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## GLOSSARY

| COMMISSION | Means the Commission for Employment Equity (CEE) |
| :---: | :---: |
| DEPARTMENT | Means the Department of Labour |
| DG | Means the Director-General of the Department of Labour |
| DESIGNATED GROUPS | Mean Black people (i.e. Africans, Coloureds and Indians), women and people with disabilities who are natural persons and: <br> - Are citizens of the Republic of South Africa by birth or descent <br> - Are citizens of the Republic of South Africa by naturalisation before the commencement date (i.e. 27 April 1994) of the interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act of 1993 <br> - Became citizens of the Republic of South Africa from the commencement date of the interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act of 1993, but who, not for Apartheid policy that had been in place prior to that date, would have been entitled to acquire citizenship by naturalisation prior to that date |
| FOREIGN NATIONALS | Mean those natural persons who are not citizens, or are those who received their citizenship after 26 April 1994 and their descendants |
| SMALL EMPLOYERS | Mean those designated employers who employ fewer than 150 employees |
| LARGE EMPLOYERS | Mean those designated employers who employ 150 or more employees |
| EAP | Means the Economically Active Population (EAP) which includes people from |
|  | 15 to 64 years of age who are either employed or unemployed and seeking employment |
| NEDLAC | Means National Economic Development and Labour Council |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |

## MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION FOR EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Members of the Commission for Employment Equity are appointed according to section 29 (1) of the Act, which includes the appointment of a Chairperson and eight members nominated by NEDLAC, i.e. two representatives of each from the State, Organised Business, Organised Labour and Community.

Members of the CEE are as follows:
Mpho Nkeli Chairperson



## INTRODUCTION

This report reflects on the status of employment equity in the country covering the period from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012 and which is submitted to the Minister by the Commission for Employment Equity (CEE) in terms of Section 33. The CEE set out the following key strategic objectives for its tenure of five years:

- Reviewing of the Employment Equity Act (the Act) in order to strengthen the achievement of its objectives
- Reviewing of the EE regulations to align them with the amended Act
- Raising awareness and conducting advocacy programmes on legislative changes and their implications
- Reviewing of the Code of Good Practice on HIV in the Workplace and its Technical Assistance Guidelines to align it with the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) recommendations of June 2010
- Reviewing of the Code of Good Practice on People with Disabilities and Employment as well as the Technical Assistance Guidelines (TAG) to bring them in line with any new developments, including the UN Convention on Disability of 2007
- Promoting the principle of 'Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value' in terms of ILO Convention 100
- Engaging in and improving on collaboration with Chapter 9 Institutions and other stakeholders
- Monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the Act and advising the Minister accordingly.

This report covers highlights for the stated period, the Economically Active Population (EAP) workforce distribution, a trends analysis of information contained in reports received in 2011 for each of the four upper occupational levels i.e. Top Management, Senior Management, Professionally Qualified and Skilled Technical. The report also concludes with observations and remarks by the Commission.

Employers with 150 or more employees (i.e. large employers) are required to submit reports to the Department on an annual basis and employers with fewer than 150 employees (i.e. small employers) are expected to submit reports to the Department of labour every two years. This report therefore only addresses information received from large employers and the trends analysis only focuses on large employers as well.

Furthermore, this report also provides for the analysis of the four upper levels separately for each of the provinces, business types and sectors as defined in Schedule 4 of the Act.
$\square$
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# HIGHLIGHTS FOR THE PERIOD 

## The highlights captured below cover key activities of the CEE in its endeavour to execute its mandate.

### 2.1 Amendments to the Act

The amending of the Employment Equity Act (the Act) is currently being deliberated at the National Economic and Labour Council (NEDLAC). NEDLAC has three main constituencies, namely Organised Business, Organised Labour and Government, and is a forum for deliberation and negotiation on proposed legislation prior to it reaching Parliament. From time-to-time and in certain Chambers, Community is nominated by NEDLAC and is represented as the fourth constituency on the Commission for Employment Equity (CEE).

Amendments to the Employment Equity Act are not done in isolation, but together with and in context of other labour legislation. It is unlikely to reach conclusion unless constituencies are able to reach some sort of common ground. Key proposed amendments to the Employment Equity Act relate to its administration, improving compliance and enforcement. A vital concern is that the longer the amendments take to reach a conclusion, the greater the prejudice will be in respect of the achievement of the objectives of the Act. Notwithstanding the delays, democracy is clearly at work and due process needs to be followed.

### 2.2 Collaboration with stakeholders

Stakeholder collaboration is one of the most vital ingredients to empower any nation and to build human capital. Transformation requires extra effort in the input, throughput and output processes to be sustainable, which is why education, training and experiential learning are so important. Employment equity therefore cannot work in isolation, it has to be viewed and deliberated upon in context of, amongst others, the Nationals Skills Development Strategy, National Plan 2030 and Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment.

### 2.2.1 Portfolio Committee on Labour

A request was received from Parliament from for the CEE to present its $11^{\text {th }}$ CEE Annual Report to Portfolio Committee (PCL) on Labour on 24 October 2011. After presenting the report, deliberations followed with members of the PCL and the following matters were raised:

- Concerns relating to the slow progress or the lack of it pertaining to increasing the representation of people with disabilities in the workforce
- More interventions were required to remove the glass ceiling in order to increase the representation of women at particularly the Senior Management and Top Management levels
- In addition to more sector data, separate data is required in the next report on provinces, Government versus private sector, Parastatals and educational institutions.

Attempts have been made by the CEE to give effect to these matters.

### 2.2.2 National Planning Commission

The National Planning Commission (NPC) invited the Commission for Employment Equity (CEE) to a meeting on 1 February 2012 in its endeavour to reach out and consult with those who are directly involved with transformation policy and legislation. The main aim of the meeting was to gather input on their draft National Development Plan (NDP), which encompasses a vision for South Africa with a number of goals until 2030. Other stakeholders that participated in this forum included the National Economic Forum (NEF), the BBBEE Council and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). Some of the areas covered by the CEE included:

- Progress is being made in increasing the representation of the designated groups, but at a very slow pace
- A need exists for employers to adopt strategies to especially increase the representation levels of African and Coloured women as well as people with disabilities in their workforces
- Most if not all employers who are defined as Qualifying Small Enterprises, when offered the choice in terms of the 7 elements on the BBBEE Scorecard for verification purposes, were likely to forgo employment equity when deciding optimum scoring strategies.

The CEE is convinced that better coordination and consultation can only enrich the transformation process if it leads to action and delivery.

### 2.3 EE Road shows 2011

Road shows were conducted in all nine provinces of the country. The main aim of the road shows was to gather public comments on the Revised Draft Code of Good Practice on HIV and AIDS and the World of Work (the Code) and the promotion of accurate reporting and online reporting.

South Africa embarked on the process of reviewing its Code of Good Practice on Key Aspects of HIV and Aids and Employment. The aim of this review was informed by the ILO Recommendations on HIV and AIDS and the World of Work, including broadening the scope for access to include all those involved in the world of work, alignment of terminology and, amongst others, providing for policies and programmes to address tuberculosis as a co-infection to HIV. People that were targeted for these road shows included:

- Chief Executive Officers and Managing Directors
- Heads of Departments
- Assigned EE Managers
- Organised Business and Employers
- Organised Labour and Employees
- HR Executives and Practitioners
- Public Service employers and employees
- Academics
- Community Constituencies.

Comments received during the road shows were collated, considered and incorporated into the Code in preparation for the NEDLAC process. The social partners and all stakeholders in general must be thanked for their active participation during the road shows as their inputs contributed towards enriching the Code and, at the same time, contributing towards improving on how employers report to the Department.

### 2.4 Review and Amendment of HIV/AIDS Codes of Good Practice and Technical Assistance Guidelines (TAG)

The reviewing of the Code to bring it in line with ILO Recommendation 100 reached finality towards the end of March 2012. The Minister has been advised of its contents and upon her consideration and approval it is due to be Gazetted and published in the 2012/2013 financial year.

The reviewing of the HIV and AIDS Technical Assistance Guidelines (TAG) in the World of Work took place almost concurrently with the review of the Code. Both these documents were developed in conjunction and in consultation with the ILO, Organised Labour, Organised Business, Community and Government and are due to be rolled out towards the middle of 2012.

The main aim of the Code is to support world of work policies and programmes on HIV and AIDS in terms of key legislative requirements and good practice. The objective of the TAG is to guide employers along practical steps that should be taken in order to implement the Code.

### 2.5 DG Reviews

One hundred and sixteen (116) companies were reviewed from the 2006/2007 financial year in terms of Sections 43,44 and 45 . These Sections of the Act empower the Director-General (DG) of the Department of Labour to assess whether 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.

Observations made during the DG Review process had shown that none of these companies were anywhere close to fully complying with the Employment Equity Act. Recommendations were provided to employers and new employment equity plans that were prepared by them and aligned to the requirements of the Act, section 20, were approved by the Director-General.

