



MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

Ministry of Social Development

Gender and Ethnic Pay Gap

Data Analysis: 2022



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Crown and abide by the other licence terms.

To view a copy of this licence, visit

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/nz/>. Please note that no departmental or governmental emblem, logo or Coat of Arms may be used in any way which infringes any provision of the Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection Act 1981. Attribution to the Crown should be in written form and not by reproduction of any such emblem, logo or Coat of Arms.

Published November 2022

Ministry of Social Development

PO Box 1556

Wellington 6140

New Zealand

Telephone: +64 4 916 3300

Facsimile: +64 4 918 0099

Email: info@msd.govt.nz

Web: www.msd.govt.nz

ISBN: 978-1-99-110516-5

Contents

	Page
Data definitions.....	3
Reading the data.....	5
List of Data	6
Data tables	7

Data definitions

Term	Definition
Ethnic-Gender Pay Gap (EGPG)	Ethnic-gender pay gaps are calculated as the difference between the average salary for females of an ethnic group (eg wāhine Māori) and the average salary of all males at MSD, expressed as a percentage of the average salary of all males at MSD.
Ethnic Pay Gaps (EPG)	Ethnic pay gaps are calculated as the difference between the average or median salary for an ethnic group and the average or median salary of all those not in that ethnic group, expressed as a percentage of the average or median salary of those not in the ethnic group.
Ethnicity percentages	Ethnicity percentages are based on the total number of people who have disclosed an ethnicity (not total staff numbers). Employees can select more than one ethnicity and can therefore be included as part of multiple different ethnicity calculations. The sum of all ethnicity percentages may exceed 100%.
Gender Pay Gap (GPG)	Gender pay gap is calculated as the difference between the average or median salary for females and the average salary of all males at MSD, expressed as a percentage of the average salary of all males at MSD.
Gender Diverse Pay Gap (GDPG)	Gender diverse pay gap is calculated as the difference between the average or median salary for gender diverse employees and the average salary of all males at MSD, expressed as a percentage of the average salary of all males at MSD.
Representation within a category	The percentage of a group (eg females or ethnicity) represented out of all employees. For example, Table 5 shows that 69.5% of MSD’s full-time employees are women. Totals add to 100% horizontally across the row with the adjacent category.
Representation across a category	The percentage of a group (eg females or ethnicity) represented out of that same group. For example, Table 5 shows that 93.2% of women at MSD work full-time. Totals add to 100% across the entire column vertically.

Term	Definition
FTE status	<p>MSD considers part-time to be less than 30 hours a week.</p> <p>Full-time employees have been divided into full-time (working 'full' contracted hours) and reduced hours (working more than 30 hours but less than contracted hours). Both are considered full-time as defined by Statistics New Zealand.</p> <p>These groupings help record the uptake of flexible working.</p>
Level of earning	<p>For the purposes of comparing level of earning, MSD has used the following definitions stipulated within the Public Service Pay Guidance 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower: earning less than \$60,000, typically includes front-line support roles such as Support Officer and administration roles such as Receptionist. • Middle: earning between \$60,000–\$100,000, typically includes front-line roles such as Case Manager and Customer Service Representative, support roles such as Advisor or Analyst and Senior Advisor or Analyst and line manager roles such as Manager Client Service Operations and Service Manager. • Higher: earning over \$100,000. Typical roles include high level support roles such as Lead or Principal Advisors/Analysts and Manager or Senior Manager roles.
Level of seniority	<p>Within each business group, the number of tiers vary, making it difficult to compare pay gaps by tier across the organisation. For the purposes of analysing representation and gender pay gaps at our senior levels of the organisation, we have grouped people managers.</p>
Minimum sample size	<p>Where there are less than 20 staff within any comparator group, MSD has considered this too small for statistical comparison, and omitted any gender or ethnic pay gap calculation.</p>

Term	Definition
Occupation group	<p>Public Service employees are engaged in a wide range of jobs spread across 247 different occupations in 2020. These can be aggregated into 10 broad occupation groups. For the purposes of this Action Plan, MSD has used these same broad occupation groups. While occupation groups are a useful view when looking at representation, at MSD these groups contain employees that span a range of roles and bands, meaning the GEPG measures are not necessarily based on same or similar roles.</p> <p>The most common occupations at MSD are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Managers, which have been included in the Social, health and education workers occupation group • Customer Service Representatives, which have been included in the Contact centre workers occupation group • Centralised Processing Officers, which have been included in the Social, health and education workers occupation group.
Pay gap of concern	<p>Research is somewhat silent on what number indicates a 'good' or 'bad' pay gap. For the purposes of this Action Plan, MSD has focused on pay gaps based on average earnings that are +/-3%.</p>
Same or similar roles	<p>For the purposes of comparing same or similar roles, MSD has used pay groups and bands.</p>

