

Abt
Associates
of Canada

Social
Research
Consultants

Project Report

**MINORITY TARGET GROUPS:
AN ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM
THE SURVEY OF BARRIERS
TO ADVANCEMENT IN THE
PUBLIC SERVICE**

Prepared for

**Greg Hunter
Human Resources Division
Treasury Board of Canada**

Participating Staff

**David Hoffman
Frank Eaton**

787-3709

**January 1990
Ottawa
N3482/ed**

I

INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

In September 1988, the President of the Treasury Board established a Task Force on Barriers to Women in the Public Service. The Task Force engaged Statistics Canada to conduct a survey of public servants to provide information on the barriers to advancement they had encountered and on the actions public servants thought would help most in overcoming possible barriers. Consultants assisted Statistics Canada in the development of the questionnaire by conducting focus groups across the country. In May 1989, Statistics Canada distributed 20,000 questionnaires to a sample of public servants. The frame for the sample was the incumbent file of December 1988, filtered to include only employees working under the PSSRA in Canada and to exclude employees in term positions of less than 6 months. Of these, 12,044 public servants returned questionnaires, making a response rate of 60%.

The objective of the Task Force survey was to determine whether or not women in the federal public service face barriers to advancement and whether these barriers differ from barriers facing men. The data are rich in information about the experience of public servants with respect to working conditions, barriers to access to developmental opportunities and promotion and other job-related matters. While the original purpose of the survey was to permit exploration of gender-based differences among public servants, responses to the survey can be usefully analyzed to explore a variety of other concerns as well.

Treasury Board asked Abt Associates to re-analyze the survey results focussing on barriers for the disabled, aboriginals and visible minority employees of the Public Service.

Our task has been to focus the analysis and the report on situations where the experiences and perceptions of the above-mentioned equity target groups are significantly different from those of other public servants. We have directed our analytical efforts at exploring four main questions:

- Do target group members differ significantly from other public servants in their rate of advancement?
- Have target groups who have not changed position since entry into the public service spent a shorter or longer period of time in their current position than comparable other public servants?
- Does being a member of a target group affect denial of promotion or development opportunities and perceptions of fairness of promotion in the public service?
- Do target group members face different barriers from other public servants? And to what extent do they mention barriers specifically related to being handicapped, aboriginal or a member of a visible minority?

B. REPORTING "SIGNIFICANT" RESULTS

In this report when we call attention to differences between groups, we do so when they are statistically significant. When a result is reported as statistically significant, we mean that the result, though based on a sample, would likely be true if all public servants were surveyed. Or, to state the converse, two differences of proportion that are said to be "not statistically significant" may look noteworthy, but they are based on sample sizes that are too small to be sure that the result would be verified if everyone in the groups was surveyed.

Much of our analysis relies on chi-square tests of statistical significance. This test is appropriate for comparing proportions of public servants who possess a certain characteristic, such as having sought a promotion in the past three years.

To increase our confidence in the reporting of the findings of the survey we have conducted a considerable number of analyses using multivariate statistical techniques such as multiple linear regression and discriminant analysis. The purpose of these technically

complex procedures is to try to ensure that statistically significant relationships between demographic and job-related variables and experience or perceptions are not in fact better explained by combinations of these and other factors that we might have otherwise have overlooked.

C. ANALYTICAL STRUCTURE

Our analysis of the questions listed above follows a common format for the three target groups under study. Therefore, we briefly describe our analytical approach to each question here, then present the results for each group separately in the next chapter.

1. Rate of Advancement

We seek to test the hypothesis that members of a target group advance more slowly than others in the public service. Our analysis also examines how target group members who have advanced rapidly differ from those who have not.

As in earlier work, we use change in average (mean) salary as a proxy for career advancement. Data added to the survey file by Statistics Canada included the mean salary in the employee's current group and level (MSC) and that of the group and level in which he or she entered the public service (MSE), adjusted for inflation. Comparing the two provides a measure of an individual's career advancement.

We recognize that a valid measure of career advancement is difficult to define and to construct. Advancement or success can comprise many forms of achievement or reward that may not be adequately reflected in the measure used in our analysis. However, within the constraints imposed by the data and by the underlying assumptions of our analysis, the above measure best served our analytical purposes.