As part of the Department's monitoring mechanisms, sixteen of these companies were followed-up in 2011/2012 financial year to gauge how these employers were progressing against the objectives they committed themselves to in their employment equity plan approved by the Director-General. None of these companies are able to say that they have equitable workplaces in terms of race, gender and disability that truly reflect the EAP of their respective population groupings. However, the following companies either came close to or achieved or surpassed most of the goals and objectives they set for themselves in the plan that was approved by the Director-General.

- Nedcor Bank Limited (Finance)
- Express Air Services (Pty) Ltd trading as Bidair Cargo (Transport)
- Rennies Ships Agency (Pty) Ltd (Transport)
- Kolok (Pty) Ltd (Technology)
- Woolworths (Pty) Ltd (Retail)
- Albany Bakeries - Tiger Consumer Brands Ltd
- King Foods - Tiger Consumer Brands Ltd.

The companies mentioned above were generally progressing well towards achieving race and gender equity at their workplaces. Some of these companies seem to be progressing reasonably well on employing people with disabilities when compared to other companies going through the same process. Nedbank have improved their representation of people with disabilities, from very few people in their employ at the beginning of the DG Review process to the $2 \%$ representation mark for people with disabilities. The achievements of these companies can largely be attributed to management's commitment to transforming their workplaces. If all employers were to emulate the strategies of these companies, South Africa is likely to gain from a diverse, tolerant and peaceful workforce in the not so distant future. The Department of Labour will continue with its programme to follow-up on the remainder of the companies.

## WORKFORCE DISTRIBUTION

The workforce population distribution is based on the Quarterly Labour Force Survey published by Statistics South Africa on the Economically Active Population (EAP). The EAP includes people from 15 to 64 years of age who are either employed or unemployed and who are seeking employment. The EAP is meant to provide guidance to employers in order to assist them in determining the resource allocation and subsequent interventions that are needed to achieve an equitable and representative workforce.

Table 1: Profile of the national EAP by race and gender

| Male |  |  | Economically Active Population (EAP) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| AM | African male | $40.3 \%$ |  |  |  |
| CM | Coloured male | $5.9 \%$ |  |  |  |
| IM | Indian male | $1.8 \%$ |  |  |  |
| WM | White male | AF | African female | $33.8 \%$ |  |
| FM | Foreign male | $6.6 \%$ |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | $0 \%$ | CF | Coloured female | $5.2 \%$ |  |
|  | IF | Indian female | $1.1 \%$ |  |  |
|  | WF | White female | $5.3 \%$ |  |  |

Source: Statistics South Africa, September 2011 QLFS

The national demographics of the Economically Active Population (EAP) are illustrated in Table 1 by race and gender, together with the EAP by province set out in Table 2. This information is provided to employers for the setting of employment equity numerical goals and targets in their Employment Equity Plans.

Table 2: Profile of the EAP by race and gender per province

| Province | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W |  |
| Western Cape | 17.3\% | 27.5\% | 0.2\% | 8.2\% | 14.3\% | 25.0\% | 0.1\% | 7.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Eastern Cape | 36.9\% | 8.5\% | 0.3\% | 6.3\% | 36.2\% | 6.5\% | 0.1\% | 5.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Northern Cape | 28.9\% | 22.5\% | 0.0\% | 5.4\% | 20.2\% | 18.3\% | 0.0\% | 4.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Free State | 49.2\% | 1.4\% | 0.1\% | 6.9\% | 36.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 100.0\% |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 42.4\% | 0.6\% | 6.5\% | 3.8\% | 38.5\% | 0.6\% | 4.4\% | 3.2\% | 100.0\% |
| North West | 53.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 6.5\% | 34.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 4.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Gauteng | 42.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.8\% | 9.0\% | 34.7\% | 1.8\% | 1.0\% | 7.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Mpumalanga | 48.1\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 5.4\% | 41.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 3.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Limpopo | 51.5\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 1.9\% | 45.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 1.1\% | 100.0\% |

Source: Statistics South Africa, September 2011 QLFS

Table 2 shows the EAP distribution per province in terms of race and gender. Except for the Western Cape, Africans are in the majority in eight of the nine provinces. All employee statistics in graphs and tables that follow should be viewed in relation to the national and provincial EAP both in terms of race and gender.

## EMPLOYMENT EQQUITY VALUE CHAIN



KEY INPUTS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO CHANGING THE PROFILE OF THE WORKPLACE

## ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY REPORTS RECEIVED IN 2011

This section of the report reflects on the extent of reporting by employers for 2007, 2009 and 2011 in relation to workforce profiles, workforce movement and skills development in terms of race, gender and disability. A trends analysis of the four upper occupational levels, i.e. Top Management, Senior Management, Professionally Qualified and Skilled levels, are provided below in terms of race and gender as well. Tables supporting the information reflected in this report are contained in Appendix A.

### 5.1 Extent of reporting

There has been a progressive increase in the number of reports received from employers and the number of reports that are fully and accurately completed since the tightening of the regulations. Table 3 outlines reporting information for large employers only for 2007, 2009 and 2011. Large employers are required to report every year and small employers are required to submit a report every two years, i.e. every year that ends with an even number.

Table 3: Employment Equity reports received and analysed

| YEAR | REPORTS RECEIVED | REPORTS EXCLUDED | REPORTS INCLUDED IN ANALYSIS | \% REPORTS FOR ANALYSIS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 2858 | 1365 | 1493 | $52.2 \%$ |
| 2009 | 3695 | 326 | 3369 | $91.1 \%$ |
| 2011 | 4492 | 122 | 4370 | $97.3 \%$ |

In 2011, 4492 reports were received and 4370 reports were analysed, which amounts to $97.3 \%$ of these reports being included in the analysis. More than $90 \%$ of these reports were submitted on-line and this dramatically improved the accuracy of reports received. The accuracy rate has also been gradually increasing since the introduction of a provision in the regulations that deem employers who do not fully and accurately report to have not reported at all in terms of the Act.

### 5.2 Workforce profile, movement and skills development in terms of race, gender and disability

This part of the report provides the employee population distribution in terms of race, gender and disability for the first four occupational levels. It also provides an insight into movements in the workplace pertaining to recruitment, promotions, terminations and skills development for the period. Illustrations are done using graphs and tables to reflect on workforce profiles, movements, sector information and trends from 2007 to 2011. Information on provinces and the various business types are also included below, with All Government representing the aggregated total of national, provincial and local Governments as a business type.

### 5.2.1 TOP MANAGEMENT LEVEL IN TERMS OF RACE AND GENDER

Figure 1: Workforce profile at the top management level by race and gender


Figure 1 shows that Whites still dominate with $65.4 \%$ at the Top Management Level, which is nearly six times their EAP and approximately double the representation of the sum of all Blacks at this level. Male representation is almost double that of their EAP and nearly four times that of women at this level. The representation of people with disabilities reflects reasonable progress when compared to other occupational levels - this could be due to the low numbers of people who are employed at this level in the workforce as a whole.

Table 4: People with disabilities in terms of race and gender at the Top Management level

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | I | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 103 | 7 | 26 | 170 | 25 | 6 | 5 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 377 |
|  | $27.3 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $45.1 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 4 shows that within the disability group, Whites dominate almost by the same margin as the general workforce at this level - male representation also dominates at this level, which is similar to the general workforce.

Table 5: Workforce profiles and movements at the Top Management level in terms of race and gender

| Workforce Movements | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Workforce profile for all employers | 2515 | 642 | 1146 | 10679 | 1060 | 285 | 303 | 1970 | 673 | 79 | 19352 |
|  | 13.0\% | 3.3\% | 5.9\% | 55.2\% | 5.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.6\% | 10.2\% | 3.5\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Recruitment for all employers | 346 | 67 | 94 | 673 | 183 | 28 | 31 | 155 | 109 | 11 | 1697 |
|  | 20.4\% | 3.9\% | 5.5\% | 39.7\% | 10.8\% | 1.6\% | 1.8\% | 9.1\% | 6.4\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Promotion for all employers | 159 | 68 | 87 | 537 | 58 | 34 | 31 | 157 | 23 | 1 | 1155 |
|  | 13.8\% | 5.9\% | 7.5\% | 46.5\% | 5.0\% | 2.9\% | 2.7\% | 13.6\% | 2.0\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Termination for all employers | 366 | 64 | 85 | 928 | 168 | 38 | 31 | 180 | 98 | 7 | 1965 |
|  | 18.6\% | 3.3\% | 4.3\% | 47.2\% | 8.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.6\% | 9.2\% | 5.0\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Skills development for all employers | 904 | 282 | 348 | 2729 | 422 | 126 | 128 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 5639 |
|  | 16.0\% | 5.0\% | 6.2\% | 48.4\% | 7.5\% | 2.2\% | 2.3\% | 12.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100.0\% |

Table 5 above shows that Whites and males still dominate in terms of representation at this level. This scenario is likely to remain as long as Whites continue to dominate most opportunities pertaining to recruitment and promotion. In 2011, of the 1155 promotion and 1697 recruitment opportunities, $60.4 \%$ of promotions and $48.8 \%$ of recruitments accrued to Whites respectively. At the same time, Whites accounted for $56.4 \%$ of all terminations and $60.8 \%$ of skills development opportunities at this level. If employers continue with their current recruitment and promotion practices, it is unlikely that reasonable progress will be made at this level, as Whites dominated the recruitment, promotion and skills development opportunities, despite accounting for most of the terminations in 2011.