Reading the data

- We have included current fixed-term and permanent employees (excluding casuals/contractors, staff on long-term leave without pay, parental leave). The comparison is based on FTE salary figures only.
- We recognise that not all people identify as male or female. Our analysis includes staff who identify as gender diverse, where the datasets were large enough to make meaningful comparisons, while ensuring anonymity.
- Average pay for all males at MSD is the same measure used to calculate MSD's overall gender pay gap and ethnic-gender pay gap. This ensures that gender pay gaps by ethnicity are calculated on the same basis as our overall gender pay gap and are therefore comparable.
- Certain pay gap figures are indicative only as they involve comparing groups of varying unequal sizes and may cause volatile results over time. Examples include gender-ethnic pay gaps and the gender-diverse pay gap.
- When reading the numbers for ethnic and ethnic-gender pay gaps, adding up for representation within band may not total 100% because 3.9% of employees have unknown ethnicity and have been calculated separately.
- Where a data entry has been marked with a dash (-), it indicates that the sample size wasn't large enough for meaningful analysis while maintaining individual privacy.
- Some groups meet the criteria for minimum sample size and can be included in agency-wide figures. However, when further separating into categories, there are instances when these groups no longer meet the minimum sample size to maintain privacy. This primarily affects analysis of GDPG, MELAA pay gap, Other Ethnic pay gap, MELAA EPGG and Other Ethnic EPGG. The categories that may be excluded from further analysis for these groups are:
 - within same or similar roles
 - by level of earning
 - by level of seniority
 - by FTE status
 - by occupation group
- Any mean or median figures which are over +3% or under -3% have been highlighted in red to indicate a pay gap of concern.
- Where a mean or median GPG figure is preceded by a negative sign (-), it indicates that the pay gap is in favour of women or the ethnic group.

List of data

Data definitions	4
Reading the data	7
List of data	8
Our gender pay gaps (GPG)	10
Table 1. Agency-wide GPG, GDPG, and representation	10
Table 2. GPG and representation within same or similar roles	10
Table 3. GPG and representation by level of earning.....	10
Table 4. GPG and representation by level of seniority	10
Table 5. GPG and representation by FTE status.....	10
Table 6. GPG and representation by occupation group	11
Our ethnic pay gaps (EPG)	12
Table 7. Agency-wide EPG and representation	12
Within same or similar roles	12
Table 8. Māori EPG and representation within same or similar roles	12
Table 9. Pacific EPG and representation within same or similar roles	12
Table 10. Asian EPG and representation within same or similar roles	13
Table 11. European EPG and representation within same or similar roles	13
By level of earning	14
Table 12. Māori EPG and representation by level of earning.....	14
Table 13. Pacific EPG and representation by level of earning.....	14
Table 14. Asian EPG and representation by level of earning	14
Table 15. MELAA EPG and representation by level of earning	14
Table 16. European EPG and representation by level of earning	14
By level of seniority	15
Table 17. Māori EPG and representation by level of seniority	15
Table 18. Pacific EPG and representation by level of seniority	15
Table 19. Asian EPG and representation by level of seniority	15
Table 20. European and representation by level of seniority	15
By occupation group	16
Table 21. Māori EPG and representation by occupation group	16
Table 22. Pacific EPG and representation by occupation group	16
Table 23. Asian EPG and representation by occupation group	17

