Influencing Our Decisions: Why Quotas Are Accepted by the Public in the Bureaucracy and Not In Legislatures

Riham Mansour

Abstract
The Canadian public has offered little protest to the implementation of quotas for women in the bureaucracy while giving diminutive thought to the introduction of quotas in legislatures. This paper first examines the underrepresentation of women in politics, the nature and the existence of quotas in Canada, as well as the public opinion towards them. To understand what affects public opinion, the examination of elite framing and socialization by the effective majority of the public was necessary. The result of this work is the acknowledgement that bureaucratic quotas are considered legitimate due to elite framing; however, the possibility of legislative quotas is unknown to the public as a result of an absence of both elite framing and socialization by an effective majority of the population.

Introduction

"Affirmative action", "positive discrimination", "free seats", and many other terms are used to refer to quotas, some terms more derogatory than others. Quotas are the number or amount constituting a proportional share (Merriam-Webster, 2010). When considering quotas in politics, quotas are a number or percentage of seats intended for a specific group. Although women compose a majority of the population, they remain a minority within politics. Governments all over the world have created a trend in which quotas have been used to address political underrepresentation of disadvantaged groups, including Canada. However, the Canadian government only implemented quotas for women in the bureaucracy in 1995 with the Employment Equity Act, while quotas have yet to be discussed for its legislatures. Why is the public accepting of quotas in the bureaucracy and not in legislatures? This paper determines that the public acceptance of quotas, despite their ineffectiveness, is reliant upon issues addressed by the effective majority, combined with framing by the political elite. As a result of this, the public accepts quotas in the bureaucracy and not in legislatures. Section 1 of this paper will investigate the nature of the underrepresentation of women in politics, while defining quotas as well as examining various feminist perspectives towards quotas. It will also discuss quotas in the Canadian bureaucracy and legislature, and finally, the ineffectiveness of quotas in addressing the underrepresentation of women in politics. Section 2 of this paper will investigate the socialization of values by the effective majority and framing by the political elite and how these two variables support one another in the discussion of quotas. It will conclude by examining two case studies which demonstrate the aforementioned effects, France and Sweden.

Section 1: Background Information Concerning Quotas to Address Underrepresentation of Women

Section 1.1: Representation of Women in Politics

The poor representation of women within politics is argued to be a result of institutional barriers within politics. Affirmative action, in this regard, entails the modification of these

institutions to increase the number of women in politics. The changes to these political systems, some scholars argue, should work beyond the forms of electoral systems while considering the distribution of decision-making power, such as federalist systems (Sawer and Vickerson, 2010: 3). Despite these considerations, most academics focus on the role of quotas in order to overcome institutional barriers.

One of the primary issues concerning the underrepresentation of women within politics is the absence of public concern. Young determined that, in 2000, only a third of the Canadian population considered the underrepresentation of women within politics a serious problem. When asked whether there should be as many female candidates as male candidates in Parliament, thirty percent of males and fifty percent of females agreed (Young, 2006: 52). These low numbers of the population confirm the notion that the public is unaware or unconcerned with the underrepresentation of women within politics. Proponents of quotas may argue that quotas should be implemented as a result of this dismissal towards underrepresentation of women, due to an absence of public knowledge. It is a valid counterargument that to act for the perceived benefit of the public and not on the wills of the public, presents a paradox concerning the democratic nature of government. To act on the basis of 'public benefits', the government would be required to neglect public will.

Concerning representation within legislatures, the low number of women participating is argued to be a result of the small number of female candidates that political parties put forward. This institutional barrier supports the argument that single-member district systems are less successful in having women involved, rather than proportional representation systems (Duverger, 1955: 79; Young, 2006: 52; Lovenduski, 2005. 99). These proposed institutional reforms have a large role in considering quotas: The electoral and party systems within institutions affect not only the kind of quotas being adopted, but how they are implemented into the system (Lovenduski, 2005: 99).

Scholars use the terms 'substantive representation' and 'descriptive representation' in order to explain the representation of women within politics (Celis, 2008: 72-93; Poggione, 2006: 182). Substantive representation refers to policymakers who act to ensure that the interests of groups are represented. By contrast, descriptive representation holds that the legislators themselves must be members of the groups that they represent, as they are the only ones who can identify the interests of the group (Stevens, 2007: 68). Substantive representation is found within the existing Canadian legislatures, where legislators are expected to represent the interests of both their political party and their electorate. Affirmative action demands for a descriptive representation system in the House of Commons, in which women represent the interests of women. Within the Canadian bureaucracy, descriptive representation exists through the application of the Employment Equity Act.

