>78 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-permanent employees</td>
<td>28 844</td>
<td>4 811</td>
<td>1 068</td>
<td>2 821</td>
<td>24 468</td>
<td>5 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542 157</td>
<td>78 640</td>
<td>37 376</td>
<td>137 129</td>
<td>278 837</td>
<td>78 192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four occupational levels and non-permanent employees from Table 13 are illustrated below.

Percentage representation of top management employees for all employers who received training by race and gender

Blacks who received training accounted for 33.1% of all employees at the Top Management level. Black males represented 22.3% (i.e. African male 13.5%, Coloured male 3.8% and Indian male 5.0%). Black females represented 10.8% (i.e. African female 7.4%, Coloured female 1.5% and Indian female 1.9%). Whites accounted for 63.7% of all employees who received training at this level. White males accounted
for 52.2% and White females accounted for 11.5%. Foreign nationals who received training accounted for 3.1% of all employees at this level. Foreign males accounted for 2.6% and foreign females accounted for 0.5%.

**Percentage representation of senior management employees for all employers who received training by race and gender**

Blacks who received training accounted for 43.8% of all employees at the Senior Management level. Black males represented 26.5% (i.e. African male 16.0%, Coloured male 4.8% and Indian male 5.7%). Black females represented 17.3% (i.e. African female 10.9%, Coloured female 3.3% and Indian female 3.1%). Whites accounted for 55.0% of all employees who received training at this level. White males accounted for 39.0% and White females accounted for 16.0%. Foreign nationals who received training accounted for 1.3% of all employees at this level. Foreign males accounted for 1.0% and foreign females accounted for 0.3%.

**Percentage representation of professionals and middle management employees for all employers who received training by race and gender**

Blacks who received training accounted for 60.1% of all employees at the Professionally Qualified and Middle Management level. Black males represented 37.5% (i.e. African male 29.1%, Coloured male 3.9% and Indian male 4.5%). Black females represented 22.6% (i.e. African female 14.5%, Coloured female 4.4% and Indian female 3.7%). Whites accounted for 38.9% of all employees who received training at this level. White males accounted for 23.5% and White females accounted for 15.4%. Foreign nationals who received training accounted for 1.0% of all employees at this level. Foreign males accounted for 0.6% and foreign females accounted for 0.4%.

**Percentage representation of skilled employees for all employers who received training by race and gender**

Blacks who received training accounted for 67.5% of all employees at the skilled level. Black males represented 41.5% (i.e. African male 30.2%, Coloured male 6.8% and Indian male 4.5%). Black females represented 26.0% (i.e. African female 16.6%, Coloured female 6.1% and Indian female 3.3%). Whites accounted for 31.7% of all employees who received training at this level. White males accounted for 18.2% and White females accounted for 13.5%. Foreign nationals who received training accounted for 0.8% of all employees at this level. Foreign males accounted for 0.6% and foreign females accounted for 0.2%.

**Percentage representation of non-permanent employees for all employers who received training by race and gender**

Blacks who received training accounted for 91.7% of all employees at the Non-Permanent level. Black males represented 48.8% (i.e. African male 40.5%, Coloured male 6.8% and Indian male 1.5%). Black females represented 42.0% (i.e. African female 34.3%, Coloured female 7.6% and Indian female 1.0%). Whites accounted for 6.8% of all employees who received training at this level. White males accounted for 4.0% and White females accounted for 2.8%. Foreign nationals who received training accounted for 1.5% of all employees at this level. Foreign males accounted for 1.2% and foreign females accounted for 0.3%.

**Observations and remarks on skills development**

Proportionally in terms of the EAP, more White and Indians employees (i.e. both male and female) received training in the Skilled, Professionally Qualified, Senior Management and Top Management levels when compared to any other population group. In addition, more males received training in
2008 at each level than females.

The training of the Black group in the semi-skilled and unskilled levels is in line with their EAP, which is the case from year-to-year. Training received by Blacks at these levels over the years should have had more of an impact in terms of increasing their representation in the middle-to-upper levels, which is not happening. This creates the perception that Blacks, particularly African and Coloureds, are on perpetual training with very little or no hope of climbing the corporate ladder.

The Commission therefore found it necessary to include a provision in the Amended Regulations, which is due to be released in the first half of 2009, a requirement for employers to only report on training that is geared towards the achievement of their numerical goals. This type of training must be informed by the need to create a pool of suitably qualified individuals from the designated groups in order to address their under-representation in an employer’s workplace.

An extract from a speech given by the Minister of Labour, Mr Membathisi Mdladlana in Parliament on 15 May 2008

“On the 19th of October 1998, we promulgated the Employment Equity Act. Guided by the Constitution of the Republic, in this Act our purpose is to promote “equal opportunity and fair treatment in employment” and to implement “affirmative action measures to redress the disadvantages in employment experienced by designated groups”. Ten years on, research conducted by the Sociology of Work Programme at Wits University tells us that, “the hierarchy of the national labour market is still very much racialised; occupations at the lower-end and lowest end are almost exclusively filled by Black people and African women respectively, whilst the very top-end occupation has the smallest proportion of Black people and especially African people. Coloured people are clustered from middle of the range to lower end occupations whilst Indian people and White people are predominantly located in middle to high end occupations”. Black people remain at the lowest end of the labour market hierarchy. Fourteen years into our democracy, why is this still the case? The common answer to this question is that there are not enough well qualified Black people to employ.”