We point out that the measure does not directly represent a rate of advancement. As we explain below, however, we control for years of service in the models we use. Therefore, while we do not examine rates of advancement directly, we achieve the

same result by comparing amount of advancement among people with comparable duration of service. When we state (below) that one group advances "more quickly" or "at a greater rate" than another, we are in fact referring to "greater advancement over the same number of years of service."

For public servants who have advanced, we use the measure MSC-MSE. To satisfy assumptions underlying our analytical methods, we work with the natural logarithm of this difference. Hence the measure of advancement we analyze is $\log(\text{MSC-MSE})$, where MSC-MSE is greater than zero.

Our comparison of advancement of target group members and non-members uses two multiple regression models in which advancement (as defined above) is the dependent variable. The independent (explanatory) variables used are listed in Appendix A. A test of statistical significance on the estimated coefficient for a variable indicating target group membership determines whether membership has a significant effect on advancement, overall. In the second model, we allow for variations in this effect within classes of Category and Level combinations. (Statistics Canada has defined generic Junior, Intermediate, and Senior levels across standard classification Groups for this purpose.) The exact combinations used varies among target groups, depending on the number of respondents available in each. The interpretation of the results of these models is less straightforward, and we refer technically inclined readers to Appendix A for details.

Applying the first model to only target group members allows us to identify characteristics associated (in a statistically significant way) with lesser or greater advancement scores among members of a specific target group. A statistically significant coefficient on any variable in the model indicates its influence.

2. Index of Stagnation

Many respondents had not changed group and level since entering the public service. Put another way, they experienced zero advancement ($\text{MSC-MSE}=0$). Since non-advancers likely differ considerably from advancers in many ways, we study the two groups separately. Years of service (LGNS) is the analytical variable we use for people with zero advancement. It embodies the converse concept of lack of advancement,

indicating the duration of the state of having failed to advance, and may be considered an index of stagnation in career advancement.

Length of service is the dependent variable for a second set of regression models used to analyze the index just described. The models follow much the same structure as those described above for the analysis of advancement scores. They exclude certain variables that distinguish conditions of the first public service job from those of the current one, since both are the same for employees who have not advanced. Again, Appendix A shows the exact set of variables used.

3. Denial of Promotion or Development and Perceptions of Fairness

This component of our analysis involves six variables derived from several questions from the original survey. If the respondent indicated in Question 24 that he or she wanted or requested a promotion in the last three years, Question 25 addressed perceived reasons why the respondent might have missed out on, or been denied, a promotion. We interpret any response to Question 25 as an indication of denial of promotion, and this forms our first analysis variable. Similarly, if the respondent indicated in Question 27 that he or she wanted or requested a developmental opportunity (secondment, training, etc.) in the last three years, Question 28 addressed perceived reasons why the respondent might have missed out on, or been denied, such an opportunity. Again, we treat any response to Question 28 as an indication of denial of a development opportunity, which is the second analysis variable.

Question 35 asked respondents to indicate to what extent they agree with several perceptions. We have selected four perceptions that have particular bearing on advancement of target groups:

- (2) Positions are often posted after the department/agency has already identified the person they want to fill the position.
- (9) Employment equity and affirmative action programmes give women an unfair career advantage when the public service is downsizing.

- (15) People get ahead because of who [sic] they know.
- (16) People quit the public service rather than repay pension contributions after extended leave.

A response indicating either slight or strong agreement with each of these perceptions was the basis for four more analysis variables.

The method of analysis for determining the effect of membership in a target group is the same for all six variables. Each is a binary (dichotomous, or "dummy") variable, taking the value 1 if a condition is present and 0 otherwise. Therefore, we selected discriminant analysis as the method for detecting an effect due to membership in a target group. This method is commonly applied in cases where the outcome variable has this structure. The discriminating variables considered for the analysis were essentially those that entered the regression models described above. We used a stepwise approach designed to select one such variable at a time. The variable selected at each step was the one with the greatest discriminating power among all the remaining candidates. Details of the results of these analyses are presented in Appendix A.

4. Comparability of Barriers Faced

The focus of this analysis is a comparison of barriers faced by members of target groups, compared to those faced by non-members.