Table 24.	MELAA EPG and representation by occupation group.....	17
Table 25.	European and representation by occupation group	18
Our ethnic-gender pay gaps (EGPG)		19
Table 26.	Agency-wide EGPG and representation.....	19
Within same or similar roles		19
Table 27.	Māori EGPG and representation within same or similar roles ...	19
Table 28.	Pacific EGPG and representation within same or similar roles ..	19
Table 29.	Asian EGPG and representation within same or similar roles ...	20
Table 30.	European EGPG and representation within same or similar roles 20	
By level of earning.....		20
Table 31.	Māori EGPG and representation by level of earning.....	20
Table 32.	Pacific EGPG and representation by level of earning.....	20
Table 33.	Asian EGPG and representation by level of earning.....	21
Table 34.	MELAA EGPG and representation by level of earning	21
Table 35.	Other Ethnic Groups EGPG and representation by level of earning 21	
Table 36.	European EGPG and representation by level of earning	21
By level of seniority		21
Table 37.	Māori EGPG and representation by level of seniority	21
Table 38.	Pacific EGPG and representation by level of seniority	21
Table 39.	Asian EGPG and representation by level of seniority	22
Table 40.	European EGPG and representation by level of seniority	22
By occupation group		23
Table 41.	Māori EGPG and representation by occupation group	23
Table 42.	Pacific EGPG and representation by occupation group	23
Table 43.	Asian EGPG and representation by occupation group	24
Table 44.	European EPGP and representation by occupation group	24

Our gender pay gaps (GPG)

Table 1. Agency-wide GPG, GDPG, and representation

Group	Headcount	Females	Males	Gender diverse	GPG average	GPG median	GDPG average	GDPG median
MSD	8,895	70.3%	29.2%	0.3%	9.5%	1.8%	-2.6%	-11.1%

Table 2. GPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total Headcount	Female within band	Female across bands	Male within band	Male across bands	GPG average	GPG median
Core	7,304	73.6%	85.9%	26.2%	73.7%	2.2%	0.0%
Premium - IT	414	33.6%	2.2%	66.4%	10.6%	5.3%	3.9%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	69.6%	0.6%	26.8%	0.6%	4.3%	0.0%
Managers and Senior Specialists	881	66.7%	9.4%	32.8%	11.1%	4.5%	4.5%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	29.0%	0.3%	71.0%	1.7%	3.0%	1.3%
Senior Managers	105	57.1%	1.0%	42.9%	1.7%	0.9	-0.2
Not sized	52	71.2%	0.6%	26.9%	0.5%	7.5%	1.8%

Table 3. GPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total Headcount	Female within level	Female across levels	Male within level	Male across levels	GPG average	GPG median
Lower	1417	72.5%	16.4%	27.3%	14.9%	0.3%	0.0%
Middle	5782	73.5%	67.9%	26.3%	58.6%	2.0%	0.0%
Higher	1675	58.5%	15.7%	41.0%	26.5%	3.6%	4.3%

Table 4. GPG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Total Headcount	Female within level	Female across levels	Male within level	Male across levels	GPG average	GPG median
Line Manager	469	73.3%	51.7%	26.7%	33.1%	-0.4%	0.0%
Manager	474	55.3%	39.3%	43.9%	55.0%	2.6%	0.2%
Senior Manager	105	57.1%	9.0%	42.9%	11.9%	0.9%	-0.2%

Table 5. GPG and representation by FTE status

Hours	Total Headcount	Female within FTE status	Female across FTE status	Male within FTE status	Male across FTE status	GPG average	GPG median
Full time	8382	69.5%	93.2%	30.2%	97.6%	9.5%	1.8%
Reduced hours	290	85.9%	4.0%	13.4%	1.5%	15.8%	19.4%
Part time	202	88.6%	2.9%	11.4%	0.9%	17.2%	0.0%

Table 6. GPG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Total Headcount	Female within occ. group	Female across occ. groups	Male within occ. group	Male across occ. Groups	GPG average	GPG median
Clerical and administrative workers	482	86.3%	6.7%	13.7%	2.5%	0.5%	0.0%
Contact centre workers	1,297	70.2%	14.5%	29.8%	14.9%	0.1%	-1.4%
ICT professionals and technicians	395	32.4%	2.0%	67.6%	10.3%	6.3%	2.6%
Information professionals	1,009	62.7%	10.1%	36.3%	14.1%	3.7%	0.1%
Inspectors and regulatory officers	386	66.6%	4.1%	33.4%	5.0%	-1.4%	0.0%
Legal, HR and finance professionals	455	73.6%	5.4%	25.9%	4.6%	4.3%	0.0%
Managers	852	64.3%	8.8%	35.4%	11.6%	6.4%	5.3%
Policy analyst	100	70.0%	1.1%	27.0%	1.0%	15.3%	5.3%
Social, health and education workers	3,844	76.1%	46.7%	23.7%	35.1%	0.4%	0.0%
Others not elsewhere included	50	64.0%	0.5%	36.0%	0.7%	-5.9%	-7.3%