“Madam Speaker, we went further and asked researchers at the HSRC to help us answer this question of the disappearance or non-appearance of Black people who are qualified, in a country were the majority is Black. This disappearing act is simply too startling. We must remember that according to the Employment Equity Act of 1998, section 20 (3) describes how employees may be regarded as suitably qualified for a job. The Act regards a person as suitably qualified for a job as a result of any one, or a combination of that person’s:

• formal qualifications
• prior learning
• relevant experience
• capacity to acquire, within a reasonable time, the ability to do the job.”

“Our respected researchers have since come back to us with their findings on this disappearance of qualified Black people in South Africa. They tell us that their data “shows that there is a growing pool of designated groups that on the basis of formal post-school qualifications may be regarded as suitably qualified in terms of the provision of the EE Act”. They go further and say when looking nationally at higher education qualifications, “there appeared to be a concerted effort across all study fields to increase the rate of growth of Black graduates, and Africans in particular. Very high rates of growth in the supply of Africans and females (in certain instances) attest to that transformative imperative”. They then conclude with the assertion that, “there is very little merit in the assertion that “they [qualified Blacks and women] were not out there”.

“Simply put, Madam Speaker, we have found well qualified Black people in South Africa, they have
reappeared. Nonetheless, we went further to not only focus on formal qualifications, but also looked for qualified Black people based on prior learning, relevant experience, and capacity to acquire the ability to do the job – as per the Employment Equity Act criteria. Again, research tells us that “nearly half of the sample projected showed potential to advance, most of those with potential are currently placed in semi-skilled positions, and potential to advance is evident in all population groups, and particularly also in females”. More Black people with potential to advance in the workplace have again been found. Madam Speaker, we have stopped searching – these are not the fruits of our labour that we envisioned ten years ago.”
5. Trends analysis

This area covers employment equity trends for the three most recent reporting periods that involved both large and small employers (i.e. 2004, 2006 and 2008). It also provides trends separately for the three most reporting periods that involved only large employers (i.e. 2003, 2005 and 2007). In addition, line graphs depicting trends from 2000 to 2008 are included for the first three occupational levels.

5.1 Numbers of Employment Equity Reports received for 2004, 2006 And 2008

Employment Equity Reports were received from both large and small employers in 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008. In 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007 only large employers were required to report. Therefore, focus is placed on Employment Equity Reports received for three reporting periods when both large and small employers were expected to report, i.e. the 2004, 2006 and 2008 reporting periods.

Table 14: Number of reports received and included in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reports received</th>
<th>Reports excluded</th>
<th>Reports included in analysis</th>
<th>% Change in the number of reports analysed</th>
<th>Number of workers covered in the analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9 389</td>
<td>3 835</td>
<td>5 554</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 534 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6 876</td>
<td>2 482</td>
<td>4 394</td>
<td>-26.4%</td>
<td>1 641 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10 580</td>
<td>3 351</td>
<td>7 229</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>2 977 862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows a decrease in the number of reports received and the number of employees covered from 2004 to 2006. An increase is however recorded for the number of reports received and the number of employees covered from 2006 to 2008. A number of factors may attribute for these variations: mergers, closure/liquidations and consolidations, changes in designated status, etc. It is clear to the Commission that over and above these factors a number of employers have stopped submitting reports.

A promising feature towards reaching a paperless work environment for the Commission was the increase in the number of employers who reported online in 2008. In 2006 when both large and small employers reported, 338 employers reported online. In 2008, 3 977 employers reported online, which represented an increase of approximately 1 000%.

5.2 Trends from 2000 to 2008

Line graphs depicting the race and gender representation trends for the Top Management, Senior Management and Professionally Qualified levels are provided in Figure 26.
The line graph above depicts a very disturbing trend at the Top Management level from 2000 to 2008. Although White male representation dropped slightly over the years, they continue to dominate by a large margin when compared to any other group in terms of race and gender at this level. No other group in terms of race and gender came even close to exceeding 20%, whereas White male representation appeared to have hung around 60% to 70% at this level over the years. The slight drop in representation appears to have mainly benefited African males, Indian males and White females.
White male representation appears to have hovered around the 50% to 60% mark at the Senior Management level from 2000 to 2008. Just like the Top Management level, the small drop in White male representation over the years appear to have mostly benefited African males and Indian males. White female representation at this level seemed to have lingered around the 10% to 20% mark over the years, while at the same time no other group exceeded the 10% representation at this level.
Apart from White male representation at this level spiking to around 50% and 60% in 2002 and 2005 respectively, their representation remained at around 35% to 40% over the years. At the same time, White female representation continued to linger around the 15% to 20% mark. African representation spiked to about 20% until around 2005, which thereafter hovered around the 10% mark. The trend is very disturbing because the small pool of designated groups represented at this level also impedes their movement into the Senior Management and Top Management levels.
6. Income differential in terms of race and gender for all employers