The barriers are those originally listed in Question 25 of the questionnaire (1 to 29) as well as a further 6 responses that were developed after the survey was completed when "other, please specify" was broken out further. The proportion of respondents answering Question 25 is reduced below the total numbers in each target group; those who were not denied promotion did not answer. On the other hand, multiple responses were possible. The analysis is based on cross tabulations and our interest focuses on those situations in which the target group members differ significantly in the barriers they cite from other public servants.

D. THE TARGET GROUPS

Exhibit I-1 shows the distribution of the three target groups by occupational category and level (junior, intermediate and senior). The numbers shown should be interpreted as follows:

- The column headed "N" is the unweighted number of cases in the sample.
- The column headed "Population" is the weighted number, representing the number in the particular level and category of the public service as a whole.

The exhibit shows that there are 209 aboriginal respondents representing 3,487 aboriginals in the public service population as whole; 667 disabled representing 13,216 in the population; and 516 visible minority members, representing 8,985 in the population.

Question 44, the source of data on target status was constructed such that respondents could indicate multiple target group memberships. The vast majority of target group members indicated only a single group membership. However, the following combinations of target group membership were reported.

- Disabled and visible minority only -- 41.
- Disabled and aboriginal only -- 15.
- Visible minority and aboriginal only -- 21.
- Disabled, aboriginal and visible minority -- 5.

These combined target groups are too small to warrant separate analyses.

EXHIBIT I-1 Number of Target Group Respondents and Number in the Public Service Population - By Occupational Category and Level

Category	Level	Aboriginal		Disabled		Visible Minority	
		N	Popu- lation	N	Popu- lation	N	Popu- lation
Management	Senior	5	22	11	377	14	85
Scientific & Professional	Junior	5	66	28	377	50	649
	Intermediate	8	30	21	366	90	1,608
	Senior	7	16	11	27	26	69
Administrative & Foreign Service	Junior	38	704	91	1,959	80	1,716
	Intermediate	19	280	46	873	34	579
	Senior	11	55	22	149	13	67
Technical	Junior	15	310	61	1,520	31	562
	Intermediate	3	13	27	341	14	161
	Senior	-	-	19	34	5	9
Administrative Support	Junior	35	811	109	2,435	71	1,630
	Intermediate	25	404	95	1,602	42	709
	Senior	-	-	2	3	2	3
Operational	Junior	17	328	38	1,123	18	452
	Intermediate	18	424	68	2,235	24	675
	Senior	4	25	18	110	2	10
ALL		209	3,487	667	13,216	516	8,985

II

FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE THREE TARGET GROUPS

A. ABORIGINALS

The analysis in this section concerns survey respondents who identified themselves (Question 44) as Inuit, Metis, Non-Status Indian, or Status Indian. For convenience, we refer to this group as aboriginals.

1. Advancement (for those who advanced)

Overall, aboriginals experienced no significantly different advancement than non-aboriginals. Although the regression estimate indicated about 8.2% less advancement for aboriginals over comparable length of service, the data were not precise enough to give us confidence that the difference occurred due to reasons other than sampling error.

Examination of the model disaggregated by classes of category and level also revealed no significant differences between aboriginals and non-aboriginals.

Looking only at aboriginals, we found that several factors have significant influence on advancement. Associated with greater advancement are the following characteristics:

- Female
- Longer period of service (years since first PS job)
- First PS job was a term position
- Longer period(s) of leave taken for educational purposes
- Current position in intermediate or senior levels of Administrative and Foreign Service Category (relative to junior Administrative and Foreign Service, which we used as the reference group)

Employees with the following characteristics exhibited less advancement:

- Older
- More children under five years old
- Longer period(s) of leave taken for pregnancy
- Current position in Technical, Administrative Support, or Operational category (relative to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

2. Stagnation (for those who did not advance)

Again, among employees who did not advance to a group and level with a higher mean salary, aboriginals had not stayed in their positions any longer than non-aboriginals.

In the disaggregated analysis, however, we found that aboriginals in the Technical category had remained in the same group and level 6.3 years longer than comparable non-aboriginals. The survey received only 18 responses from aboriginals in this category, but the large difference in years of service achieved statistical significance.

