Edinburgh Research Explorer

From women's presence to feminist representation

KEY MESSAGES

- Despite improvement in the numbers of women in parliaments, representative democracy continues to fail women
- 'Poverty of representation' captures the intersectional ways in which women are under and mis-represented
- We call for the formal presence within existing legislatures of 'affected representatives of women'
- Feminist Democratic Representation incentivizes elected representatives to meet the needs of diverse women

BIO (50 WORDS)

Karen Celis is full Professor affiliated to the VUB Department of Political Sciences. She is co-director of RHEA, Centre of Expertise Gender, Diversity Intersectionality and Academic Advisor Inclusion Policy. She conducts theoretical and empirical research on the democratic quality of political representation from an intersectional perspective.

Sarah Childs is Professor of Politics and Gender at the University of Edinburgh. She researches women's political representation, political parties, and gender/diversity sensitive parliaments (GSP/DSP). An impactful academic, she has undertaken GSP work with the UK Parliament, the Inter-parliamentary Union, the Commonwealth Parliamentarian Association, and UN Women.

INTRODUCTION

A lot can be said about the failure of representative democracy to do good by women. 1990s presence theorists' response was to call for women's group presence. Reflecting on parliaments full of men, there was agreement that these representatives mostly knew and cared too little about women to stand and act for them (Phillips, 1995; Mansbridge 1999; Williams 1998; Young 1990a/b; 2002). Women's political representation would in such situations be anything but fair, with women's interests overlooked, and laws and policies biased against them (Williams 1998, 77). The preferred solution was to repopulate elected political institutions with women representatives, using gender quota[1] as their handmaidens. Once present, these newly elected descriptive representatives would embody and signify women's political equality and, it was hoped if not expected to, deliver fair representation for women substantively speaking.

Today gender quota are in place in more than 130 countries (Paxton et al. 2019). Yet despite relative, and in some instances significant, improvement in the numbers of women in the world's parliaments, political equality is still to be achieved (Dahlerup 2017; Lovenduski 2019). The term 'poverty of women's political representation' captures the multiple and compounding ways in which women are

---

[1] Gender quota can take different forms, but are mechanism to increase the number of women candidates and/or elected representations. For example, a quota may determine the proportion of the men and women on electoral lists, hence not only securing a minimum number of women but also men candidates. The norm is to use the term gender quota, even when formally a sex quota. Where quota include trans women, gender quota is the more accurate nomenclature.

under and mis-represented in formal politics, descriptively, substantively, and symbolically. Crudely, parties largely continue to reflect cleavages and ideologies from previous centuries, with the political agenda and party competition remaining very much defined by traditional, masculinized interests; governments and legislatures are insufficiently responsive and accountable to women, with women's experiences and voices often marginalized or absent from formal political debate; and the average percentage of women in national parliaments remains a mere 25 percent (www.ipu.org).

Like Anne Phillips (1992) three decades ago and Joni Lovenduski (2019) more recently, we hold onto the claim that feminists should not give up on representative democracy. To do so risks turning our backs on the self-same political institutions that are needed to protect women from those seeking to overturn their formal rights, especially so in these turbulent and anti-feminist times (Verloo 2018). Believing that women's poverty of political representation is neither natural nor inevitable, and that women can and should be in receipt of good representation, we update and remake the case for women's group representation in electoral politics. We do so knowing full well that advocates of women's political representation face renewed criticism from those who query gender as a legitimate political identity (Fukuyama 2018), and we do so appreciative that feminist acknowledgement of women's intra-group differences begs elemental questions about the ability of women representatives (disproportionately elite and majority ethnic) to represent those from different and particularly less privileged backgrounds (Smooth 2011; Schwindt-Bayer and Taylor-Robinson 2011; Celis and Mügge 2014).