Table 6: Industry Sector workforce profile at the Top Management level by race and gender

| Sectors | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |

Table 6 shows that the Community/Social/Personal Services were making the best progress at this level both in terms of race and gender. The Agriculture sector appears to be making the least amount of progress in terms of race and gender at this level followed by Manufacturing sector.

Table 7: Workforce profile percentage at the Top Management level by race and gender per Province

| Province | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 2.7\% | 65.1\% | 1.1\% | 3.9\% | 1.0\% | 12.1\% | 2.2\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Eastern Cape | 18.6\% | 4.5\% | 2.9\% | 55.7\% | 5.4\% | 1.2\% | 0.5\% | 7.5\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Northern Cape | 23.0\% | 11.7\% | 1.2\% | 38.5\% | 16.3\% | 3.9\% | 0.4\% | 4.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Free State | 25.8\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 45.4\% | 12.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 13.4\% | 1.5\% | 14.5\% | 51.8\% | 5.2\% | 0.6\% | 3.6\% | 7.2\% | 1.9\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| North West | 27.1\% | 1.0\% | 1.7\% | 47.9\% | 10.4\% | 0.3\% | 1.4\% | 8.7\% | 1.0\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Gauteng | 12.5\% | 2.5\% | 5.9\% | 54.7\% | 5.4\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 11.0\% | 4.7\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Mpumalanga | 23.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.6\% | 54.5\% | 9.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 7.8\% | 1.4\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Limpopo | 31.6\% | 0.6\% | 4.0\% | 40.5\% | 17.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 4.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |

According to the Table 7, Limpopo appears to be making the most progress at this level in terms of race and the Northern Cape appears to be progressing well in terms of race and gender representation. Western Cape appears to be making the least progress in terms of both race and gender at this level.

Table 8: Workforce profile percentage at the Top Management level for PRIVATE SECTOR, per Province by race and gender

| Private Sector <br> by Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |  |  |
| Western Cape | $3.4 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $67.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Eastern Cape | $8.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $69.5 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Northern Cape | $9.2 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $69.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Free State | $11.0 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $67.8 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $6.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| North West | $14.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $63.9 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Gauteng | $9.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Mpumalanga | $15.1 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Limpopo | $13.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |

The most progressive province at this level in terms of race according to Table 8 is Mpumalanga and the Western Cape is most progressive when it comes to the representation of women. Western Cape is the least progressive in terms of race and KwaZulu Natal the least progressive in terms of gender.

Table 9: Workforce profile at the Top Management level for GOVERNMENT, per Province by race and gender

| Government By <br> Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $11.2 \%$ | $36.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $34.7 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $54.5 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $27.7 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $51.5 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $34.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $45.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $48.8 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $43.9 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $71.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $55.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 9 above shows that the only province that is progressing badly in terms of race and gender in Government is the Western Cape. Although the Western Cape appears to be the least progressive province at this level in terms of gender, White females were over represented in the Western Cape.

Table 10: Workforce profile at the Top Management level by race and gender per BUSINESS TYPE -
(Please note All Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local Governments)

| Business Type | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |  |
| All Employers | $13.0 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $55.2 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| All Government | $45.4 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $23.6 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| National <br> Government | $43.1 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Provincial <br> Government | $48.3 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Local Government | $45.3 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Private Sector | $8.1 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $61.7 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Non-Profit <br> Organisation | $41.9 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Parastatal | $32.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Educational <br> Institution | $27.1 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |

According to the Table 10 above, Government is performing much better than all the other Business Types at this level. It is very evident from the information provided above that White dominance in the Private Sector outweighs all other Business Types at this level.

Figure 2. Trisends for the Top Management level from 2007 to 2011 by race


Figure 2 shows the dominance of White representation at this level in that it has stood at above $60 \%$ from 2007 to 2011. Real progress towards increasing the representation of especially Africans and Coloureds at this level is critical if any form of equity is to be reached. The only race group, apart from Whites, that is doing well at this level are Indians.

Figure 3: Trends for the Top Management level from 2007 to 2011 by gender


Figures 3 shows that male representation at approximately $80 \%$ and female representation at approximately $20 \%$ has remained pretty flat over the past four years. Increasing the representation of women at this level should be made a priority by most employers.

### 5.2.2 SENIOR LEVEL MANAGEMENT LEVEL IN TERMS OF RACE AND GENDER

Figure 4: Workforce profile at the Senior Management level by race and gender


Figure 4 shows that White representation is almost $60 \%$ and about five times their EAP. The representation of males is nearly one-and-a-half-times their EAP when compared to the representation of women at this level. Indians are also three times their EAP at this level. The representation of people with disabilities at $1.2 \%$ is also higher than at the middle occupational levels, which could also be due to the low numbers of people who are employed at this level.

Table 11: People with disabilities in terms of race and gender at the Senior Management level

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | I | W | Male | Female |  |
| Senior Management | 122 | 33 | 39 | 407 | 59 | 16 | 19 | 121 | 15 | 2 | 833 |
|  | $14.6 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $48.9 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 11 shows Whites and males with disabilities also dominate at the Senior Management level, which is similar to the general workforce at this level as well. Africans, followed by Coloureds, are the most under-represented group at this level

Table 12: Workforce profile and movements at the Senior Management level in terms of race and gender

| Workforce Movements | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Workforce profile for all employers | 10353 | 3296 | 4837 | 31332 | 5224 | 1702 | 1985 | 10877 | 1456 | 353 | 71415 |
|  | 14.5\% | 4.6\% | 6.8\% | 43.9\% | 7.3\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 15.2\% | 2.0\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Recruitment for all employers | 1316 | 350 | 492 | 3133 | 795 | 171 | 254 | 1116 | 247 | 53 | 7927 |
|  | 16.6\% | 4.4\% | 6.2\% | 39.5\% | 10.0\% | 2.2\% | 3.2\% | 14.1\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Promotion for all employers | 1449 | 425 | 678 | 2335 | 801 | 227 | 356 | 1213 | 224 | 60 | 7768 |
|  | 18.7\% | 5.5\% | 8.7\% | 30.1\% | 10.3\% | 2.9\% | 4.6\% | 15.6\% | 2.9\% | 0.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Termination for all employers | 1234 | 354 | 512 | 4175 | 606 | 168 | 224 | 1434 | 296 | 84 | 9087 |
|  | 13.6\% | 3.9\% | 5.6\% | 45.9\% | 6.7\% | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 15.8\% | 3.3\% | 0.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Skills development | 5700 | 1655 | 2113 | 11530 | 2828 | 892 | 1003 | 4847 | 0 | 0 | 30568 |
|  | 18.6\% | 5.4\% | 6.9\% | 37.7\% | 9.3\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 15.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100.0\% |

Table 12 above reflects that Whites and males are still dominating in terms of representation at this level. This scenario is likely to remain as long as Whites continue to dominate opportunities pertaining to recruitment, promotion and skills development opportunities. In 2011, of the 7768 promotion and 7927 recruitment opportunities, $45.6 \%$ of promotions and $53.6 \%$ of recruitments accrued to Whites respectively.

Table 13: INDUSTRY SECTOR workforce profile at the Senior Management level by race and gender

| Sectors | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |

Table 13 shows that the least progressive sector was Mining in terms of race and gender at this level. The Community/Social/Personal Services sector appear to have been making the most progress when compared to other sectors in terms of race and gender at this level. White women representation is dominant over the representation of Black women across most sectors, which is a major concern.

Table 14: Workforce profile at the Senior Management level by race and gender per Province

| Province | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | 6.0\% | 11.2\% | 3.9\% | 47.9\% | 2.7\% | 6.4\% | 1.7\% | 18.1\% | 1.7\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Eastern Cape | 20.9\% | 6.6\% | 2.1\% | 42.4\% | 12.6\% | 2.0\% | 0.8\% | 10.4\% | 2.0\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Northern Cape | 21.3\% | 12.7\% | 0.7\% | 39.6\% | 7.2\% | 5.9\% | 0.8\% | 11.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Free State | 25.8\% | 2.6\% | 0.8\% | 42.3\% | 11.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.2\% | 14.9\% | 1.1\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 13.6\% | 2.8\% | 17.2\% | 39.0\% | 5.7\% | 1.9\% | 6.7\% | 11.4\% | 1.6\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| North West | 30.4\% | 2.2\% | 1.7\% | 39.7\% | 13.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 10.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Gauteng | 13.9\% | 3.6\% | 6.8\% | 44.6\% | 7.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.9\% | 16.0\% | 2.4\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Mpumalanga | 29.3\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 44.1\% | 11.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 11.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Limpopo | 47.5\% | 0.6\% | 1.8\% | 19.4\% | 22.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 6.6\% | 0.9\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |

Table 14 shows Limpopo province as the most progressive in terms of both race and gender. The least progressive province in terms of race and gender still appears to be the Western Cape.