Our ethnic pay gaps (EPG)

Table 7. Agency-wide EPG and representation

	Māori	Pacific	Asian	MELAA	European	Other Ethnicity
Ethnicity rep	24.3%	18.2%	16.6%	1.8%	58.9%	1.0%
EPG average	3.7%	11.5%	8.8%	2.7%	-12.8%	5.9%
EPG median	0.0%	3.9%	6.4%	1.5%	-1.5%	8.9%

Within same or similar roles

Table 8. Māori EPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Māori within band	Non-Māori within band	Māori across bands	Non-Māori across bands	Māori EPG average	Māori EPG median
Core	7,319	24.2%	71.9%	85.9%	81.8%	0.5%	0.0%
Premium - IT	416	10.1%	78.8%	2.0%	5.1%	8.2%	2.5%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	8.9%	82.1%	0.2%	0.7%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	23.9%	71.3%	10.2%	9.8%	4.2%	4.7%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	12.9%	77.4%	0.4%	0.7%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	18.1%	71.4%	0.9%	1.2%	-	-
Not sized	53	11.3%	75.5%	0.3%	0.6%	-	-

Table 9. Pacific EPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Pacific rep. within band	Non-Pacific rep. within band	Pacific rep. across bands	Non-Pacific rep. across bands	Pacific EPG average	Pacific EPG median
Core	7,319	19.0%	77.1%	89.7%	81.3%	5.3%	8.9%
Premium – IT	416	8.9%	80%	2.4%	4.8%	14.5%	17.9%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	1.8%	89.3%	0.1%	0.7%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	12.6%	82.6%	7.2%	10.5%	8.1%	10.3%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	4.8%	85.5%	0.2%	0.8%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	6.7%	82.9%	0.5%	1.3%	-	-
Not sized	53	1.9%	84.9%	0.1%	0.6%	-	-

Table 10. Asian EPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Asian rep. within band	Non-Asian rep. within band	Asian rep. across bands	Non-Asian rep. across bands	Asian EPG average	Asian EPG median
Core	7,319	16.4%	79.6%	85.2%	82.4%	5.0%	11.3%
Premium – IT	416	31.0%	57.9%	9.1%	3.4%	-0.9%	-2.6%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	8.9%	82.1 %	0.4%	0.6%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	6.3%	88.8%	4.0%	11.1%	7.4%	11.9%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	19.4%	71.0%	0.9%	0.6%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	1.9%	87.6%	0.1%	1.3%	-	-
Not sized	53	9.4%	77.4%	0.4%	0.6%	-	-

Table 11. European EPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	European rep. within band	Non-European rep. within band	European rep. across bands	Non-European rep. across bands	EPG average	EPG median
Core	7,319	54.5%	41.5%	79.8%	87.1%	-5.5%	-6.8%
Premium – IT	416	46.9%	42.1%	3.9%	5.0%	-4.8%	-2.6%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	80.4%	10.7%	0.9%	0.2%	-1.7%	-4.0%
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	69.8%	25.3%	12.3%	6.4%	-9.1%	-9.2%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	58.1%	32.3%	0.7%	0.6%	-5.5%	-10.6%
Senior Managers	105	76.2%	13.3%	1.6%	0.4%	5.8%	2.0%
Not sized	53	66.0%	20.8%	0.7%	0.3%	-46.1%	-58.2%

By level of earning

Table 12. Māori EPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total headcount	Māori rep. within level	Non-Māori rep. within level	Māori rep. across levels	Non-Māori rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Lower	1,420	19.7%	77.5%	13.6%	17.1%	-0.1%	0.0%
Middle	5,793	25.5%	70.4%	71.6%	63.4%	1.1%	0.0%
Higher	1,682	18.2%	74.3%	14.8%	19.4%	2.5%	2.7%

Table 13. Pacific EPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total headcount	Pacific rep. within level	Non-Pacific rep. within level	Pacific rep. across levels	Non-Pacific rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Lower	1,420	23.5%	73.7%	21.6%	15.1%	0.1%	0.0%
Middle	5,793	18.2%	77.6%	68.3%	64.8%	3.7%	1.5%
Higher	1,682	9.3%	83.2%	10.1%	20.2%	6.8%	4.7%