Descriptive representation has two major limitations, whether expressed through affirmative action or not. These limitations are shown through the uncertainty as to what members of a group are intended to be represented, as well as the inability to represent women as a unified group.

Descriptive representation fails to address whether the member of the group represented in a legislature would be expressing the group's interests, ideas, or simply the identity of the group (Stevens, 2007: 69). These three different categories would result in different responsibilities for legislators. A legislator, who expresses the interests or ideas of the group, would be expected to correspond with their group and express their opinions. Representing the identity of a group only, may cause the legislator to neglect responsibilities to the group they represent: being a member of the group results in representing its identity through a physical presence.

Another issue that descriptive representation raises is the issue of whether women have unified interest, ideas, and identities. As Trimble explains,

> "The case for the entry of more, and more diverse, women into Canada's parliament and legislatures should not be based on their ability to represent 'women's interests', defined as women's difference from men, feminist opinion or particular policy goals. There is no single will, or set of interests, of the category 'woman' that can be intelligibly represented. The social construction of gender situates women within patriarchal norms and practices but does not necessarily lead women to share opinions, agree on political strategies or wish for a particular set of policy outcomes. Thus individual legislators do not and cannot embody the experiences, needs and often complex identities of the entire group of women, nor should they be expected to do so" (2006: 131).

Although this explanation utilizes legislators, this can be applied to descriptive representation in a broader sense. Women cannot appoint representatives to address their interests as women, nor can women be chosen through job selection processes to represent women within the bureaucracy. When considering Canada's implementation of descriptive representation in the bureaucracy, it is difficult to consider whether these women act on behalf of any of these three, other than identity alone. The inability for women to be represented through descriptive representation immediately brings into question whether descriptive representation, and quotas, can be utilized efficiently to address women's interests. Descriptive representation is contingent on the idea that only members of the group can succeed in the representation of its members.

This brings into question whether descriptive representation is required for the existence of substantive representation. Lawless and Theriault argue that descriptive representation is required in order to accomplish the implementation of ideas within legislatures and the bureaucracy on behalf of women (2006: 175). Although there are cases in which representation of specific women's interests have been accomplished through the presence of women in legislatures, this paper holds that women are too diverse of a group to adequately represent through descriptive representation and will not support the substantive representation of women through implementing descriptive representation in the form of quotas. The implementation of women's ideas will only be successful provided it is in the best interest of an effective majority of the population and/or of the political elite, as shown in Section 2 of the paper. This causes one to consider why descriptive representation, quotas, is adopted in one area of government, the bureaucracy, and not the other, the legislature.

There are four discourses that address the perceptions towards the representation of women within politics: the 'fast track' policy, the 'incremental track' policy, the 'gender-blind' policy, and the policy that politics should remain in the hands of men. The fast track policy argues that affirmative action is necessary to set a jump start for women for their entrance into politics, and increase the rate to which women are entering politics. Fast track policy is also concerned with equality of result rather than equality of opportunity when considering the political representation of women. The incremental track policy advocates for the current system in place: the slow, incremental increase of women in politics. The gender blind policy contends that gender should be irrelevant when addressing politics. The final discourse argues that politics is not an area for women (Dahlerup, 2006: 6-8). This paper will argue on the basis of the incremental track and gender-blind discourses to address the failures found within 'fast track' policy (affirmative action).

As a group, women cannot be represented sufficiently. The faults in descriptive representation and quotas are evident: Women will not be represented as a whole through the implementation of more women into Canadian government. Despite this acknowledgement, quotas have been implemented in numerous states.

Section.1.2: Quotas to Address Representation

Quotas are the establishment of a minimum percentage in politics for the representation of a specific group (Dahlerup, 2006: 19). The purpose of quotas is to ensure that groups within the population are considered.

Quotas to ensure the representation of women have been adopted in over 80 countries. The high number of quotas within political systems is credited to the September 1995 UN Fourth World Conference in Beijing, which produced the Platform for Action. This document, which was signed by all states in attendance, called for the equality of women in politics and decision-making (Krook, 2009: 3; Dahlerup, 2006: 4). The Platform for Action addressed three points when considering the roles of women in politics: first, the negative attitudes placed towards women, as well as 'unequal power relations' found in multiple government systems. Second, the term 'gender balance' was expressed, demanding for a minimum level of representation of women. Finally, the Platform for Action recommends 'specific targets and implementing measures…if necessary through positive action' (Dahlerup, 2006: 5). This recommendation for affirmative action is argued to be the catalyst towards the establishment of quotas internationally within legislatures.