Table 15: Workforce profile at the Senior Management level for PRIVATE SECTOR, per Province by race and gender

| Private Sector <br> by Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $5.6 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $49.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $10.1 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $57.4 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $12.6 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $8.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $8.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $41.8 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $13.4 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $9.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $20.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $27.7 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $41.4 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 15 shows that the Limpopo province is the most progressive in terms of race. The least progressive province in terms of race was the Western Cape. The representation of Black females remains a concern across all provinces at this level.

Table 16: Workforce profile at the Senior Management level for GOVERNMENT, per Province by race and gender

| Government by <br> province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $11.5 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $45.3 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $32.0 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $48.4 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $36.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $52.7 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $35.3 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $22.9 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $58.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $26.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $58.5 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $30.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 16 shows that Government in 8 provinces, except for the Western Cape, was performing well in terms of race at this level. Government in the Western Cape is also struggling to increase the representation of women at this level, except for White females that were well represented at this level in the Western Cape.

Table 17: Workforce profile at the Senior Management level by race and gender per Business Type (Please note All Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local Governments)

| Businesses type | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| All Employers | $14.5 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $43.9 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| All Government | $38.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| National <br> Government | $34.5 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Provincial <br> Government | $45.6 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Local Government | $39.9 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Private Sector | $9.4 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $50.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Non-Profit <br> Organisation | $28.6 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Parastatal | $24.4 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Educational <br> Institution | $24.9 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $24.8 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 17 shows Government outperforming the private sector in terms of race and gender. The data contained in Table 17 also shows White dominance at Educational Institutions, where White females surpass the representation of Black females by a huge margin.

Figure 5: Population distribution trends for the Senior Management level from 2007 to 2011


Figure 5 shows that Black representation was gradually increasing though at a very slow pace at this level. White representation remains around $60 \%$ and has been decreasing at a very slow pace at this level from 2007 to 2001.

Figure 6: Population distribution trends for the Senior Management level from 2007 to 2011
SENIOR MANAGEMENT - GENDER


Figure 6 shows the slight increase in female representation correlating to the decrease in male representation. The CEE is concerned that if women are struggling to break through the glass ceiling at this level, how much more difficult it will be at the Top Management level.

### 5.2.3 PROFESSIONALLY QUALIFIED IN TERMS OF RACE AND GENDER

Figure 7: Workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level by race and gender


Figure 7 reflects good progress at this level in terms of race and gender. White representation is about three-and-a-half times their EAP while males are slightly below their EAP at this level. It also shows that as the workforce increases in the middle-to-lower levels, the percentage representation of people with disabilities decreases - this could be due to more people being employed at these levels.

Table 18: People with disabilities in terms of race and gender at the Professionally Qualified level

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Professionally qualified level | 632 | 173 | 184 | 1434 | 525 | 122 | 88 | 612 | 27 | 12 | 3809 |
|  | 16.6\% | 4.5\% | 4.8\% | 37.6\% | 13.8\% | 3.2\% | 2.3\% | 16.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |

Table 18 shows that Whites and males with disabilities were also dominating at the Professionally Qualified level, which is similar to the general workforce at this level. Africans, followed by Coloureds, both males and females are the most under-represented groups at this level.

Table 19: Workforce profile and movements at the Professionally Qualified level

| Workforce Movements | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Workforce profile for all employers | 70055 | 19970 | 19842 | 97817 | 64892 | 17965 | 13864 | 59097 | 5714 | 2153 | 371369 |
|  | 18.9\% | 5.4\% | 5.3\% | 26.3\% | 17.5\% | 4.8\% | 3.7\% | 15.9\% | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Recruitment for all employers | 7559 | 1987 | 2279 | 10819 | 6577 | 1694 | 1873 | 6589 | 1075 | 452 | 40904 |
|  | 18.5\% | 4.9\% | 5.6\% | 26.4\% | 16.1\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% | 16.1\% | 2.6\% | 1.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Promotion for all employers | 7668 | 3909 | 2044 | 7551 | 7434 | 3633 | 1980 | 6402 | 449 | 222 | 41292 |
|  | 18.6\% | 9.5\% | 5.0\% | 18.3\% | 18.0\% | 8.8\% | 4.8\% | 15.5\% | 1.1\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Termination for all employers | 7691 | 2302 | 2502 | 13692 | 6517 | 1899 | 1866 | 7799 | 954 | 396 | 45618 |
|  | 16.9\% | 5.0\% | 5.5\% | 30.0\% | 14.3\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 17.1\% | 2.1\% | 0.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Skills development | 36480 | 10716 | 10406 | 35573 | 31712 | 9909 | 7354 | 26405 | 0 | 0 | 168555 |
|  | 21.6\% | 6.4\% | 6.2\% | 21.1\% | 18.8\% | 5.9\% | 4.4\% | 15.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100.0\% |

Table 19 shows more promising patterns compared to the two upper occupational levels in terms of recruitment and promotion opportunities, although Whites tend to still benefit from a large portion of the opportunities. However, this level is prone to transformation outcomes because the amount of people recruited and promoted from the designated groups were much more than those that were terminated.

Table 20: Industry Sector workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level by race and gender

| Sectors | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |$|$

Table 20 shows the Manufacturing sector as the least progressive in terms of race and the Construction sector the least progressive in terms of gender. The Community/Social/Personal Services sector seems to be making the most progress in terms of both race and gender at this level, probably because Government is in this Sector.

Table 21: Workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level by race and gender per Province

| Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $7.0 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $28.5 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $36.2 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $19.8 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $24.4 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $21.4 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $26.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $24.4 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $18.0 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $30.5 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $27.8 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $28.8 \%$ | $25.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $42.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 21 shows Limpopo as being the most progressive in terms of both race and gender at this level. The least progressive in terms of race, is the Western Cape and the least progressive in terms of gender is the Northern Cape.

Table 22: Workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level for PRIVATE SECTOR, per Province by race and gender

| Private Sector by <br> Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $8.3 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $30.9 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $12.4 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $45.6 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $11.9 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $56.8 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $16.8 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $47.0 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $15.5 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $12.6 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $14.3 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $35.8 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $24.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $47.2 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $34.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $33.8 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 22 shows Limpopo as the most progressive in terms of both race and gender at this level. The least progressive was the Northern Cape in terms of gender and the Western Cape in terms of race.

Table 23: Workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level for All GOVERNMENT, per Province by race and gender

| Government by Province | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | 5.4\% | 15.8\% | 1.0\% | 18.0\% | 8.5\% | 31.2\% | 1.3\% | 17.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Eastern Cape | 32.8\% | 5.1\% | 0.3\% | 4.8\% | 45.8\% | 4.5\% | 0.3\% | 5.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Northern Cape | 26.9\% | 20.1\% | 0.3\% | 14.2\% | 17.6\% | 12.0\% | 0.4\% | 7.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Free State | 20.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.5\% | 15.1\% | 37.4\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% | 19.1\% | 2.5\% | 1.6\% | 100.0\% |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 27.2\% | 1.0\% | 11.0\% | 5.8\% | 35.5\% | 1.2\% | 11.0\% | 5.3\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| North West | 29.6\% | 0.6\% | 1.4\% | 6.2\% | 44.6\% | 1.5\% | 0.9\% | 10.3\% | 3.7\% | 1.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Gauteng | 38.6\% | 3.9\% | 3.0\% | 15.4\% | 25.4\% | 2.5\% | 1.8\% | 9.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Mpumalanga | 30.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.9\% | 6.3\% | 47.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.9\% | 7.8\% | 4.4\% | 1.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Limpopo | 42.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 2.1\% | 51.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 1.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |

Table 23 shows that the least progressive provinces at this level are the Western Cape in terms of race and the Northern Cape in terms of gender.

Table 24: Workforce profile at the Professionally Qualified level by race and gender per BUSINESS TYPE (Please note All Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local Governments)

| Businesses Type | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| All Employer | $18.9 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| All Government | $30.9 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| National <br> Government | $37.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $25.3 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Provincial <br> Government | $29.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $39.4 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Local Government | $25.5 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $22.6 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Private Sector | $13.9 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Non-Profit <br> Organisation | $27.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Parastatal | $25.5 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Educational <br> Institution | $15.1 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $28.2 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 24 shows Government outperforming the private sector in terms of race and gender at this level. White representation in Educational Institutions still dominates compared to other racial groups.

Figure 8: Population distribution trends for the Professionally Qualified level from 2007 to 2011 by race for all employers

## PROFESSIONALLY QUALIFIED - RACE



Figure 8 shows White representation gradually decreasing and Black representation gradually increasing at this level. This is a very good indicator as to how the country is likely to progress in the two upper levels in future. Coloureds are also faring well at this level, whereas Indians far exceed their EAP of $3 \%$. More focus needs to be placed on improving the representation of Africans at this level.