Table 14. Asian EPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total headcount	Asian rep. within level	Non-Asian rep. within level	Asian rep. across levels	Non-Asian rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Lower	1,420	25.1%	72.2%	25.2%	14.5%	0.1%	0.0%
Middle	5,793	14.9%	80.9%	61.2%	66.2%	1.6%	1.5%
Higher	1,682	11.4%	81.1%	13.6%	19.3%	8.6%	4.9%

Table 15. MELAA EPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total headcount	MELAA rep. within level	Non-MELAA rep. within level	MELAA rep. across levels	Non-MELAA rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Lower	1,420	2.1%	95.1%	20.0%	16.2%	0.5%	0.0%
Middle	5,793	1.6%	94.3%	61.3%	65.5%	1.1%	1.5%
Higher	1,682	1.7%	90.8%	18.7%	18.3%	4.9%	2.4%

Table 16. European EPG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Total headcount	European rep. within level	Non-European rep. within level	European rep. across levels	Non-European rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Lower	1,420	48.2%	49.1%	13.7%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Middle	5,793	55.1%	40.7%	63.9%	67.6%	-3.2%	0.0%
Higher	1,682	66.8%	25.7%	22.5%	12.4%	-7.7%	-5.2%

By level of seniority

Table 17. Māori EPG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Total headcount	Māori rep. within level	Non-Māori rep. within level	Māori rep. across levels	Non-Māori rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Line Manager	470	28.7%	68.1%	56.7%	42.5%	0.8%	0.0%
Manager	476	17.6%	75.2%	35.3%	47.5%	1.8%	0.6%
Senior Manager	105	18.1%	71.4%	8.0%	10.0%	-	-

Table 18. Pacific EPG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Total headcount	Pacific rep. within level	Non-Pacific rep. within level	Pacific rep. across levels	Non-Pacific rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Line Manager	470	16.8%	80.0%	65.3%	43.2%	3.0%	2.8%
Manager	476	7.4%	85.5%	28.9%	46.8%	4.0%	2.5%
Senior Manager	105	6.7%	82.9%	5.8%	10.0%	-	-

Table 19. Asian EPG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Total headcount	Asian rep. within level	Non-Asian rep. within level	Asian rep. across levels	Non-Asian rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Line Manager	470	8.1%	88.7%	54.3%	45.3%	5.2%	4.6%
Manager	476	6.3%	86.6%	42.9%	44.7%	0.8%	0.7%
Senior Manager	105	1.9%	87.6%	2.9%	10.0%	-	-

Table 20. European and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Total headcount	European rep. within level	Non-European rep. within level	European rep. across levels	Non-European rep. across levels	EPG average	EPG median
Line Manager	470	64.5%	32.3%	6.1%	4.4%	-3.7%	-5.0%
Manager	476	73.5%	19.3%	7.0%	2.6%	-3.9%	-3.2%
Senior Manager	105	76.2%	13.3%	1.6%	0.4%	5.8%	2.0%

By occupation group

Table 21. Māori EPG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Māori rep. within occupation group	Non-Māori rep. within occupation group	Māori rep. across occupation groups	Non-Māori rep. across occupation groups	EPG average	EPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	21.9%	72.9%	5.1%	5.5%	1.5%	4.5%
Contact centre workers	18.4%	78.6%	11.6%	15.9%	-0.6%	-5.4%
ICT professionals & technicians	10.4%	79.3%	2.0%	4.9%	8.7%	2.5%
Information professionals	17.5%	77.1%	8.6%	12.2%	-0.7%	-0.4%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	15.5%	79.5%	2.9%	4.8%	-4.7%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	23.7%	71.5%	5.2%	5.1%	7.8%	0.0%
Managers	24.0%	70.0%	9.9%	9.3%	5.9%	5.1%
Policy analyst	11.9%	77.2%	0.6%	1.2%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	28.8%	67.6%	53.8%	40.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Others not elsewhere included	6.0%	88.0%	0.1%	0.7%	-	-

Table 22. Pacific EPG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Pacific rep. within occupation group	Non-Pacific rep. within occupation group	Pacific rep. across occupation groups	Non-Pacific rep. across occupation groups	EPG average	EPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	10.8%	84.1%	3.4%	5.8%	4.3%	3.7%
Contact centre workers	24.9%	72.1%	20.9%	13.5%	0.4%	0.0%
ICT professionals & technicians	9.3%	80.3%	2.4%	4.6%	14.5%	17.9%
Information professionals	10.4%	84.2%	6.9%	12.3%	0.3%	-4.1%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	17.4%	77.7%	4.3%	4.3%	9.6%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	14.5%	80.7%	4.3%	5.3%	9.8%	0.0%
Managers	11.7%	82.3%	6.5%	10.1%	12.3%	12.0%
Policy analyst	5.0%	84.2%	0.3%	1.2%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	20.5%	75.9%	50.9%	42.1%	1.9%	3.9%
Others not elsewhere included	4.0%	90.0%	0.1%	0.6%	-	-