There are four main reasons why quotas are implemented. The first reason held is that women advocate for quotas in order to increase their representation. The second reason argued is that political elites utilize quotas as a political strategy to increase popularity. The third, is that quotas correspond to existing and emerging social norms towards gender equality within politics.

The last reason argues that quotas are implemented as a result of persisting international norms, as shown with the Platform for Action (Krook, 2009: 19).

Section 1.3: Feminist Perspectives towards Quotas

The divides among feminists are apparent when discussing quotas in politics. Four views are prominent in the literature which discuss quotas for women: that quotas will be successful in pushing forward the political representation of women within politics, that quotas will be detrimental to the efforts of women, that the political system must be reformed for women to gain equal representation, and that the quotas and other political systems established by men are insufficient in responding to the biological responsibilities of women and their role in the private sphere.

As discussed in the previous section, quotas have been internationally argued to be a positive reinforcement towards the participation of women in politics. This feminist view of quotas argues that quotas will establish a gender-balanced legislature that diverges away from the existing patriarchal elite and enforce more social-based policies such as welfare, childcare and healthcare. Other feminists within this view present the idea that an increase of women in politics will fairly represent the Canadian population, which is female-dominated. Many scholars debate what the precise goal of this group of feminists is: whether it is equivalency through numbers, or an entire transformation of policy based on the increase of women within politically powerful positions.

The contrasting feminist argument is also demonstrated within the previous section: that affirmative action will be unsuccessful in addressing the ideas and opinions of women because the group is too diverse and the representatives cannot adequately represent all women despite being a member of the group. Whether the aim of quotas for women is to diverge from male elite, enable certain types of policy, or represent the population, these feminists put forward that none of these three outcomes are guaranteed by the presence of quotas.

The abolishment of existing political systems in order to establish more gender-friendly institutions is the argument of other feminist scholars. To work within the institutions established by males and place quotas are not sufficient to addressing the gender gap found in politics. Many consider the electoral establishment of Scotland as an example of an established political system that is considerate of female interests. Some of the scholars argue for quotas to be established within these new, gender-sensitive systems, such as an equal number of males and females on ballots (Lovenduski, 2005: 84). The strengths of this political outlook is that it addresses the patriarchal preferences embedded within existing institutions, and acknowledges the difficulty of changing established institutions. The weakness of this perspective is the understanding that the abolishment of political systems is extremely difficult: both due to institutionalization and resistant elites.

The final feminist perspective towards quotas draws from radical feminism. These feminists present that quotas not only work within a system established by the patriarchy, but

that affirmative action does nothing to address the gender role dichotomy. Women are continuously inhibited by their biological role of childbearing, and the quota system fails to address the choice that women frequently have to make between their lives at home and the political life (Chapman, 1993: 145-6). This view presented by radical feminists is simple to critique: the implementation of quotas is a small aspect of politics and should be deemed irrelevant because of the entire nature of biology. As this view does not address quotas and dismisses them as irrelevant to larger feminist goals, this feminist perspective will not be referred to in the remainder of the paper.

These divisions found amongst feminist scholars demonstrate the difficulty in concluding that women can be adequately represented through quotas. The inability to come to a consensus on the method in which women should be represented within politics, quotas or not, enforces that women are too divided as a group to adequately represent them. These divides among feminists is evidence as to why quotas would be inefficient in addressing the underrepresentation of women: their ideas and opinions are too diverse to represent.

Section 1.4: Quotas in Canadian Legislatures and Bureaucracy

The current existing Canadian legislatures do not contain quotas for women. When addressing the quotas found in the legislatures of other countries, quotas take the form of three different policies: reserved seats, party quotas, and legislative quotas. Reserved seats require a minimum number of seats for women, as opposed to a minimum percentage of female candidates. For reserved seat quotas, some states with single member district party systems hold elections where particular districts are restricted to women. In other cases, women are chosen by the Members of Parliament (MPs) following general elections. The second forms of quotas, party quotas, are the most commonly chosen form of quota implemented. This form of quota requires that political parties aim for a certain percentage of women among its candidates. Finally, legislative quotas are similar to party quotas, in which they demand a minimum percentage of women (usually 20 percent to 50 percent) among all candidates (Krook, 2009: 6-7; Lovenduski, 2005: 94). These quota policies have been discussed among scholars as potential systems to be established within Canadian legislatures.