Figure 9: Population distribution trends for the Professionally Qualified level from 2007 to 2011 by gender


Figure 9 shows the slight increase in female representation from $33.8 \%$ in 2007 to $42.5 \%$ in 2011 correlating to the decrease in male representation from $66.1 \%$ in 2007 to $57.5 \%$ in 2011 . The CEE is concerned that if women are struggling to break through the glass ceiling at this level, how much more difficult it will be at the Top Management and Senior Management levels.

### 5.2.4 SKILLED LEVEL IN TERMS OF RACE AND GENDER

Figure 10: Workforce profile at the skilled level by race and gender for all employers


Figure 10 depicts Blacks at $57 \%$ and women at $46.5 \%$, which is a position employers should try to replicate in their workplaces in the short-to-medium term. It also shows that Whites are still double their EAP at this level. Reasonable progress is being made both in terms of race and gender at this level, though it has taken some time. Figure 10 also shows that as the workforce begins to increase in the middle-to-lower levels, the percentage representation of people with disabilities decreases, which could be linked to the greater amount of people in the workforce that are employed at this level.

Table 25: People with disabilities in terms of race and gender at the Skilled Level

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | I | W | Male | Female |  |
| Skilled level | 2874 | 759 | 495 | 2760 | 1561 | 583 | 284 | 1700 | 82 | 13 | 11111 |
|  | 25.9\% | 6.8\% | 4.5\% | 24.8\% | 14.0\% | 5.2\% | 2.6\% | 15.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |

Table 25 shows a reasonable representation of Black people within the disability group at this level, although Black women with disabilities still remain well under-represented at this level.

Table 26: Workforce profile and movements at the Skilled Level in terms of race and gender

| Workforce Movements | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Workforce profile for all employers | 399476 | 79248 | 44862 | 178186 | 362082 | 74710 | 37342 | 142798 | 13458 | 3883 | 1336045 |
|  | 29.9\% | 5.9\% | 3.4\% | 13.3\% | 27.1\% | 5.6\% | 2.8\% | 10.7\% | 1.0\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Recruitment for all employers | 50463 | 12004 | 5759 | 27032 | 36280 | 11358 | 4626 | 19759 | 3095 | 905 | 171281 |
|  | 29.5\% | 7.0\% | 3.4\% | 15.8\% | 21.2\% | 6.6\% | 2.7\% | 11.5\% | 1.8\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Promotion for all employers | 32982 | 8615 | 3266 | 9017 | 28430 | 12437 | 3112 | 10587 | 559 | 231 | 109236 |
|  | 30.2\% | 7.9\% | 3.0\% | 8.3\% | 26.0\% | 11.4\% | 2.8\% | 9.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Termination for all employers | 50304 | 13128 | 5938 | 29934 | 32611 | 12359 | 4542 | 23275 | 2514 | 827 | 109236 |
|  | 28.7\% | 7.5\% | 3.4\% | 17.1\% | 18.6\% | 7.0\% | 2.6\% | 13.3\% | 1.4\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Skills development | 173985 | 38778 | 21984 | 74020 | 98172 | 33226 | 16220 | 56226 | 0 | 0 | 512611 |
|  | 33.9\% | 7.6\% | 4.3\% | 14.4\% | 19.2\% | 6.5\% | 3.2\% | 11.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100.0\% |

Table 26 reflects a progressive movement pertaining to recruitment, promotion, skills development and termination. The progress made during these processes is very evident in the population distribution of the designated groups in the workforce profile, which stands at $76 \%$ comprising Blacks and approximately $46.2 \%$ of women at this level. Progress reflected at this level needs to be replicated at other three upper levels as well.

Table 27: INDUSTRY/SECTOR workforce profile at the Skilled Level by race and gender

| Sectors | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Agriculture | 34.2\% | 7.7\% | 1.9\% | 16.4\% | 19.6\% | 5.2\% | 1.0\% | 13.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Mining and Quarrying | 41.3\% | 4.0\% | 0.7\% | 33.7\% | 7.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.4\% | 6.8\% | 4.7\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Manufacturing | 29.8\% | 10.0\% | 7.1\% | 25.4\% | 8.4\% | 4.7\% | 2.6\% | 10.6\% | 1.3\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Electricity, Gas and Water | 38.8\% | 5.4\% | 2.8\% | 15.7\% | 25.1\% | 2.9\% | 1.6\% | 6.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Construction | 45.6\% | 7.5\% | 2.9\% | 19.9\% | 9.3\% | 1.9\% | 1.2\% | 6.8\% | 4.8\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Retail and Motor Trade/Repair Service | 23.6\% | 7.5\% | 5.4\% | 15.5\% | 19.8\% | 11.4\% | 4.3\% | 12.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Wholesale Trade/ Commercial Agents/ Allied Services | 23.8\% | 7.1\% | 5.9\% | 14.5\% | 20.7\% | 7.6\% | 4.4\% | 15.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Catering/ Accommodation/ other trade | 24.9\% | 4.2\% | 1.9\% | 6.8\% | 39.8\% | 7.3\% | 2.3\% | 10.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Transport/ Storage/ Communications | 30.5\% | 8.5\% | 5.7\% | 22.4\% | 13.7\% | 4.4\% | 2.8\% | 11.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Finance/Business Services | 20.4\% | 5.7\% | 4.4\% | 12.4\% | 22.0\% | 9.5\% | 5.7\% | 18.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Community/Social/ Personal Services | 30.4\% | 4.5\% | 1.9\% | 5.7\% | 40.3\% | 5.2\% | 2.4\% | 8.8\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |

Table 27 is showing nearly all the sectors to be performing well in terms of race. However, a number of them need to improve when it comes to increasing the representation of Black women at this level. White women representation exceed their EAP across all sectors. The Community/Social/Personal Services sector performed reasonably well at this level.

Table 28: Workforce profile at the Skilled Level per province by race and gender

| Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |  |
| Western Cape | $14.0 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $22.4 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Eastern Cape | $24.1 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $52.1 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Northern Cape | $26.6 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Free State | $28.3 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $44.3 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $26.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| North West | $32.3 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Gauteng | $32.7 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Mpumalanga | $45.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Limpopo | $40.0 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $55.0 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |

Table 28 shows the Western Cape as making the least progress across the provinces at this level in terms of African representation, although they seem to be performing well with regard to Coloured representation at this level. The best performing provinces at this level in terms of race and gender are Limpopo, Mpumalanga and North West. The Western Cape Province faces future challenges both in terms of race and gender at all other levels if it does not address the imbalances at this level soon.

Table 29: Workforce profile at the Skilled Level for PRIVATE SECTOR by Province per race and gender

| Private Sector by <br> Province | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | $17.4 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Eastern Cape | $27.5 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Northern Cape | $27.6 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Free State | $31.4 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| KwaZulu-Natal | $33.7 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| North West | $38.7 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Gauteng | $29.7 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mpumalanga | $50.9 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $25.6 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Limpopo | $58.8 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table 29 shows Limpopo as the most progressive in terms of Africans in the Private Sector. Western Cape is the least representative among the provinces in terms of race and Mpumalanga in terms of gender at this level.

Table 30: Workforce profile at the Skilled Level for Government by Province per race and gender

| Government by Province | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |
| Western Cape | 7.5\% | 27.3\% | 0.2\% | 9.6\% | 10.8\% | 33.2\% | 0.4\% | 10.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Eastern Cape | 22.6\% | 2.7\% | 0.1\% | 1.7\% | 64.8\% | 4.0\% | 0.2\% | 3.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Northern Cape | 24.4\% | 22.2\% | 0.4\% | 3.0\% | 24.4\% | 20.2\% | 0.2\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Free State | 27.2\% | 1.7\% | 0.0\% | 5.5\% | 46.4\% | 4.5\% | 0.1\% | 14.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 22.1\% | 0.7\% | 5.0\% | 1.3\% | 58.0\% | 1.4\% | 7.9\% | 3.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| North West | 30.9\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 1.8\% | 58.7\% | 1.7\% | 0.1\% | 5.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Gauteng | 42.5\% | 5.8\% | 1.8\% | 11.2\% | 26.3\% | 2.4\% | 1.0\% | 8.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Mpumalanga | 33.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 2.9\% | 57.0\% | 0.9\% | 0.2\% | 5.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Limpopo | 38.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 57.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 1.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |

Table 30 shows Government performing well in 8 provinces, except for the Western Cape where much more has to be done to improve the representation of the African population at this level. The best performing provinces are Gauteng, Limpopo and Mpumalanga in terms of race, although Limpopo and Mpumalanga need to improve on the representation of Coloured and Indian males at this level.

Table 31: Workforce at the Skilled Level by race and gender and per BUSINESS TYPE
(Please note All Government is inclusive of national, provincial and local Governments)

| Businesses Type | Male |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | African | Coloured | Indian | White | African | Coloured | Indian | White | Male | Female |  |

Table 31 shows relatively good progress in terms of race and gender across all business types at this level - a surprising feature is the relatively good progress being made with women representation at this level. Government is much more equitably represented in respect of women at this level when compared to the Private Sector.