Table 23. Asian EPG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Asian rep. within occupation group	Non-Asian rep. within occupation group	Asian rep. across occupation groups	Non-Asian rep. across occupation groups	EPG average	EPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	14.7%	80.1%	5.0%	5.5%	-1.9%	-1.0%
Contact centre workers	25.4%	71.6%	23.4%	13.2%	2.0%	5.1%
ICT professionals & technicians	30.6%	59.1%	8.6%	3.3%	-0.9%	-2.6%
Information professionals	12.7%	81.9%	9.1%	11.8%	1.5%	2.7%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	18.9%	76.2%	5.2%	4.2%	9.5%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	14.0%	81.1%	4.5%	5.2%	1.1%	0.0%
Managers	6.1%	87.9%	3.7%	10.6%	15.1%	15.1%
Policy analyst	9.9%	79.2%	0.7%	1.1%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	14.4%	82.0%	39.2%	44.6%	3.3%	6.4%
Others not elsewhere included	14.0%	80.0%	0.5%	0.6%	-	-

Table 24. MELAA EPG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	MELAA rep. within occupation group	Non-MELAA rep. within occupation group	MELAA rep. across occupation groups	Non-MELAA rep. across occupation groups	EPG average	EPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	1.0%	93.8%	3.3%	5.4%	-	-
Contact centre workers	2.4%	94.6%	20.7%	14.8%	-1.2%	0.0%
ICT professionals & technicians	2.0%	87.6%	5.3%	4.2%	-	-
Information professionals	2.4%	92.2%	16.0%	11.2%	-0.3%	-2.3%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	2.8%	92.2%	7.3%	4.3%	-	-
Legal, HR & finance professionals	1.3%	93.9%	4.0%	5.1%	-	-
Managers	0.7%	93.3%	4.0%	9.5%	-	-
Policy analyst	4.0%	85.1%	2.7%	1.0%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	1.4%	95.0%	36.0%	43.8%	2.4%	6.2%
Others not elsewhere included	2.0%	92.0%	0.7%	0.6%	-	-

Table 25. European and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Europe rep. within occupation group	Non-Europe rep. within occupation group	Europe rep. across occupation groups	Non-Europe rep. across occupation groups	EPG average	EPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	61.9%	32.9%	6.0%	4.6%	-1.5%	-5.6%
Contact centre workers	47.0%	50.0%	12.2%	18.7%	-1.1%	-2.7%
ICT professionals & technicians	46.5%	43.2%	3.7%	4.9%	-4.4%	-2.6%
Information professionals	67.4%	27.2%	13.7%	7.9%	-0.9%	0.0%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	53.6%	41.5%	4.1%	4.6%	-12.0%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	60.1%	35.1%	5.5%	4.6%	-8.8%	0.0%
Managers	69.5%	24.5%	11.9%	6.0%	-12.3%	-8.3%
Policy analyst	73.3%	15.8%	1.5%	0.5%	-17.8%	-25.7%
Social, health & education workers	52.7%	43.6%	40.6%	48.1%	-1.9%	-1.5%
Others not elsewhere included	80.0%	14.0%	0.8%	0.2%	-9.7%	-6.2%

Our ethnic-gender pay gaps (EGPG)

Table 26. Agency-wide EGPG and representation

Ethnicity	Females	EGPG average	EGPG median
Māori	18.2%	11.5%	1.8%
Pacific	13.1%	18.0%	10.5%
Asian	9.5%	16.5%	8.1%
MELAA	1.1%	10.8%	1.8%
Other Ethnic Groups	0.5%	12.8%	10.5%
European	40.0%	5.7%	1.8%

Within same or similar roles

Table 27. Māori EGPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Māori female rep. within band	Māori female rep. across bands	All male rep. across bands	EGPG average	EGPG median
Core	7,319	19.4%	88.1%	73.7%	2.4%	0.0%
Premium IT	416	4.6%	1.2%	10.6%	-	-
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	8.9%	0.3%	0.6%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	17.0%	9.3%	11.1%	7.2%	8.9%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	4.8%	0.2%	1.7%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	12.4%	0.8%	1.7%	-	-
Not sized	53	5.7%	0.2%	0.5%	-	-