Among aboriginals, the following statistically significant factors increased the measure of stagnation:

- More children between 12 and 17 years old
- Educated to the Master's level (compared to failing to finish high school, which was the reference group)
- Current position in the Technical category (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

3. Likelihood of Identifying Specific Barriers

This section relies on discriminant analysis to identify the factors associated with an individual's perception of the existence of certain unfavourable characteristics of

promotion opportunities in the public service or of having been denied a promotion or a developmental opportunity.

The characteristics about which the survey solicited opinions and which we examined in this study were described in Chapter I. However, whether a respondent was aboriginal or not did not significantly affect agreement with any of the cited statements or denial of a promotion or a developmental opportunity, after controlling for other influencing factors measured in the survey.

4. Differences in Barriers Identified

Exhibit II-1 compares the barriers identified by aboriginals with those reported by other public servants. The percentages reported are for public servants who reported being denied promotions. Although 15% of aboriginals denied promotion said they were denied promotion because of their aboriginal status, this reason for denial was not the most frequently cited reason. More important for aboriginal respondents were the following reasons:

- I was not part of the group - 30%.
- Manager did not think I was ready - 28%.
- Manager did not want to to replace me - 27%.
- Manager would not support my application - 25%.
- Manager did not give me information - 21%.

Note that these reasons were given in roughly the same proportions as by other public servants. However, also noteworthy is the fact that 8% said they were denied promotion because they objected to sexual harassment and 15% said that it was because they were women.

EXHIBIT II-1 Barriers Identified By Aboriginals

	Aboriginal						ALL		
	No			Yes					
	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %
TOTAL DENIED	4,034	68,799	100.00	70	1,160	100.00	4,104	69,959	100.00
Manager did not think I was ready	834	14,074	20.46	19	329	28.39	853	14,403	20.59
Manager did not want to replace me	971	16,945	24.63	18	310	26.74	989	17,255	24.66
Manager did not give me information	558	10,441	15.18	16	243	20.91	574	10,684	15.27
Manager would not support my application	863	15,841	23.02	15	292	25.20	878	16,133	23.06
Did not get along with supervisor	451	8,041	11.69	8	113	9.77	459	8,154	11.66
Did not want overtime, set hours, shifts	68	1,229	1.79	0	-	-	68	1,229	1.76
I was too young	228	3,715	5.40	4	78	6.72	232	3,793	5.42
I was too old	210	3,542	5.15	3	22	1.87	213	3,563	5.09
I was or was planning to become pregnant	93	1,313	1.91	0	-	-	93	1,313	1.88
I am a woman	417	5,181	7.53	16	170	14.66	433	5,351	7.65
I am a man	296	5,653	8.22	2	42	3.59	298	5,694	8.14
I am a member of a visible minority	137	2,582	3.75	7	141	12.19	144	2,724	3.89
I am a person with disabilities	66	1,268	1.84	0	-	-	66	1,268	1.81
I am an aboriginal person	1	21	0.03	10	179	15.47	11	200	0.29
Would not normally hire a woman	131	1,446	2.10	6	51	4.43	137	1,497	2.14
Would not normally hire a man	30	587	0.85	2	33	2.82	32	620	0.89
I had young children, dependents at home	132	2,080	3.02	3	44	3.77	135	2,123	3.04
I worked part-time or shared a job	62	960	1.40	0	-	-	62	960	1.37
I was divorced, separated	28	499	0.73	1	10	0.88	29	510	0.73
I was a single parent	31	505	0.73	1	25	2.15	32	530	0.76
I objected to sexual harassment	43	638	0.93	6	97	8.35	49	735	1.05
Took maternity/paternity/parental leave	91	1,414	2.05	1	15	1.31	92	1,429	2.04
Took language/education leave	20	313	0.46	1	5	0.43	21	318	0.45
Took long term disability/sick leave	55	1,162	1.69	0	-	-	55	1,162	1.66
I am an anglophone	801	13,089	19.02	11	136	11.72	812	13,225	18.90
I am a Francophone	206	3,702	5.38	1	25	2.14	207	3,727	5.33
I could not relocate	238	3,674	5.34	5	90	7.80	243	3,764	5.38
I was not "part of the group"	1,184	20,552	29.87	22	350	30.15	1,206	20,902	29.88
I was unable to travel	52	859	1.25	1	15	1.31	53	874	1.25
I did not meet a language requirement	51	714	1.04	0	-	-	51	714	1.02
Downsizing, budget cut	49	771	1.12	1	6	0.53	50	777	1.11
Competition, promotion process not fair	118	2,271	3.30	1	2	0.16	119	2,273	3.25
Nothing available	305	5,326	7.74	3	57	4.91	308	5,383	7.69
I lack educational requirement	53	1,013	1.47	1	25	2.15	54	1,038	1.48
Other	1,020	17,581	25.55	21	352	30.32	1,041	17,933	25.63

B. DISABLED

This section concerns survey respondents who indicated (Question 44) that they consider themselves, or believe that a potential employer would likely consider them, disadvantaged by reason of a persistent and severe disability. For short, we refer to this group as disabled.