Figure 11: Population distribution trends for the Skilled Level from 2007 to 2011 by race


Figure 11 shows the general trend to be promising as more people from the designated groups are being employed at this level. The pace of change at this level is likely to positively influence the representation of the designated groups at the Professionally Qualified level in future. However, more focus has to be placed on improving the representation of Africans at this level taking into account their $73.6 \%$ EAP.

Figure 12: Population distribution trends for the Skilled Level from 2007 to 2011 by gender


Figure 12 shows a promising trend in relation to good progress made at this level, in particular, the women representation that has even surpassed their EAP at this level. The CEE can say that in terms of representation very good progress has been made at this level.

### 5.2.5 DISABILITY WORKFORCE PROFILE IN TERMS OF RACE AND GENDER

Figure 13: Workforce profile representation of people with disabilities by race


Figure 13 clearly shows that people with disabilities make up approximately $0.8 \%$ of the total workforce reported. This population distribution should be measured against the $2 \%$ target set by Government for the public service to achieve in 2005 which was later extended to 2010 and, thereafter, keeping the same target until 2015 because of a lack of reasonable progress in this area. The CEE has been working with the various stakeholders in this area for specific interventions to improve the representation of people with disabilities in the workforce.

Table 32: Aggregated population distribution of people with disabilities by race and gender

|  | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Disability for all Employers | 16133 | 2801 | 1314 | 6283 | 8743 | 2500 | 804 | 3918 | 1076 | 94 | 43666 |
|  | 36.9\% | 6.4\% | 3.0\% | 14.4\% | 20.0\% | 5.7\% | 1.8\% | 9.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| EAP for People With Disabilities | No EAP available for People With Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

People with disabilities accounted for 43666 or $0.8 \%$ (Total disability / Total workforce) of the total number of employees reported by all large employers. The race and gender representation of people with disabilities at every level almost mirrors the race and gender profile of the general workforce. Much more focus has to be placed on skilling, employing and retaining people with disabilities in the workforce.

Table 32 shows a reasonable representation of Black people within the disability group at this level, although Black women with disabilities still remain well under-represented at this level.

Figure 14: Trends for aggregated workforce profile of people with disabilities from 2007 to 2011 for all employers


Figure 19 shows that the disability representation in the workforce remained pretty flat over the past two years, with the actual percentage of disability representation varying by $0.1 \%$ from 2009 to 2011. The low base in 2007 when compared to 2009 and 2011 can be explained by the improved quality control required by the regulations of 2009 and increase in number of online reporting.

## SUMMARY AND REMARKS

- The quality of Employment Equity Reports received from large employers improved drastically since the 2009 Reporting period. This can be attributed to the amendments in the regulations requiring employers to fully and accurately complete their reports to be deemed to have reported. An additional reason is the ease and accuracy with which employers are now able to report online - approximately $90 \%$ of the employers reported online in 2011.
- The labour market's performance, taking all large employers who reported in 2011, is too slow in terms of race and gender representation at the Top and Senior Management Levels. Progress at the Professionally Qualified and Skilled Levels appear to be much better, which raises questions as to why the same cannot be achieved for the two upper levels.
- Government is performing much better when compared to the Private Sector in terms of both race and gender representation. The good performance can be clearly seen at all three tiers, i.e. National, Provincial and Local Government.
- The Western Cape is the worst performing province in terms of race and gender both in Government and the Private Sector across every occupational level. Serious steps are needed to improve on the representation of Black people, in particular, Africans.
- The Community/Social/Personal Services is the best performing sector across nearly all occupational levels, which could be related to the fact that Government is included in this sector - Manufacturing appears to be the least progressive across all sectors.
- The contents of the report indicate that Educational Institutions are a Business type where much attention is also needed to improve on race, gender and disability representation.
- The CEE is pleased to announce the finalisation of the Revised Code of Good Practice on HIV and AIDS in the world of work during this reporting period, which is due for publication in the next financial year. The same cannot be said about the amendments to the Employment Equity Act, as social partners at NEDLAC still continue deliberating in an attempt to carve positions of compromise but the longer it takes the more employment equity stands to lose.
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## APPENDIX A

The total number of employees (including employees with disabilities) in each occupational level for all employers

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | I | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 2515 | 642 | 1146 | 10679 | 1060 | 285 | 303 | 1970 | 673 | 79 | 19352 |
|  | 13.0\% | 3.3\% | 5.9\% | 55.2\% | 5.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.6\% | 10.2\% | 3.5\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 10353 | 3296 | 4837 | 31332 | 5224 | 1702 | 1985 | 10877 | 1456 | 353 | 71415 |
|  | 14.5\% | 4.6\% | 6.8\% | 43.9\% | 7.3\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 15.2\% | 2.0\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and midmanagement | 70055 | 19970 | 19842 | 97817 | 64892 | 17965 | 13864 | 59097 | 5714 | 2153 | 371369 |
|  | 18.9\% | 5.4\% | 5.3\% | 26.3\% | 17.5\% | 4.8\% | 3.7\% | 15.9\% | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 399476 | 79248 | 44862 | 178186 | 362082 | 74710 | 37342 | 142798 | 13458 | 3883 | 1336045 |
|  | 29.9\% | 5.9\% | 3.4\% | 13.3\% | 27.1\% | 5.6\% | 2.8\% | 10.7\% | 1.0\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 839496 | 103927 | 31399 | 48735 | 518569 | 11470 | 32772 | 78297 | 42954 | 2875 | 1816494 |
|  | 46.2\% | 5.7\% | 1.7\% | 2.7\% | 28.5\% | 6.5\% | 1.8\% | 4.3\% | 2.4\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 490221 | 47973 | 6366 | 6796 | 290682 | 47794 | 3249 | 3081 | 28306 | 3473 | 927941 |
|  | 52.8\% | 5.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 31.3\% | 5.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 3.1\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 1812116 | 255056 | 108452 | 373545 | 1242509 | 259926 | 89515 | 296120 | 92561 | 12816 | 4542616 |
|  | 39.9\% | 5.6\% | 2.4\% | 8.2\% | 27.4\% | 5.7\% | 2.0\% | 6.5\% | 2.0\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 277705 | 36889 | 12168 | 24938 | 202633 | 36199 | 6920 | 21288 | 9479 | 4025 | 632244 |
|  | 43.9\% | 5.8\% | 1.9\% | 3.9\% | 32.0\% | 5.7\% | 1.1\% | 3.4\% | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 2089821 | 291945 | 120620 | 398483 | 1445142 | 296125 | 96435 | 317408 | 102040 | 16841 | 5174860 |


| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 103 | 7 | 26 | 170 | 25 | 6 | 5 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 377 |
|  | 27.3\% | 1.9\% | 6.9\% | 45.1\% | 6.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.3\% | 8.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 122 | 33 | 39 | 407 | 59 | 16 | 19 | 121 | 15 | 2 | 833 |
|  | 14.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.7\% | 48.9\% | 7.1\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 14.5\% | 1.8\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management | 632 | 173 | 184 | 1434 | 525 | 122 | 88 | 612 | 27 | 12 | 3809 |
|  | 16.6\% | 4.5\% | 4.8\% | 37.6\% | 13.8\% | 3.2\% | 2.3\% | 16.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 2874 | 759 | 495 | 2760 | 1561 | 583 | 284 | 1700 | 82 | 13 | 11111 |
|  | 25.9\% | 6.8\% | 4.5\% | 24.8\% | 14.0\% | 5.2\% | 2.6\% | 15.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 6542 | 1263 | 402 | 1125 | 3532 | 1151 | 305 | 1239 | 175 | 14 | 15748 |
|  | 41.5\% | 8.0\% | 2.6\% | 7.1\% | 22.4\% | 7.3\% | 1.9\% | 7.9\% | 1.1\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 4778 | 410 | 77 | 237 | 1850 | 334 | 30 | 138 | 767 | 51 | 8672 |
|  | 55.1\% | 4.7\% | 0.9\% | 2.7\% | 21.3\% | 3.9\% | 0.3\% | 1.6\% | 8.8\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 15051 | 2645 | 1223 | 6133 | 7552 | 2212 | 731 | 3842 | 1069 | 92 | 40550 |
|  | 37.1\% | 6.5\% | 3.0\% | 15.1\% | 18.6\% | 5.5\% | 1.8\% | 9.5\% | 2.6\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 1082 | 156 | 91 | 150 | 1191 | 288 | 73 | 76 | 7 | 2 | 3116 |
|  | 34.7\% | 5.0\% | 2.9\% | 4.8\% | 38.2\% | 9.2\% | 2.3\% | 2.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 16133 | 2801 | 1314 | 6283 | 8743 | 2500 | 804 | 3918 | 1076 | 94 | 43666 |

The total number of new recruits, including people with disabilities, for all employers