In comparison to Canadian legislatures, the Canadian bureaucracy has established quotas. The 'Employment Equity Act' was put into force in 1995 under Jean Chretien's Liberal government. This act established quotas within the Canadian bureaucracy to target four disadvantaged groups: women, aboriginals, visible minorities, and persons with disabilities. The Employment Equity Act states concerning affirmative action and representation of disadvantaged groups:

> "5. Every employer shall implement employment equity by
>
> (*a*) identifying and eliminating employment barriers against persons in designated groups that result from the employer's employment systems, policies and practices that are not authorized by law; and

> (*b*) instituting such positive policies and practices and making such reasonable accommodations as will ensure that persons in designated groups achieve a degree of representation in each occupational group in the employer's workforce that reflects their representation in (i) the Canadian workforce, or (ii) those segments of the Canadian workforce that are identifiable by qualification, eligibility or geography and from which the employer may reasonably be expected to draw employees"(Canadian Department of Justice, 2011b).

As there is little scholarly debate as to why these quotas were implemented in the bureaucracy, it is predicted that the passing of the Employment Equity Act was to bring federal hiring practices in line with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, passed in 1982 (Canadian Department of Justice , 2011a).

Section 1.5: Why Quotas are Ineffective in Addressing Representation

As discussed in Section 1.1, the primary limitation of implementing quotas is adequately representing women and their interests, ideas, and opinions through affirmative action. The failure to adequately represent women through descriptive representation demonstrates the failures of quotas, as women are too disjointed of a group to fairly represent. This primary reason against quotas immediately questions why quotas are used. However, despite this understanding of descriptive representation and its failures when addressing women, there are multiple other factors to be considered when debating the failures of quotas and their inefficiency of addressing representation.

One argument against quotas placed forward by scholars is that they risk essentialism: the focus on establishing equality for women, which would diminish the attention given to other minorities. In 1999, in Scotland, women held 40 percent of the legislature; however, there were no ethnic minorities (Lovenduski, 2005: 97). This evidence of marginalization should act as a reminder of the limitations of quotas. Should women have quotas and other minorities be disregarded, may result in resentment by minorities who feel that their needs are not being addressed in similar concrete manners as women. As well, essentialism also brings into question whether governments would be obligated to extend quotas to other minorities within Canada, such as aboriginals, ethnic minorities, or disabled persons. This necessity to extend quotas brings forward two questions: how many seats would be available for the public to vote on? Where does one draw the limit with quotas? This incapacity to discern public reactions to quotas, halt the risk of essentialism, as well as the uncertainty as to how far quotas should be extended, are important considerations as to why quotas should not be implemented. When considering why these quotas are placed in the bureaucracy and not in the legislature, this question is resolved by the acknowledgment that quotas are in place not only for women, but for other minority groups as well, establishing equal emphasis on all minorities and avoiding marginalization. This may be a reason why the public is not opposed to the utilization of quotas in the bureaucracy.

Another reason why quotas are ineffective is because of their risk of sidestepping women's issues. Through affirmative action, individuals who mobilize for women's representation may be sidestepped due to the measure put in place for women's representation.

Women placed in these positions may not have a strong influence in decision-making, or may be used to present a commitment to women's representation, which does not exist (Lovenduski, 2005: 95). This alleviated responsibility of government to represent women not only fails to represent women, but also harms women and their interests. This is supported with the evidence that Canadian citizens are generally unconcerned with the underrepresentation of women, as shown in Section 1.1. Through the assumption that women's interests are addressed through the physical presence of women in government, women's representation is likely to be harmed.

A third reason why quotas are inefficient is 'positive discrimination'. Positive discrimination entails discriminating against males through affirmative action for women. The fear presented by critics of positive discrimination is that exceptionally qualified males will meet a limit to their political success due to a preoccupation with satisfying quotas with women. The counterargument to this claim is that governments are obligated to repair the historical mistakes made in the past, and that positive discrimination accounts for the negative discrimination against women through institutional barriers (Bacchi, 2006: 33; Stith, 1998: 93). This discussion of positive discrimination brings forward a simple argument: to respond to discrimination with positive discrimination is likely to build hostility among those who are not women. For example, black males have faced similar discrimination to that of women. The exclusion of other groups points towards the previous concern of essentialism. As well, hostility can arise from women who were required to overcome institutional and social hurdles in order to establish their political careers. These potential divides amongst women reinforce the argument that women are too divided as a group to adequately represent their ideas, demonstrating the failures of quotas.

The argument of positive discrimination relates strongly to another reason why quotas are ineffective in addressing representation: the concept of merit. Quotas enforce the idea of positive discrimination, so that women will be compensated for previous discrimination set against them in the past. This system endorses a dichotomous gender environment, in which women are fixated upon through quotas. Those who side with the merit argument advocate that representation should act as gender-neutral, neither dominated by males or females (Bacchi, 2006: 34). This would require systems to select politicians and bureaucrats based on an established set of agreed qualifications. Therefore, those who are most qualified for the position gain it, regardless of gender. This view brings forward an evaluation of what is true equality: whether it is the numbers of each sex which is involved in politics, or whether gender should be overall disregarded and individuals should be assessed based on merit.