Table 28. Pacific EGPG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Pacific female rep. within band	Pacific female rep. across bands	All male rep. across bands	EGPG average	EGPG median
Core	7,319	14.7%	91.9%	73.7%	6.8%	7.5%
Premium - IT	416	2.2%	0.8%	10.6%	-	-
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	1.8%	0.1%	0.6%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	9.0%	6.9%	11.1%	11.0%	13.6%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	-	-	1.7%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	2.9%	0.3%	1.7%	-	-
Not sized	53	1.9%	0.1%	0.5%	-	-

Table 29. Asian EPGG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	Asian female rep. within band	Asian female rep. across bands	All male rep. across bands	EPGG average	EPGG median
Core	7,319	10.2%	88.5%	73.7%	6.1%	10.0%
Premium - IT	416	11.8%	5.8%	10.6%	5.0%	1.5%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	8.9%	0.6%	0.6%	-	-
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	4.2%	4.4%	11.1%	10.6%	14.5%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	1.6%	0.1%	1.7%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	1.0%	0.1%	1.7%	-	-
Not sized	53	7.5%	0.5%	0.5%	-	-

Table 30. European EPGG and representation within same or similar roles

Pay Group	Total headcount	OEG female rep. within band	OEG female rep. across bands	All male rep. across bands	EPGG average	EPGG median
Core	7,319	40.7%	83.8%	73.7%	0.0	-1.5
Premium - IT	416	13.9%	1.6%	10.6%	3.6%	3.9%
Premium – Forecasting & Costing, Policy	56	57.1%	0.9%	0.6%	4.3%	-1.3%
Managers and Senior Specialists	884	45.2%	11.2%	11.1%	2.6%	3.8%
IT Managers and Senior Specialists	62	22.6%	0.4%	1.7%	-	-
Senior Managers	105	46.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	-0.2%
Not sized	53	47.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	1.8%

By level of earning

Table 31. Māori EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Māori female rep. within level	Māori female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	14.9%	13.1%	14.9%	0.3%	0.0%
Middle	20.6%	73.7%	58.6%	2.9%	0.0%
Higher	12.7%	13.2%	26.5%	5.9%	6.9%

Table 32. Pacific EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Pacific female rep. within level	Pacific female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	18.5%	22.5%	14.9%	0.4%	0.0%
Middle	14.0%	69.3%	58.6%	5.2%	1.5%
Higher	5.7%	8.2%	26.5%	9.8%	8.4%

Table 33. Asian EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Asian female rep. within level	Asian female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	16.4%	27.6%	14.9%	0.6%	0.0%
Middle	9.0%	61.4%	58.6%	2.9%	1.5%
Higher	5.5%	11.0%	26.5%	12.3%	8.8%

Table 34. MELAA EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	MELAA female rep. within level	MELAA female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	1.5%	23.2%	14.9%	0.6%	0.0%
Middle	0.9%	57.9%	58.6%	2.4%	0.0%
Higher	1.1%	18.9%	26.5%	-	-

Table 35. Other Ethnic Groups EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	OEG female rep. within level	OEG female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	0.9%	27.7%	14.9%	-	-
Middle	0.4%	55.3%	58.6%	4.3%	5.2%
Higher	0.5%	17.0%	26.5%	-	-

Table 36. European EPGG and representation by level of earning

Level of earning	Asian female rep. within level	Asian female rep. across levels	All male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Lower	35.0%	14.0%	14.9%	0.2%	0.0%
Middle	41.1%	66.9%	58.6%	0.8%	0.0%
Higher	40.4%	19.1%	26.5%	1.8%	3.2%

By level of seniority

Table 37. Māori EPGG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Māori female rep. within level	Māori female rep. across levels	Male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Line Manager	21.5%	6.3%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Manager	10.9	3.2%	8.0%	3.7%	3.6%
Senior Manager	12.4%	0.8%	1.7%	-	-

Table 38. Pacific EPGG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Pacific female rep. within level	Pacific female rep. across levels	Male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Line Manager	12.6%	5.1%	4.8%	2.9%	2.5%
Manager	4.4%	1.8%	8.0%	5.7%	2.7%
Senior Manager	2.9%	0.3%	1.7%	-	-