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | I | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 346 | 67 | 94 | 673 | 183 | 28 | 31 | 155 | 109 | 11 | 1697 |
|  | 20.4\% | 3.9\% | 5.5\% | 39.7\% | 10.8\% | 1.6\% | 1.8\% | 9.1\% | 6.4\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 1316 | 350 | 492 | 3133 | 795 | 171 | 254 | 1116 | 247 | 53 | 7927 |
|  | 16.6\% | 4.4\% | 6.2\% | 39.5\% | 10.0\% | 2.2\% | 3.2\% | 14.1\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and midmanagement | 7559 | 1987 | 2279 | 10819 | 6577 | 1694 | 1873 | 6589 | 1075 | 452 | 40904 |
|  | 18.5\% | 4.9\% | 5.6\% | 26.4\% | 16.1\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% | 16.1\% | 2.6\% | 1.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 50463 | 12004 | 5759 | 27032 | 36280 | 11358 | 4626 | 19759 | 3095 | 905 | 171281 |
|  | 29.5\% | 7.0\% | 3.4\% | 15.8\% | 21.2\% | 6.6\% | 2.7\% | 11.5\% | 1.8\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 166210 | 23493 | 7466 | 13878 | 110182 | 28700 | 7928 | 16453 | 5693 | 1250 | 381253 |
|  | 43.6\% | 6.2\% | 2.0\% | 3.6\% | 28.9\% | 7.5\% | 2.1\% | 4.3\% | 1.5\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 146080 | 16996 | 1961 | 3227 | 90781 | 14373 | 1018 | 1493 | 7488 | 1682 | 285099 |
|  | 51.2\% | 6.0\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 31.8\% | 5.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 2.6\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 371974 | 54897 | 18051 | 58762 | 244798 | 56324 | 15730 | 45565 | 17707 | 4353 | 888161 |
|  | 41.9\% | 6.2\% | 2.0\% | 6.6\% | 27.6\% | 6.3\% | 1.8\% | 5.1\% | 2.0\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 190852 | 30713 | 8582 | 16204 | 144889 | 33376 | 5212 | 16615 | 6332 | 2893 | 455668 |
|  | 41.9\% | 6.7\% | 1.9\% | 3.6\% | 31.8\% | 7.3\% | 1.1\% | 3.6\% | 1.4\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 562826 | 85610 | 26633 | 74966 | 389687 | 89700 | 20942 | 62180 | 24039 | 7246 | 1343829 |


| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 159 | 68 | 87 | 537 | 58 | 34 | 31 | 157 | 23 | 1 | 1155 |
|  | 13.8\% | 5.9\% | 7.5\% | 46.5\% | 5.0\% | 2.9\% | 2.7\% | 13.6\% | 2.0\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 1449 | 425 | 678 | 2335 | 801 | 227 | 356 | 1213 | 224 | 60 | 7768 |
|  | 18.7\% | 5.5\% | 8.7\% | 30.1\% | 10.3\% | 2.9\% | 4.6\% | 15.6\% | 2.9\% | 0.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management | 7668 | 3909 | 2044 | 7551 | 7434 | 3633 | 1980 | 6402 | 449 | 222 | 41292 |
|  | 18.6\% | 9.5\% | 5.0\% | 18.3\% | 18.0\% | 8.8\% | 4.8\% | 15.5\% | 1.1\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 32982 | 8615 | 3266 | 9017 | 28430 | 12437 | 3112 | 10587 | 559 | 231 | 109236 |
|  | 30.2\% | 7.9\% | 3.0\% | 8.3\% | 26.0\% | 11.4\% | 2.8\% | 9.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 39208 | 4843 | 1377 | 1953 | 29377 | 6037 | 1594 | 2741 | 1580 | 129 | 88839 |
|  | 44.1\% | 5.5\% | 1.5\% | 2.2\% | 33.1\% | 6.8\% | 1.8\% | 3.1\% | 1.8\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 8745 | 1183 | 234 | 178 | 6177 | 1063 | 112 | 91 | 308 | 8 | 18099 |
|  | 48.3\% | 6.5\% | 1.3\% | 1.0\% | 34.1\% | 5.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 1.7\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 90211 | 19043 | 7686 | 21571 | 72277 | 23431 | 7185 | 21191 | 3143 | 651 | 266389 |
|  | 33.9\% | 7.1\% | 2.9\% | 8.1\% | 27.1\% | 8.8\% | 2.7\% | 8.0\% | 1.2\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 5776 | 1396 | 240 | 581 | 4655 | 1306 | 259 | 622 | 166 | 47 | 15048 |
|  | 38.4\% | 9.3\% | 1.6\% | 3.9\% | 30.9\% | 8.7\% | 1.7\% | 4.1\% | 1.1\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 95987 | 20439 | 7926 | 22152 | 76932 | 24737 | 7444 | 21813 | 3309 | 698 | 281437 |

The total number of terminations in each occupational level, including people with disabilities, for all employers

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 366 | 64 | 85 | 928 | 168 | 38 | 31 | 180 | 98 | 7 | 1965 |
|  | 18.6\% | 3.3\% | 4.3\% | 47.2\% | 8.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.6\% | 9.2\% | 5.0\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 1234 | 354 | 512 | 4175 | 606 | 168 | 224 | 1434 | 296 | 84 | 9087 |
|  | 13.6\% | 3.9\% | 5.6\% | 45.9\% | 6.7\% | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 15.8\% | 3.3\% | 0.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and midmanagement | 7691 | 2302 | 2502 | 13692 | 6517 | 1899 | 1866 | 7799 | 954 | 396 | 45618 |
|  | 16.9\% | 5.0\% | 5.5\% | 30.0\% | 14.3\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 17.1\% | 2.1\% | 0.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 50304 | 13128 | 5938 | 29934 | 32611 | 12359 | 4542 | 23275 | 2514 | 827 | 175432 |
|  | 28.7\% | 7.5\% | 3.4\% | 17.1\% | 18.6\% | 7.0\% | 2.6\% | 13.3\% | 1.4\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 164074 | 23698 | 8190 | 14430 | 86105 | 28319 | 8133 | 18114 | 6380 | 908 | 358351 |
|  | 45.8\% | 6.6\% | 2.3\% | 4.0\% | 24.0\% | 7.9\% | 2.3\% | 5.1\% | 1.8\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 122042 | 14483 | 2013 | 2662 | 64769 | 12178 | 973 | 1116 | 7139 | 1678 | 229053 |
|  | 53.3\% | 6.3\% | 0.9\% | 1.2\% | 28.3\% | 5.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 345711 | 54029 | 19240 | 65821 | 190776 | 54961 | 15769 | 51918 | 17381 | 3900 | 819506 |
|  | 42.2\% | 6.6\% | 2.3\% | 8.0\% | 23.3\% | 6.7\% | 1.9\% | 6.3\% | 2.1\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 156346 | 26991 | 5672 | 14344 | 121793 | 30175 | 4599 | 13530 | 6440 | 2648 | 382538 |
|  | 40.9\% | 7.1\% | 1.5\% | 3.7\% | 31.8\% | 7.9\% | 1.2\% | 3.5\% | 1.7\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 502057 | 81020 | 24912 | 80165 | 312569 | 85136 | 20368 | 65448 | 23821 | 6548 | 1202044 |

The total number of people from the designated groups, including people with disabilities, who received training solely for the purpose of achieving numerical goals for all employers

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | 1 | W |  |
| Top Management | 904 | 282 | 348 | 2729 | 422 | 126 | 128 | 700 | 5639 |
|  | 16.0\% | 5.0\% | 6.2\% | 48.4\% | 7.5\% | 2.2\% | 2.3\% | 12.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 5700 | 1655 | 2113 | 11530 | 2828 | 892 | 1003 | 4847 | 30568 |
|  | 18.6\% | 5.4\% | 6.9\% | 37.7\% | 9.3\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 15.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and midmanagement | 36480 | 10716 | 10406 | 35573 | 31712 | 9909 | 7354 | 26405 | 168555 |
|  | 21.6\% | 6.4\% | 6.2\% | 21.1\% | 18.8\% | 5.9\% | 4.4\% | 15.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 173985 | 38778 | 21984 | 74020 | 98172 | 33226 | 16220 | 56226 | 512611 |
|  | 33.9\% | 7.6\% | 4.3\% | 14.4\% | 19.2\% | 6.5\% | 3.2\% | 11.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 312603 | 40251 | 12714 | 19044 | 180969 | 44002 | 15131 | 30064 | 654778 |
|  | 47.7\% | 6.1\% | 1.9\% | 2.9\% | 27.6\% | 6.7\% | 2.3\% | 4.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 143399 | 14555 | 1654 | 3391 | 79783 | 15036 | 1023 | 983 | 259824 |
|  | 55.2\% | 5.6\% | 0.6\% | 1.3\% | 30.7\% | 5.8\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 673071 | 106237 | 49219 | 146287 | 393886 | 103191 | 40859 | 119225 | 1631975 |
|  | 41.2\% | 6.5\% | 3.0\% | 9.0\% | 24.1\% | 6.3\% | 2.5\% | 7.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 56178 | 7405 | 2142 | 4373 | 41471 | 8364 | 1685 | 4354 | 125972 |
|  | 44.6\% | 5.9\% | 1.7\% | 3.5\% | 32.9\% | 6.6\% | 1.3\% | 3.5\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 729249 | 113642 | 51361 | 150660 | 435357 | 111555 | 42544 | 123579 | 1757947 |