We contend that just as it was nearly three decades ago, the normative argument for group representation remains compelling from both democratic and feminist perspectives: necessary "whenever the group's history and social situation provides a particular perspective on the issue, when the interests of its members are specifically affected, and when its perceptions and interests are not likely to receive expression without that representation" (Young 2002, 128). The problem is, then, much less the principled case, and more how women's group representation is to be designed and enacted. In this article, we *re-think* how the principles of women's group representation can be revised, revived, and realized (Saward 2020; Newton 2012): to *re-design* practices for a revitalized representative politics.[2] In an exercise that Mansbridge (2002) calls practice-thought-practice, we build a new, second-generation design - what we call *feminist democratic representation*. If the first-generation's intent was to increase the number of women legislators, with the accompanying assumption that these women, especially when they were present in larger numbers, would have feminist substantive effects (Dahlerup 1988; Childs and Krook 2008), the representational effects of our second-generation design are intended as multiple: the transformation of representative processes within elected political institutions, along with new representative relationships between elected representatives and those they represent, and with women in society seeing formal politics

---

[2] This contribution limits itself to the first two phases of democratic design: design-*thinking* and design*ing* (Saward 2020). We refrain from discussing the implementation of feminist democratic representation in varying real-world contexts (i.e. parliamentary or presidential democracy; multi-or two-party systems; newer or established democracies). The latter would require a third 'building'-phase: (i) a "translation" to specific contexts, which requires more than a simple "transfer" of practices from one context to another (Saward 2020); (ii) involve "local design coalitions" mobilizing "local knowledge and creativity of multiple dispersed institutional entrepreneurs" as well as the critical engagement of a pluralistic and diverse groups of citizens (Lowndes and Roberts 2013, 187); and (iii) necessitate "joining up" with other democratic innovations (Saward 2020).

as a critical site of their representation, and of themselves becoming central actors of representative democracy.

The First-Generation: Women's Inclusion through Presence

Classic presence theorists – Mansbridge, Phillips, Williams, and Young - took issue with the idea that universal franchise was sufficient to secure for women a foundational democratic principle: political equality. Rule by elected men was paternalistic and patriarchal. The demand to share political power crucially involved a reframing of the principle of inclusion from an individual to a collective basis: as members of an historically excluded, marginalized, and oppressed group, women *qua* women must have seats at the political table (Young 1990a/b; Jónasdóttir 1988). Distilling presence theories, women merit political presence because they: (i) 'find' themselves a member of the group – in an ascriptive and non-essentialist fashion; (ii) recognize a mutual identity and have an affinity with other women; (iii) have a broad, shared history of exclusion from politics and society, which is empirically demonstrable and frequently subjectively claimed; and (iv) as a consequence of that exclusion, experience laws and institutions biased against them.

Fundamental to first-generation theories was a refutation of Pitkin's (1967) disregard for descriptive representation and its links to substantive representation, her favoured dimension of representation. After Phillips' (1995) *The Politics of Presence*, no one would regard descriptive representation as unimportant (Childs and Lovenduski 2013, 490). At its core, presence theory holds that women's issues, and interests derive from women's structural position in gendered societies (Tamerius 1995; see also Harder in this SI on the issue of women's interests); because of biology *and* gendered societal roles, women have experiences that are in many ways different from men, as well as gendered takes on the situations and experiences that they share with men (Lovenduski 2005). Men's ability to acquire knowledge of, and the will and ability to act in, women's interests (Phillips 1995, 13; Mansbridge 1999) is questioned on epistemological grounds. In sum, men lack women's experiences, and consequently women's perceptions, concerns and needs are inaccessible to them (Williams 1998).

The original presence claim was, we are at pains to point out, advanced alongside recognition that women are neither homogenous nor share an exclusive set of interests. There was an explicit rejection of essentialism, which does "violence to the empirical facts of diversity as well as to the agency of individuals to define the meaning of their social and biological traits" (Williams 1998, 6). Over determinism was criticized: women's social position *conditions* (Young 2002, 97-8 emphasis added). Women's "shared experience" figure only as a "*promise* of shared concerns" (Phillips 1995, 83, emphasis added). Notwithstanding this commitment to difference, the normative assessment of what constituted political equality in general, and fair and just representation for women in particular, *became* in practice the presence of women's sex/gendered bodies in representative institutions. This is what counted, normatively speaking, and was what was *actually counted* (Trimble and Arscott 2003).

