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***Introduction***

Merits, targets and quotas also termed as affirmative actions are termed as standards that can act as an assessment tool and perfect standards for the distribution of resources and the satisfaction of the public homegroups of employment, management and recruitment. Merit is defined as a quality that allocates scales of good, bad, worthy, or reward. Target is defined as the selected aim or objective taking into account that it is associated with achievement. Quota is defined as a fixed share of something that is entitled to an individual or a group of individuals in order to harmonize the essence of contribution. [2] Three of the scales are used to determine and resolve issues that are associated with ethnicity, sexuality, disability and religion. There are two contrasting views regarding this system, side by side, there are a number of benefits that are counted. Gender equality is a topic that proceeds in parallel to the affirmative action, taking into consideration that people think, merits and quotas are actually a disservice to women because it compromises the authorities and positions that are given to the females. These systems compromise the position of all females who are left with the idea that females are given job opportunity only because of the quota that suppressed that position of better qualified men. The other side of the picture highlights, because of the quota system, indigenous women are making their way to political grounds. Radical solutions are proposed to guarantee the equal representation of women in national indigenous leadership. On the same paradigm, it is asserted that merits, quotas and targets are byproducts to each other because one is used in place of other when one of the scales fails to address its validity. In a nutshell, it can be inferred that these three categories are platforms of evaluation where it is supported and equally argued, adhering to variant perceptions. This paper will discuss ideologies and changing perspectives in terms of affirmative action over the course of years and geographies.

***Australia and measures of representation a success***

In Australia, affirmative actions are the central part of workforce participation, as well as gender equality, adhering to the first legal opportunity that was passed in 1986. By 2015, the Australian government ensured 40% representation of men and women on all the public platforms. Although Australia is one of the significant countries to impart equal rights for women in terms of historical perspective, still there was slow progress in terms of government representation. [1] It is asserted that merit and quota system is an approach that has made women take an equal part in the progress of country. In the same way, the Australian Labor Party has also given equal representation to both men and women because it is believed that this quota system can mitigate the narrow horizons of thought. It is asserted that 40% of the seats would be filled by women and the other 40% are to be filled by men. Remaining 20% can be filled by any of the genders. The quota system that is associated with race, disability, religion and nationality is a significant option for the people who are treated as marginalized. alienated people are given the opportunity to take part in different areas of work and employment such as politics, education and other public grounds. It is significant to note that target, merit and quota system is an approach that address minorities and people with other ethnic grounds to take an equal part in the walk of life because there are a number of students who don't get opportunities to work and learn due to some gaps of identity. [2]. It is evident that affirmative actions have promised a bright future for a number of individuals who were the victims of racism and religious phobia in the past. It has a social, economic and political approach towards national assessment.

***A backlash to representation***

The other side of the picture highlights that these affirmative positions are doing more harm than good. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, it is inferred that although the quotas and targets are making difference to the actual count of the number of women who are performing some senior roles in leadership, these roles are actually the wrong principles. Many of the people think it too counterproductive as well as tokenistic in order to bring about a change in the culture of the workplace. MaCann, (2019) believe that merit argument is one of the significant issues to address whenever the quota system, targets and merit spectra are analyzed. It is argued that the merit system allows any well-suited person to get a job because there would be deficit supply of experienced and qualified women who could address the given post with full advocacy and authority. [3]  Berett, (2019) assert, merit assumption is more like a conflict because the abilities of an individual are continuously negated and doubted under the impression of quota and merit. It is justified as one of the reasons that people are usually opposed to the implementation of quotas. The same approach paves the way for social, moral cultural and ethics issues because people feel inferiority complex when they are compared to those who are the candidates of reserved seats. It is believed that a racist and narrow approach towards other identities and nationalities is also traced because of the reserved system of seats, as people feel that their right and position is curbed and occupied by someone who has no skill or ability, in fact, it is the identity that has given them subject power.

***Paradigms of culture, religion, disability and nationality***

It is significant to note that the timeline of quotas, targets and merits have changed over time, and with culture. In past, there was a narrow spectrum of merit and quota in which geographical paradigms were emphasized, addressing public services and institutions. With the passage of time, the approach has changed, asserting, almost all the cultures are given the option of representation side by side, both public and private department is encouraged to opt for the option that can ensure equal representation. [4] Today, women are one of the major categories that are given the opportunity of representation in terms of both employment and education in all industries such as politics and military. In Australia, women are given a 40% representation. However, history infers that Australian politics has several allegations of sexism in terms of culture. According to the Australian Institute of Company Directors, by 2015, there are 29.7% of women who are given representation in organizations and politics. [5] By now, there are only 200 companies where there are no women on board and about 45% of the directors are appointed in 2018 who are women. Even, Fortescue, one of the largest mining company has 55% female directors including position of Chief Executive. [4] According to Mathew, (2019) merits are not fulfilling the required position so it is the time for quotas to work because they ensure both equal participation and legitimate chances of recruitment. In contrast, target system is a slow process but the efforts to communicate, educate, change culture and stereotypes, quotas and merits are playing a significant role.

***A comparative analysis of Australia and India***

A comparison with India asserts that India had a history of deprivation and negligence but the perception is changed over time. Data from Think Tank highlights that centuries’ old Hindu Caste system is given the right to vote. Similar to Australia, the parliament of India has passed a bill according to which youth and lower social classes are given the right to use their power. [1] However, the information from All India Trinomial Congress Party has shared that the bill is an entire platform of guilt because the ratio of unemployment is growing with the passage of time and about 10% of the population is unemployed. [1] In contrast, Australia has strong baselines that ensures employment for the people belonging to minorities especially women. While, in India, data from the Centre of Monitoring Indian Economy highlights that India has lost about 11 million jobs within the last ten years and it makes up the ratio of 83% in rural areas. [1] In a nutshell, it can be observed that Australia is ranked at a higher level in terms the analysis of quota, merits and targets as compared to India where minorities are just given theoretical opportunities and women are still treated as “other population”.

***Flashback to the entire framework***

Affirmative action such as merits, quotas and targets are paradigms of evaluation because they have incorporated stance of participation in underrepresented people. These positions have incorporated a scale that is used for the participation of people in both private and public avenues of work. Sexism and culture stereotypes are the major departments that are addressed under affirmative actions. [4] This paradigm has changed over time because Australia has empowered women to a great extent because of equal representation. However, these actions are treated with both negative and positive connotations because at one hand they allow individuals to show their expertise but on the other hand, the options of eligibility are curbed because there are a few seats. It is inferred that there are a number of people who believe that women are not eligible of credits and men don't want to work with women’s direction and doubt their skill by associating it with the ratio of representation.
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