Quotas also face limitations which are specific to the bureaucracy. Although quotas are currently in place, this does not override the conclusion that quotas are ineffective in addressing representation. The implementation of quotas within the bureaucracy does not mend the underrepresentation of women in the higher ranks of the bureaucracy. The phenomena that has developed as a result of quotas within the bureaucracy is that women are kept within the lower ranks of the bureaucracy, and face glass ceilings near the bottom of the job ladder. These glass ceilings "creates inequities in hiring practices, compensation, levels of support, and opportunities which are mandatory for successful careers and personal satisfaction. Its activities impede or prevent its victims from progressing into entry, middle, and senior level positions" (Stith, 1998:

65). The existence of these glass ceilings which inhibit the ability for women to hold high-ranking positions are not an issue that are resolved by quotas: they place more women in lower-level positions that impact this glass ceiling. The existence of the glass ceiling despite the existence of quotas in the bureaucracy demonstrate that the underrepresentation of women is not fully satisfied through the existence of quotas, as high-ranking positions continue to discriminate against the presence of women. Quotas do not remove the glass ceiling that women face once they are successfully secured in a political position. Getting into the political system is not the largest issue that women face. The role of women once they are within the political system- that is the largest problem. As a result of this, it is understood that quotas fail to be the most effective manner to address the underrepresentation of women.

After a discussion of the failures of quotas, it is extremely important to question why quotas are placed in the bureaucracy have not met public disapproval due to their ineffective nature, and why quotas meet high levels of disapproval when considered for legislatures. This paper will consider what institutions influence public perception of quotas, and whether these institutions acknowledge the failures of quotas.

Section 2: Public Perception of Quotas in the Legislature and in the Bureaucracy

Through Section 1, the failures of affirmative action to address the underrepresentation of women have been demonstrated on both legislative and bureaucratic levels. If these failures are evident, the following question must be addressed: why do quotas exist in the Canadian bureaucracy? Due to the present quotas in the bureaucracy, and the absence of such quotas in the legislature, it is predicted that the public is more comfortable with the concept of quotas within the bureaucracy than legislatures. The bureaucracy also appears to present little controversy in comparison to the quotas discussed regarding legislatures. There are few academic writings as to why the public is more accepting of affirmative action within legislatures.

The purpose of this section is to identify reasons for the different Canadian public perceptions of quotas in the two different sections of government. It is a general consensus among scholars that the public is not fully educated on all policy issues, and that there is a gap of information among the public. To fill this gap, two dominant factors shape the public's perception of quotas: framing by the elite, and the socialization of values. These two factors support one another and create a relationship, in which elite framing affects the socialization of public opinion and public opinion shapes elite framing. Although additional factors such as media also affect public opinion, the selection of political media content is primarily reliant on these two factors (see: Huck et. al, 2009). To support this hypothesis, this paper will investigate the following case studies: the success of France and their mandatory quotas, Sweden and building new institutions, and Canada and regional quotas.

Section 2.1: The Socialization of Values

In order for issues to be brought to the forefront of public policy, there must be an effective majority who can control the opinion of the public through effective communication

(Glickman, 1959: 501). Two means in which citizens disagree with the expert opinion on political issues based on personal preferences (Darmofal, 2005: 392). These personal preferences held by the effective majority are likely to contrast with the opinions of experts. This effective majority would bring forward issues to be considered relevant to the public, and these issues would become a general concern. The public's opinion of these issues brought forward by the effective majority is likely to be the same or similar (Glickman, 1959: 502). Without the mobilization of issues by an effective majority, these issues are generally not addressed: problems alone, without public attention, do not bring issues to policy discussion.

The effectiveness of socialized values by the effective majority is heightened through the availability of information by technology. Individuals are likely to investigate sources that only support their points of view. The utilization of technology and lack of public debate on policy issues results in public negligence towards contrasting ideas. "Individuals prefer exposure to arguments supporting their position over those supporting other positions. As a consequence, individuals are more likely to read, listen to, or view a piece of information the more it supports their opinion, and less likely to attend to it the more it challenges their position" (Garrett, 2009: 678). This avoidance is an integral manner in which the effective majority successfully mobilizes its position and maintains its ideas. As well, through this avoidance, alternate solutions to issues are not discussed (Garrett, 2009: 677). Without the ideas brought forward by the effective majority being challenged, these ideas persist and are socialized by those who are in support or those who are indifferent.