6.1 Study on population and income group

A research report published by the Bureau of Market Research (BMR) at the University of South Africa (UNISA) in 2008 covered income streams for each population group according to various income categories. The percentage distribution for each population group in terms of income earned for each income category is captured in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Percentage of population (16+ years) by population and income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>R0-R50K</th>
<th>R50K-100K</th>
<th>R100K-300K</th>
<th>R300K-500K</th>
<th>R500K-750K</th>
<th>R750K+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africans</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloureds</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 shows that the proportion of Whites and Indians who earned more than R100K in the 2007/08 financial year far exceeds that of any other group. At the same time, the table shows that the proportion of Africans and Coloureds who earned within the range of R0K to R50K is much larger than any other group (i.e. 83.2% and 70.8% respectively).

6.2 Income differential in terms of race and gender for all employers

This area of the report covers data received from employers on remuneration contained in the EEA4 forms submitted to the Department of Labour by employers in 2008. The average has been calculated by taking the total remuneration of a particular group and dividing it by the number of people in that group in terms of race and gender and occupational level. The figures were then rounded to the nearest R 1 000 (k=000) and included in the appropriate cells in Table 6.2.
The data received from employers in their Income Differential Statement confirms the income trends in terms of the various population groups depicted in the research report published by the Bureau of Market Research (BMR) at the University of South Africa (UNISA) in the previous table. The incomes depicted in Table 6.2, however, do not confirm the incomes depicted in the previous table because the quality of data provided by some employers are highly questionable. The Department found that many employers did not, amongst other things, provide data as required by the Regulations – they did not round figures to the nearest rand or even provide accurate data. Some were even reluctant to complete the EEA4 forms accurately, which is in breach of the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational level</th>
<th>For level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of employees</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>21 964</td>
<td>2 402</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 1 340k</td>
<td>R 997k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>6 336</td>
<td>2 378</td>
<td>3 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 1 791k</td>
<td>R 4 196k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally qualified and middle management</td>
<td>33 621</td>
<td>9 724</td>
<td>11 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 691k</td>
<td>R 507k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled technical and lower management</td>
<td>229 467</td>
<td>48 339</td>
<td>27 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 221k</td>
<td>R 180k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making</td>
<td>565 729</td>
<td>75 798</td>
<td>24 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 145k</td>
<td>R 169k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and defined decision making</td>
<td>379 934</td>
<td>36 843</td>
<td>5 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average remuneration</td>
<td>R 60k</td>
<td>R 66k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Income differentials in terms of race and gender

The data, despite it being questionable, does confirm that Whites and Indians on average generally tend to earn the highest amounts at nearly every level and Africans and Coloureds on average generally tend to earn the lowest at nearly every level.
7. General observations and concluding remarks

White males continue to dominate the top echelons in the private sector followed by White females and the Indian population. Africans and Coloureds continue to languish at the bottom with a few Africans sprinkling on top. Data also shows that even in the disability group White people are still being disproportionately preferred.

Had the private sector been reported exclusively, the picture as painted in the paragraph above would have been looking far worse. The inclusion of the State Owned Enterprises data positively influenced the final result. This misrepresentation will not be repeated in the next report.

A striking revelation on Table 3 is data that shows that Africans constitute the majority in the professionally qualified and skilled category; however this majority is not carried through proportionately to the higher levels. Needless to mention that this anomaly fuels the claims from certain segments of the society that believe that racism is still reigning supreme and is the biggest factor that continue to deny Africans and Coloureds their deserved positions in the corporate world. It is also worth noting that Table 3 constitutes an independent confirmation of the 2008 HSRC research on skills supply that had a telling concluding statement, “there is very little merit in the assertion that “they [qualified Blacks and females] were not out there”.”

For the first time this year, government departments were reported separately. Contrary to the pre-election claims that the so-called minority groups (Whites, Indians and Coloureds) were underrepresented, data shows that in fact these groups either approximate or exceed their EAP representation at senior and top levels in government. Government should now focus its attention more to the qualitative aspects to ensure true and sustainable empowerment.

The plethora of transformation charters continue to cause a distraction in the implementation of this Act. Companies continue to worship the immeasurable spirit of the law over the measurable letter of the law, resulting in the lack of demonstrable and tangible transformation beyond statements of intent and strategic plans.

Key recommendations

- Greater collaboration between the Commission with the relevant Chapter 9 institutions to consolidate the messaging
- Greater collaboration with NEDLAC social partners, especially big business
- Zero tolerance on defaulting companies which MUST result in prosecution
- Government MUST exercise the power in its disposal as per section 53 of the EE Act
- The fines must be escalated to 10% of turnover similar to the Competitions Commission
- Name and Shame in 2009/10 to target companies in breach individually rather than grouping the offenders and by default providing “safety in numbers” cushion
- Name and Praise for companies that show compliance with both procedural and substantive
aspects of the law.

The continued exclusion of “people of colour” in the mainstream US economy, despite them being a minority, is testimony that markets on their own are incapable of transforming society. The legislative enforcement of the Employment Equity Act is still the ONLY viable option to rationally democratise the economic emancipation of our people.
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