1. Advancement (for those who advanced)

The disabled experienced advancement no different from that of the able-bodied. The regression estimate indicated about 2.2% greater advancement for the disabled, but this amount was not statistically significant at even close to the .05 level.

Disaggregating by category and level reinforced this finding. While some differences (see Appendix A) were quite large, inherent variation in the data prevented a conclusion that the differences were due to other than sampling error.

Examining the disabled only, we found several factors that influence advancement in a statistically significant fashion. Associated with greater advancement are:

- Completion of high school (compared to not completing)
- Longer period of service (years since first PS job)
- First PS job was in the National Capital Region
- First PS job was a term position
- Employee was denied a developmental opportunity in the past two years
- Current position in the Managerial category or at the intermediate or senior levels in one of the Scientific and Professional, Administrative and Foreign Service, or Technical categories (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

The following characteristics tend to curtail advancement among the disabled:

- Older
- Current position at the junior level in the Technical category, or at any level in the Administrative Support or Operational categories (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

2. Stagnation (for those who did not advance)

We find some evidence that disabled employees who did not advance tended to have stayed at the same group and level slightly longer than the able-bodied. The regression model yielded an estimate of two-thirds of a year longer for this difference. While this value is not significant at the .05 level, it would be at the .08 level. We conclude that the disabled may stagnate longer than the able-bodied, but warn that this conclusion has a greater chance of being incorrect than others we state in this report (8% *versus* 5% or less).

This effect was particularly evident at the intermediate and senior levels of the Operational category. The regression analysis indicates that disabled people who have been in such positions since entering the public service (86 respondents fit this description) have been there 2.9 years longer than comparable able-bodied employees.

Looking at only the disabled who failed to advance, we find that older workers have stayed longer at the current group and level, while those for whom the first public service position was a term position had a shorter stay there, as did people at the intermediate or senior levels in the Scientific and Professional category or at the junior level in either the Administrative Support or the Operational categories (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service).

3. Likelihood of Identifying Certain Barriers

We found that being both disabled and at the intermediate or senior levels of the Operational category was significantly associated with agreement with the statement that

people will quit the public service rather than repay pension contributions after an absence. Among people in this group, 18% agreed, compared to 10% of those not in this group.

In no other cases (denial or promotion or developmental opportunity or agreement with the other three statements studied) did being disabled have any significant influence on the respondents' answers.

4. Differences in Barriers Identified

Exhibit II-2 shows the pattern of responses for the disabled, compared to other public servants denied promotion.

As was the case with aboriginal respondents, being a member of the target group was not the most frequently cited reason for denial of promotion. Not being part of the group (38%), not having the manager's support for an application (29%), having a manager unwilling to replace (26%) or who thought them unready (24%), were all more frequently cited than "I am a person with disabilities" (17%). Overall, apart from the obvious difference with respect to identifying being a person with a disability as a reason for not being promoted, and not being part of the group, the profile of reasons given the disabled is very similar to that given by other public servants.

C. VISIBLE MINORITIES

The analysis in this section concerns survey respondents who identified themselves (Question 44), by virtue of race or colour, as a member of a visible minority.

1. Advancement (for those who advanced)

Members of visible minorities have experienced greater advancement than non-members. Overall, respondents who identified themselves as members of a visible minority had an advancement score 8.8% higher than comparable non-members.