This socialization of ideas and this ignorance towards alternate perspectives can easily be applied to the awareness of women's underrepresentation and affirmative action. The underrepresentation of women within politics is not being addressed by an effective majority and, thus, the issue is being ignored. As the issue is not being addressed, the general public and its ignorance towards women's underrepresentation `persist. There is closed exposure of arguments as to why women's underrepresentation is important, and less exposure concerning affirmative action for women. Without bringing the issue of female underrepresentation to public attention, and presenting contrasting opinions to the importance of women's underrepresentation, this issue will remain ignored by Canadian citizens. The issue of underrepresentation will not become an issue that is addressed if it remains in the periphery of Canadians' attention. This is supported through the statistic shown in Section 1.1, which stated that a majority of Canadian citizens do not consider underrepresentation of women to be a serious issue.

Glickman (1959) argues that the mobilization of a majority of political issues either support or oppose the individuals who govern. This results in questioning the role of the elite in controlling the political opinion of the masses concerning quotas for women.

Section 2.2: Framing by the Political Elite

Framing is defined by Brewer and Gross as "an association between a value and an issue that carries an evaluative implication: it presents one position on an issue as being right (and others as wrong) by linking that position to specific core value" (2005: 931). Framing has been

debated to occur on two accounts: through a passive absorption of information of the information given, and through an active taking of opinions presented by framing which integrate with individual values (Brewer and Gross, 2005: 931; Darmofal, 2005: 382). Politicians frame public policy issues based on core values that are important to the public. Through framing, the intent of politicians is to use public values in the hopes that their definitions of issues will be politicized, and used as tools of political information when required to reason about them. These perceptions of political information are socialized, and this information is relied upon by the public when discussing political controversies.

The framing utilized by political elites is utilized by the public to have effective policy decisions (Darmofal, 2005: 381). The effectiveness of these frames is heightened by the public following the cues of the elite in order to further educate themselves. The knowledge of the citizen in understanding political issues worsens when elites challenge the opinion of experts on the issue, as society is more likely to trust the opinion of the elites than the opinion of experts (Darmofal, 2005: 383). To heighten personal biases and close-mindedness to opposing opinions, citizens are more likely to accept cues from elites that they support as opposed to elites they do not (Darmofal, 2005: 382).The effects of framing by politicians is negative as a result of this socialization of values: the framing of policy issues by the elite seems to result in a lower amount of knowledge known by the public, resulting in less efficacious political decisions (Darmofal, 2005: 381). Exposure to frames also resulted in a lower number of expressed opinions on an issue by the public (Brewer and Gross, 2005: 943).

In application to women and their representation within government, the role of elite framing on the opinions of the public results in the limitation of recognition drawn towards women and their underrepresentation. As shown, women and their underrepresentation is not an issue that is frequently addressed by the political elite, and quotas are addressed less. The only political party in Canada which addresses women's underrepresentation through voluntary quotas is the New Democratic Party. As the political elite is drawing little attention to the underrepresentation of women in government roles, the framing of the political elite is proven to be successful in not addressing the underrepresentation of women. The maintaining of white male controlled elite is upheld by the framing utilized by the political elite, which is integrated into the values of the public. This directly affects the perception of the public in their understanding towards the underrepresentation of women, their understanding of quotas, and their understanding of how these are implemented within the government.
.

Section 2.3: The Elite and the Effective Majority Supporting One Another

Through the ideas that the elite enforce upon the society through framing, the underrepresentation of women is not addressed. These ideas are integrated into the effective majority, the general population of citizens who have a limited amount of education concerning political issues and rely on elite framing for the shaping of their idea. The values which are imported by the effective majority are upheld through the framing of the elite who target these values to relate to policy issues and controversies. It is also more likely that the effective

majority would be the instigators of political change, as elites are also likely to prevent addressing issues that will bring controversy and challenge their political positions.

When this cycle is applied to women, it is understood that the political elite and socialization successfully prevents the addressing quotas and the underrepresentation of women. If the elite does not address frames concerning women and the effective majority does not address the nature of the underrepresentation of women within politics, the political will continue to be excluded by the nature of this cycle. The exclusion of the discussion of the underrepresentation of women in politics by both socialization and elite framing results in an overall indifference and lack of information towards the underrepresentation of women. It is not that the public feels negatively towards quotas or promoting the representation of women in politics, but they are excluded from the political information that permits knowledge concerning women's underrepresentation and the implementation of quotas. This results in the success of implementing quotas in the bureaucracy and not in legislatures. In order to bring the bureaucracy in line with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the elites pushed forward a frame which indicated that the quotas in the bureaucracy would be beneficial. This unified opinion by experts and legislators provides little controversy to the public, who have the values of equal rights affirmed by the Charter in 1982. Addressing women's representation in legislatures is an issue that remains neglected by both effective majorities and political elites; therefore, the general public has little response or strong opinion on the issue.