The total number of employees (including employees with disabilities) in each occupational level for Government only

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 639 | 109 | 62 | 172 | 332 | 23 | 17 | 46 | 5 | 2 | 1407 |
|  | 45.4\% | 7.7\% | 4.4\% | 12.2\% | 23.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.2\% | 3.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 3464 | 503 | 419 | 1389 | 2029 | 225 | 215 | 696 | 49 | 22 | 9011 |
|  | 38.4\% | 5.6\% | 4.6\% | 15.4\% | 22.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.4\% | 7.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management | 27464 | 3795 | 2706 | 8591 | 30495 | 4991 | 2422 | 7188 | 849 | 368 | 88869 |
|  | 30.9\% | 4.3\% | 3.0\% | 9.7\% | 34.3\% | 5.6\% | 2.7\% | 8.1\% | 1.0\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 150029 | 18463 | 8691 | 25644 | 204855 | 15447 | 10262 | 26186 | 1722 | 944 | 462243 |
|  | 32.5\% | 4.0\% | 1.9\% | 5.5\% | 44.3\% | 3.3\% | 2.2\% | 5.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 128204 | 19330 | 3784 | 3826 | 137002 | 17854 | 3737 | 7595 | 392 | 203 | 321927 |
|  | 39.8\% | 6.0\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 42.6\% | 5.5\% | 1.2\% | 2.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 52355 | 9272 | 965 | 605 | 44641 | 3671 | 382 | 392 | 35 | 13 | 112331 |
|  | 46.6\% | 8.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.5\% | 39.7\% | 3.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 362155 | 51472 | 16627 | 40227 | 419354 | 42211 | 17035 | 42103 | 3052 | 1552 | 995788 |
|  | 36.4\% | 5.2\% | 1.7\% | 4.0\% | 42.1\% | 4.2\% | 1.7\% | 4.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 18637 | 1658 | 1011 | 1348 | 36883 | 2205 | 1081 | 1999 | 885 | 314 | 66021 |
|  | 28.2\% | 2.5\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 55.9\% | 3.3\% | 1.6\% | 3.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 380792 | 53130 | 17638 | 41575 | 456237 | 44416 | 18116 | 44102 | 3937 | 1866 | 1061809 |


| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | 1 | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 32 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
|  | 50.0\% | 3.1\% | 3.1\% | 10.9\% | 26.6\% | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 57 | 3 | 7 | 38 | 33 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 159 |
|  | 35.8\% | 1.9\% | 4.4\% | 23.9\% | 20.8\% | 2.5\% | 3.1\% | 6.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management | 225 | 36 | 17 | 201 | 150 | 21 | 19 | 65 | 1 | 1 | 736 |
|  | 30.6\% | 4.9\% | 2.3\% | 27.3\% | 20.4\% | 2.9\% | 2.6\% | 8.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 918 | 154 | 58 | 524 | 624 | 73 | 38 | 370 | 4 | 2 | 2765 |
|  | 33.2\% | 5.6\% | 2.1\% | 19.0\% | 22.6\% | 2.6\% | 1.4\% | 13.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 876 | 166 | 56 | 111 | 611 | 86 | 22 | 170 | 2 | 0 | 2100 |
|  | 41.7\% | 7.9\% | 2.7\% | 5.3\% | 29.1\% | 4.1\% | 1.0\% | 8.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 336 | 43 | 15 | 28 | 110 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 553 |
|  | 60.8\% | 7.8\% | 2.7\% | 5.1\% | 19.9\% | 2.4\% | 0.2\% | 1.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 2444 | 404 | 155 | 909 | 1545 | 199 | 85 | 624 | 9 | 3 | 6377 |
|  | 38.3\% | 6.3\% | 2.4\% | 14.3\% | 24.2\% | 3.1\% | 1.3\% | 9.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 50 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 67 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 139 |
|  | 36.0\% | 5.0\% | 2.2\% | 2.2\% | 48.2\% | 2.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 2494 | 411 | 158 | 912 | 1612 | 203 | 87 | 626 | 10 | 3 | 6516 |

The total number of employers (including employees with disabilities) in each occupational level for Private Sector employers

| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 1332 | 453 | 998 | 10101 | 512 | 225 | 263 | 1768 | 659 | 72 | 16383 |
|  | 8.1\% | 2.8\% | 6.1\% | 61.7\% | 3.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.6\% | 10.8\% | 4.0\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 5312 | 2484 | 4116 | 28388 | 2242 | 1294 | 1594 | 9281 | 1304 | 296 | 56311 |
|  | 9.4\% | 4.4\% | 7.3\% | 50.4\% | 4.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 16.5\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and midmanagement | 30322 | 11932 | 15099 | 76938 | 18044 | 9308 | 9698 | 41972 | 3265 | 1139 | 217717 |
|  | 13.9\% | 5.5\% | 6.9\% | 35.3\% | 8.3\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 19.3\% | 1.5\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 210221 | 51971 | 33786 | 138361 | 103544 | 44481 | 24449 | 94999 | 10614 | 2218 | 714644 |
|  | 29.4\% | 7.3\% | 4.7\% | 19.4\% | 14.5\% | 6.2\% | 3.4\% | 13.3\% | 1.5\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 671590 | 79102 | 26992 | 42280 | 324985 | 93116 | 28126 | 63975 | 42098 | 2378 | 1374642 |
|  | 48.9\% | 5.8\% | 2.0\% | 3.1\% | 23.6\% | 6.8\% | 2.0\% | 4.7\% | 3.1\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 421173 | 36273 | 5342 | 5924 | 231785 | 41396 | 2849 | 2411 | 28226 | 3442 | 778821 |
|  | 54.1\% | 4.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | 29.8\% | 5.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 3.6\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 1339950 | 182215 | 86333 | 301992 | 681112 | 189820 | 66979 | 214406 | 86166 | 9545 | 3158518 |
|  | 42.4\% | 5.8\% | 2.7\% | 9.6\% | 21.6\% | 6.0\% | 2.1\% | 6.8\% | 2.7\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 243345 | 33535 | 10522 | 18239 | 151278 | 31967 | 5177 | 13928 | 7668 | 3245 | 518904 |
|  | 46.9\% | 6.5\% | 2.0\% | 3.5\% | 29.2\% | 6.2\% | 1.0\% | 2.7\% | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 1583295 | 215750 | 96855 | 320231 | 832390 | 221787 | 72156 | 228334 | 93834 | 12790 | 3677422 |


| Occupational Levels | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  | Foreign National |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | C | I | W | A | C | 1 | W | Male | Female |  |
| Top Management | 18 | 5 | 22 | 156 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 247 |
|  | 7.3\% | 2.0\% | 8.9\% | 63.2\% | 2.4\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 11.3\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Senior Management | 55 | 30 | 31 | 345 | 22 | 10 | 13 | 102 | 11 | 2 | 621 |
|  | 8.9\% | 4.8\% | 5.0\% | 55.6\% | 3.5\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 16.4\% | 1.8\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Professionally qualified and experienced specialists and mid-management | 195 | 111 | 147 | 992 | 100 | 74 | 60 | 384 | 11 | 4 | 2078 |
|  | 9.4\% | 5.3\% | 7.1\% | 47.7\% | 4.8\% | 3.6\% | 2.9\% | 18.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, and superintendents | 1634 | 549 | 362 | 1865 | 681 | 456 | 189 | 1076 | 66 | 9 | 6887 |
|  | 23.7\% | 8.0\% | 5.3\% | 27.1\% | 9.9\% | 6.6\% | 2.7\% | 15.6\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making | 5040 | 1000 | 329 | 837 | 208 | 1018 | 271 | 932 | 173 | 11 | 12219 |
|  | 41.2\% | 8.2\% | 2.7\% | 6.8\% | 21.3\% | 8.3\% | 2.2\% | 7.6\% | 1.4\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Unskilled and defined decision making | 4238 | 349 | 62 | 197 | 1619 | 307 | 28 | 109 | 766 | 51 | 7726 |
|  | 54.9\% | 4.5\% | 0.8\% | 2.5\% | 21.0\% | 4.0\% | 0.4\% | 1.4\% | 9.9\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% |
| TOTAL PERMANENT | 11180 | 2044 | 953 | 4392 | 5036 | 1869 | 566 | 2631 | 1030 | 77 | 29778 |
|  | 37.5\% | 6.9\% | 3.2\% | 14.7\% | 16.9\% | 6.3\% | 1.9\% | 8.8\% | 3.5\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% |
| Temporary employees | 995 | 148 | 87 | 130 | 1101 | 281 | 68 | 64 | 6 | 2 | 2882 |
|  | 34.5\% | 5.1\% | 3.0\% | 4.5\% | 38.2\% | 9.8\% | 2.4\% | 2.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 100.0\% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 12175 | 2192 | 1040 | 4522 | 6137 | 2150 | 634 | 2695 | 1036 | 79 | 32660 |