EXHIBIT II-2 Barriers Identified By Disabled

	Disabled						ALL		
	No			Yes					
	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted X	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted X	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted X
TOTAL DENIED	3,849	64,810	100.00	255	5,149	100.00	4,104	69,959	100.00
Manager did not think I was ready	795	13,145	20.28	58	1,258	24.43	853	14,403	20.59
Manager did not want to replace me	922	15,898	24.53	67	1,357	26.35	989	17,255	24.66
Manager did not give me information	530	9,774	15.08	44	910	17.67	574	10,684	15.27
Manager would not support my application	811	14,642	22.59	67	1,491	28.95	878	16,133	23.06
Did not get along with supervisor	412	7,243	11.18	47	911	17.69	459	8,154	11.66
Did not want overtime, set hours, shifts	62	1,107	1.71	6	122	2.37	68	1,229	1.76
I was too young	217	3,461	5.34	15	332	6.46	232	3,793	5.42
I was too old	197	3,258	5.03	16	305	5.93	213	3,563	5.09
I was or was planning to become pregnant	88	1,224	1.89	5	89	1.73	93	1,313	1.88
I am a woman	410	4,966	7.66	23	385	7.48	433	5,351	7.65
I am a man	280	5,304	8.18	18	390	7.58	298	5,694	8.14
I am a member of a visible minority	126	2,329	3.59	18	395	7.67	144	2,724	3.89
I am a person with disabilities	22	380	0.59	44	887	17.23	66	1,268	1.81
I am an aboriginal person	10	179	0.28	1	21	0.41	11	200	0.29
Would not normally hire a woman	125	1,334	2.06	12	163	3.16	137	1,497	2.14
Would not normally hire a man	29	549	0.85	3	71	1.39	32	620	0.89
I had young children, dependents at home	127	1,996	3.08	8	127	2.47	135	2,123	3.04
I worked part-time or shared a job	61	936	1.44	1	25	0.48	62	960	1.37
I was divorced, separated	27	464	0.72	2	45	0.88	29	510	0.73
I was a single parent	31	513	0.79	1	17	0.33	32	530	0.76
I objected to sexual harassment	46	671	1.04	3	64	1.24	49	735	1.05
Took maternity/paternity/parental leave	86	1,315	2.03	6	114	2.22	92	1,429	2.04
Took language/education leave	20	303	0.47	1	16	0.30	21	318	0.45
Took long term disability/sick leave	42	828	1.28	13	334	6.48	55	1,162	1.66
I am an anglophone	758	12,132	18.72	54	1,093	21.23	812	13,225	18.90
I am a Francophone	195	3,467	5.35	12	261	5.06	207	3,727	5.33
I could not relocate	228	3,468	5.35	15	296	5.75	243	3,764	5.38
I was not "part of the group"	1,112	18,955	29.25	94	1,947	37.81	1,206	20,902	29.88
I was unable to travel	49	772	1.19	4	102	1.99	53	874	1.25
I did not meet a language requirement	46	651	1.00	5	64	1.24	51	714	1.02
Downsizing, budget cut	50	777	1.20	0			50	777	1.11
Competition, promotion process not fair	109	2,097	3.23	10	176	3.43	119	2,273	3.25
Nothing available	293	5,039	7.78	15	344	6.68	308	5,383	7.69
I lack educational requirement	51	949	1.46	3	89	1.73	54	1,038	1.48
Other	972	16,529	25.50	69	1,404	27.26	1,041	17,933	25.63

At the disaggregated level (by category and level), the analysis does not reveal any significant differences. We conclude that the effect overall achieves statistical significance due to the larger numbers of members of visible minorities contributing to the single effect in that model, while the numbers are not sufficient at the disaggregated level to do so.

Considering only respondents who are members of visible minorities, we find that the following factors contribute to greater advancement:

- Longer period of service (years since first PS job)
- Current position is in the Managerial category or at the intermediate level in the Scientific and Professional category (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

At the same time, advancement is slower for members of visible minorities who possess the following traits:

- Older
- Current position at the junior level in the Scientific and Professional category, at the intermediate or senior level in the Administrative and Foreign Service category, or in the Administrative Support or Operational categories (compared to junior Administrative and Foreign Service)

2. Stagnation (for those who did not advance)

Members of visible minorities who have not advanced do not languish in their current positions longer than comparable counterparts. Both overall and disaggregated by category and level, there was no statistically significant difference in the length of time spent at the current group and level.

Among members of visible minorities, age was the only factor that was associated with length of time at the same group and level. Older workers tended to have remained longer.