To investigate circumstances in which the elite and effective majorities control public opinion towards quotas and the underrepresentation of women, this paper will first look at a circumstance in which quotas were implemented with uncertainty from both elite and effective majority resulting in their ineffectiveness (France), followed by a circumstance in which socialization resulted in an effective implementation of quotas by the elite (Sweden).

Section 2.3: Case Study: France and their Institutional Quotas

The current representation of women in French legislatures is only nineteen percent(International IDEA et al., 2010). For a state that has quotas implemented within its system, this number is lower than many states without quotas or voluntary quotas, such as Canada and the United Kingdom. Why is it that France has a limited amount of success with its quotas? It is necessary to investigate the role of the elite and socialization when determining the overall success of quota implementation and effectiveness in France.

Scholars argue that France is progressive in terms of the social measures it has established for the rights of women, such as sixteen to twenty-six weeks of maternity leave, and free access to refundable abortion. The majority of these social policies, however, are targeted towards women's role in the private sphere. This does not indicate a uniform position on the role of women in the public sphere and within legislatures.

Prior to the implementation of quotas within French legislatures, there was a large debate among the public as to whether affirmative action was a reasonable measure to ensure women's representation within legislatures. The French public is known for appreciating the value of equality of opportunity, something that quotas would go against, as its policies are preferential (Corbett, 2001: 887).Some viewed the principal of universality (universalité) to be restricted to women, while others argued by implementing quotas, the notion of women as the weaker sex would be reinforced (Corbett, 2001: 884). Le Monde, the French newspaper, proposed the "Manifesto of the 577" which called for legislators to ensure equal representation of the sexes within legislatures (Corbett , 2001: 886). These two values held by two portions of the population resulted in a mixed perception of quotas by the public.

These mixed values were strongly reinforced by the role of the elite. In 1993, Alain Juppe appointed twelve female ministers, indicating to the public that progression concerning the representation of women in politics was being made. However, within half a year, two-thirds of these women disappeared due to a cabinet shuffle (Corbett, 2001: 886). This regressive political stance demonstrated by France's elite shows that little progression is able to be made within legislatures without the reinforcement by the elite. Conflicts with the elite persisted with opposition by the French Senate, who maintained that the government might reduce simultaneous electoral mandate holding by politicians, and introducing a proportional representation system to address underrepresentation of women within politics (Corbett, 2001: 887).

These conflicting views presented by both the French elite as well as the public resulted in the implementation of quotas through the constitution, so that representation would be considered a legal right. To date, the legal representation of women within French legislatures remains low. As shown, this is likely due to both a failure of elite cohesion and support for women's representation, as well as an uncertain public on the issue. This also reaffirms the notion that affirmative action is unsuccessful if neither elite or effective majority advocate for the issue, despite having laws in place.

Section 2.4: Case Study: Sweden and Socialization into Quotas

Many point towards Sweden as the model of ideal quotas and their success of implementing gender inequality within legislatures. The success of Sweden's quotas to address the underrepresentation of women is not derived from an implementation of quotas. The success of Sweden's electoral success derives from the point that the boom of representation of women in Swedish politics began in the 1970s, prior to the introduction of any quotas. Prior to this, it took approximately seventy years for Sweden to reach the point in which thirty percent of the legislative population are women (Dahlerup, 2006: 7). Additionally, the quotas placed within Sweden are not obligatory, but voluntary party-quotas, similarly to those used by the Canadian New Democratic Party. This indicates that the application of quotas themselves in Swedish politics is not the cause of the equal representation of women.

The length of time that Sweden required in order to accomplish representation of women within legislatures (currently forty-six percent) (International IDEA et al., 2010), indicates two factors concerning its elite and its social perceptions. First, because of the length of time required for representation of women to be sufficient was beyond fifty years, the progress of women's representation within Swedish legislatures is incremental and not immediate, which are changes which are typically promoted by quotas and affirmative action. The second point that this demonstrates is that the percentage of women represented within Swedish legislatures is a direct result of socialized values being integrated into the political elite: the incremental increase of women in politics indicates socialization by an effective majority, and the party quotas adapted indicates an elite acceptance and framing towards these values.