Table 39. Asian EPGG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	Asian female rep. within level	Asian female rep. across levels	Male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Line Manager	6.0%	3.3%	4.8%	2.8%	2.5%
Manager	2.1%	1.2%	8.0%	-	-
Senior Manager	1.0%	0.1%	1.7%	-	-

Table 40. European EPGG and representation by level of seniority

Level of seniority	European female rep. within level	European female rep. across levels	Male rep. across levels	EPGG average	EPGG median
Line Manager	47.0%	6.2%	4.8%	-1.7%	-2.5%
Manager	40.5%	5.4%	8.0%	1.8%	-0.6%
Senior Manager	46.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	-0.2%

By occupation group

Table 41. Māori EGP and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Māori female rep. within occupation group	Māori female rep. across occupation groups	All male rep. across occupation groups	EGPG average	EGPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	19.5%	5.8%	2.5%	1.3%	2.8%
Contact centre workers	13.4%	10.8%	14.9%	-0.5%	-5.4%
ICT professionals & technicians	4.5%	1.1%	10.3%	-	-
Information professionals	11.9%	7.5%	14.1%	3.2%	0.1%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	11.9%	2.8%	5.0%	-4.1%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	20.0%	5.6%	4.6%	9.5%	0.0%
Managers	17.0%	9.0%	11.6%	10.3%	7.5%
Policy analyst	9.9%	0.6%	1.0%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	23.7%	56.6%	35.1%	0.7%	0.0%
Others not elsewhere included	6.0%	0.2%	0.7%	-	-

Table 42. Pacific EGP and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Pacific female rep. within occupation group	Pacific females rep. across occupation groups	All male rep. across occupation groups	EGPG average	EGPG median
Clerical & administrative workers	9.7%	4.0%	2.5%	4.3%	2.8%
Contact centre workers	20.0%	22.3%	14.9%	0.1%	-5.4%
ICT professionals & technicians	2.3%	0.8%	10.3%	-	-
Information professionals	7.0%	6.1%	14.1%	3.9%	-2.6%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	14.0%	4.6%	5.0%	6.5%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	11.8%	4.6%	4.6%	11.7%	0.0%
Managers	7.9%	5.7%	11.6%	17.8%	15.5%
Policy analyst	4.0%	0.3%	1.0%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	15.6%	51.4%	35.1%	2.6%	2.5%
Others not elsewhere included	2.0%	0.1%	0.7%	-	-

Table 43. Asian EPGG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	Asian female rep. within occupation group	Asian female rep. across occupation groups	All male rep. across occupation groups	EPGG average	EPGG median
Clerical & administrative workers	11.0%	6.3%	2.5%	-1.4%	-0.8%
Contact centre workers	16.4%	25.2%	14.9%	2.0%	0.0%
ICT professionals & technicians	11.4%	5.3%	10.3%	6.8%	2.6%
Information professionals	7.3%	8.8%	14.1%	4.0%	2.8%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	9.3%	4.3%	5.0%	4.5%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	9.6%	5.2%	4.6%	5.8%	0.0%
Managers	3.4%	3.4%	11.6%	23.2%	18.4%
Policy analyst	8.9%	1.1%	1.0%	-	-
Social, health & education workers	8.8%	40.0%	35.1%	3.2%	3.7%
Others not elsewhere included	8.0%	0.5%	0.7%	-	-

Table 44. European EPGG and representation by occupation group

Occupation group	European female rep. within occupation group	European female rep. across occupation groups	All male rep. across occupation groups	EPGG average	EPGG median
Clerical & administrative workers	54.9%	7.4%	2.5%	-0.1%	-3.8%
Contact centre workers	32.0%	11.7%	14.9%	-0.4%	-5.4%
ICT professionals & technicians	13.6%	1.5%	10.3%	5.3%	2.6%
Information professionals	42.8%	12.2%	14.1%	3.8%	1.8%
Inspectors & regulatory officers	36.0%	3.9%	5.0%	-5.8%	0.0%
Legal, HR & finance professionals	43.0%	5.5%	4.6%	1.3%	0.0%
Managers	45.1%	10.8%	11.6%	3.7%	3.0%
Policy analyst	52.5%	1.5%	1.0%	12.2%	2.6%
Social, health & education workers	41.3%	44.6%	35.1%	-0.4%	-1.5%
Others not elsewhere included	50.0%	0.7%	0.7%	-7.4%	-11.9%