3. Likelihood of Identifying Specific Barriers

Being a member of a visible minority had no significant effect on workers' attitudes toward the four perceptions of fairness of the promotion process or on their perception that they had been denied a promotion or a developmental opportunity.

4. Differences in Barriers Identified

Exhibit II-3 compares the barriers identified by visible minorities with those cited by other public servants. In this case, in contrast to the pattern for aboriginal respondents, "membership in a visible minority" (42%) and "not part of the group" (43%) were the most frequently identified reasons for denial of promotion. Over two-fifths of visible minority public servants gave these responses.

Visible minority respondents were also a little more inclined than public servants as a whole to say that managers did not think they were ready (31%) or that they would not support their application (32%). Otherwise, as observed for the two other target groups, the barriers identified followed a profile similar to that of other public servants.

EXHIBIT II-3 Barriers Identified By Visible Minorities

	Visible minority						ALL		
	No			Yes					
	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Weighted %
TOTAL DENIED	3,878	66,083	100.00	226	3,877	100.00	4,104	69,959	100.00
Manager did not think I was ready	787	13,217	20.00	66	1,186	30.59	853	14,403	20.59
Manager did not want to replace me	941	16,424	24.85	48	831	21.43	989	17,255	24.66
Manager did not give me information	526	9,824	14.87	48	859	22.17	574	10,684	15.27
Manager would not support my application	809	14,898	22.54	69	1,235	31.86	878	16,133	23.06
Did not get along with supervisor	426	7,573	11.46	33	582	15.00	459	8,154	11.66
Did not want overtime, set hours, shifts	68	1,229	1.86	0	.	.	68	1,229	1.76
I was too young	221	3,603	5.45	11	191	4.92	232	3,793	5.42
I was too old	197	3,309	5.01	16	254	6.56	213	3,563	5.09
I was or was planning to become pregnant	92	1,298	1.96	1	15	0.39	93	1,313	1.88
I am a woman	404	5,072	7.68	29	279	7.21	433	5,351	7.65
I am a man	287	5,543	8.39	11	151	3.90	298	5,694	8.14
I am a member of a visible minority	48	1,093	1.65	96	1,630	42.06	144	2,724	3.89
I am a person with disabilities	60	1,168	1.77	6	99	2.56	66	1,268	1.81
I am an aboriginal person	8	150	0.23	3	50	1.29	11	200	0.29
Would not normally hire a woman	131	1,464	2.22	6	33	0.84	137	1,497	2.14
Would not normally hire a man	28	543	0.82	4	77	1.99	32	620	0.89
I had young children, dependents at home	130	2,053	3.11	5	70	1.81	135	2,123	3.04
I worked part-time or shared a job	60	912	1.38	2	49	1.26	62	960	1.37
I was divorced, separated	28	485	0.73	1	25	0.64	29	510	0.73
I was a single parent	29	472	0.71	3	58	1.50	32	530	0.76
I objected to sexual harassment	44	641	0.97	5	94	2.44	49	735	1.05
Took maternity/paternity/parental leave	91	1,423	2.15	1	6	0.16	92	1,429	2.04
Took language/education leave	20	314	0.48	1	4	0.09	21	318	0.45
Took long term disability/sick leave	52	1,087	1.65	3	75	1.94	55	1,162	1.66
I am an anglophone	779	12,706	19.23	33	519	13.38	812	13,225	18.90
I am a Francophone	203	3,636	5.50	4	91	2.35	207	3,727	5.33
I could not relocate	233	3,596	5.44	10	168	4.34	243	3,764	5.38
I was not "part of the group"	1,109	19,251	29.13	97	1,651	42.60	1,206	20,902	29.88
I was unable to travel	53	874	1.32	0	.	.	53	874	1.25
I did not meet a language requirement	47	652	0.99	4	62	1.60	51	714	1.02
Downsizing, budget cut	50	777	1.18	0	.	.	50	777	1.11
Competition, promotion process not fair	111	2,123	3.21	8	150	3.87	119	2,273	3.25
Nothing available	294	5,191	7.85	14	192	4.97	308	5,383	7.69
I lack educational requirement	52	994	1.50	2	44	1.15	54	1,038	1.48
Other	985	16,872	25.53	56	1,061	27.37	1,041	17,933	25.63