The success of women's representation within Sweden is a result of the socialization of women in politics over an extended period of time and the elite promotion of women in the 1970s. The success of women's representation by quotas in the Swedish government is not a result of quotas at all, but a result of incremental socialization that resulted in elite support.

Conclusion

As shown, the lack of public knowledge on politics results in a public reliance on both elite framing and socialization by the effective majority. The lack of public information results in either indifference or being unaware of quotas. As the elite and the effective majority in Canada have not brought attention to the option of quotas within the Canadian legislatures, this possibility has been neglected by the public. As the elite implemented the quotas within the bureaucracy to bring federal hiring practices to standard with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, this was a considered a legitimate action by the public and faced little protest. With the example of France, quotas cannot be implemented on principal alone and be successful without the support of either the elite or the effective majority. As shown with Sweden, the role of the effective majority over time will result in the success of representation of women within politics and a voluntary integration of quotas into the system by the political elite. These two factors determine the public's response to quotas, as individuals are not educated on affirmative action without having the issue brought to their attention. The public in Canada is not positive towards quotas in the bureaucracy and negative towards quotas in the legislature. The public is accepting of quotas in the bureaucracy by elite framing and indifferent on quotas in the legislature because it is not brought to their attention by elite framing or the effective majority.

References

Bacchi, Carol. 2006. "Arguing For and Against Quotas: Theoretical Issues." In *Women, Quotas and Politics,* ed. Drude Dahlerup. Routledge: London.

Brewer, Paul R. and Kimberly Gross. 2005. "Values, Framing, and Citizens' Thoughts about Policy issues: Effects on Content and Quality." *Political Psychology* 26: 929-948.

Celis, Karen. 2008. "Gendering Representation." In *Politics, Gender and Concepts: Theory and Methodology.* ed. Gary Goertz and Amy G. Mazur. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Chapman, Jenny. 1993. *Politics, Feminism and the Reformation of Gender.* Routledge: London.

Corbett, James. 2001. "Cherchez la femme1 Sexual Equality in Politics and Affirmative Action in France."*The French Review* 74: 882-888.

Dahlerup, Drude. 2006. *Women, Quotas and Politics.* Routledge: London.

Darmofal, David. 2005. "Elite Cues and Citizen Disagreement with Expert Opinion." *Political Research Quarterly* 58: 381-395.

Duverger, Maurice. 1955. *The Political Role of Women.* Unesco: France.

Canadian Deparment of Justice (a). 2011. *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter/*(March 15, 2011.)

Canadian Department of Justice (b). 2011. *Employment Equity Act. http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/e-5.401/index.html*(March 15, 2011.)

Garrett, R. Kelly. 2009. "Politically Motivated Reinforcement Seeking: Reframing the Selective Exposure Debate."*Journal of Communication* 59: 676-699.

Glickman, Harvey. 1959. "Viewing Public Opinion in Politics: A Common Sense Approach." The Public Opinion Quarterly 23: 495-504.

International IDEA, Stockholm University and Inter-Parliamentary Union. 2010. *Quota Project.*http://www.quotaproject.org/ (March 17, 2011.)

Krook, Mona Lena. 2009. *Quotas for Women and Politics.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Lawless, Jennifer L. and Sean M. Therault. 2006. "Women in the U.S. Congress: From Entry to Exit." In Lois Duke Whitaker, ed. *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders? 4th ed.* Pearson Education Inc.: New Jersey.

Lovenduski, Joni. 2005. *Feminizing Politics.* Polity Press: Cambridge.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 2011. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/quota (March 24, 2011.)

Poggione, Sarah. 2006. "Women State Legislators: Descriptive and Substantive Representation." In Lois Duke Whitaker, ed. *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders? 4th ed.* Pearson Education Inc.: New Jersey.

Sawer, Marian and Jill Vickerson. 2010. "Political Architecture and its Gender Impact." In *Federalism, Feminism and Multilevel Governance.*ed. Haussman, Melissa, Marian Sawer and Jill Vickerson.Ashgate Publishing Limited: England.

Stevens, Anne. 2007. *Women, Power, and Politics.* Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Stith, Anthony. 1998. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling.* Warwick Publishing Inc. : Toronto.

Trimble, Linda. 2006. "Women's Representation in the Canadian House of Commons." In *Representing Women in Parliament: A Comparative Study.*ed. Marian Sawer, Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble.Routledge: London.

Young, Lisa. 2006. "Women's Representation in the Canadian House of Commons." In *Representing Women in Parliament: A Comparative Study.*ed. Marian Sawer, Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble.Routledge: London.