Equated with the presence of women's bodies, presence risks downplaying women's intersectional heterogeneity, within-group privileging and marginalization, and erasing ideological differences. The standard for women's inclusion (even if unfairly) associated with first generation theorist allows for a claim that all women are well represented in institutions populated by unrepresentative women. Such

conclusions belie the essence of representative politics and power: the core democratic question of who gets what, when and how in large and complex societies where there is no agreement about political ends, and where resources are finite. It is, then, but a 'hop, skip and jump' from women's inclusion to presence, and to descriptive representation that privileges this dimension and reinforces a disaggregated approach to representation, even when it is linked to substantive representation.

There are substantial risks that overly optimistic conclusions are drawn from women's inclusion: first, that with descriptive representation, all women are well represented, substantively and symbolically. Secondly, that all women are well represented where women legislators are predominantly situated on one side of the ideological spectrum, or are homogenous and/or privileged. The represented might not, however, feel well represented because of who the elected representatives are, how they are, and/or how they act and speak (Skeggs and Wood 2012, 136; Kantola and Lombardo 2017; Kantola 2018; see also Siow and Talukder in this SI). Equally, they might feel represented when their interests are being harmed, precisely because of who the representative is and how they act and speak (Clayton, Piscopo and O'Brien 2018). In contrast to a disaggregated approach, it is in the intertwining of its dimensions that the good representation for women is achieved. This is not to say that the first-generation failed to explore the concept of representation and representative democracy in sophisticated ways. Yet, what materialized was the principle of inclusion enacted by – and thereby reduced to - the presence of women elected representatives in existing representative institutions in the absence of any additional institutional re-design. The unfortunate consequence, as Phillips (2012) later made clear, was that representation effectively dropped out of the picture, creating a disconnect between the principle and its enactment.

A (re)reading of the original 1990s works remind us of an ideal of representative politics characterized by greater deliberation and advocacy, publicity, and which is more exploratory and connected. Existing representative institutions were falling far short of realizing women's (and men's) good representation; decision making based on aggregation - most votes wins - was criticized for failing to appreciate how this reinforces and replicates existing power relations, including gender relations (Williams 1998; Young 2002). To discover the best argument, and thus decisions made on that basis, more deliberative decision making was preferred (Young 2002, 23; Williams 1998). As Phillips rather nicely put it, deliberative decision-making is an *exploratory politics* that discovers "new areas of common interests facilitated by the possibility to formulate new positions in the course of the discussion with others" (Phillips 1995). At its simplest, better decisions are forthcoming because representatives inhabit settings of greater information, and because deliberative decision making allows for – if not expects - a transformation of interests (Phillips 1991; 1995; Young 2002, 26). Through deliberation the range of interests and potential solutions are greater and more appropriate to the issue at hand because they reflect the interests and needs of all those affected (Mansbridge et al. 2010; Young 2002; Phillips 1991, 1995). Even as consensus and agreement is aimed for, differences and conflicts are not swept aside (Young 2002, 7). Deliberating participants form a "public" speaking in ways accountable to "plural others" (Young 2002, 25). To persuade the represented "of the rightness of her judgement", appeals shift from "self-regard to appeals of justice" (Young 2002, 115). Advocacy has a continuing critical role to play because it reduces the risk of deliberation giving rise to a consensus that is mis-represented as "in the interest of all" (Young 2002, 23).

Young was particularly detailed in her design work and, in many ways her ideas have aged remarkably well. She was adamant that in modern societies individuals simply cannot be where all the decisions are made and thus representative politics was necessary (Young 2002, 125), and she was sure that "all existing representative democracies could be improved by additional procedures and fora" (Young 2002, 134). Young wished to link the institutions of and in civil society and formal electoral politics (Young 2002, 8; 132-3) - talking of "many avenues and institutions". By connecting public debate and accountability mechanisms "to institutional or policy outcomes" democratic processes could address some of the "injustices" of unequal societies (Young 2002, 36). Finally, Young's assertion that legitimacy is linked to political processes characterized by publicity, inclusiveness, and procedural regularity (Young 2002, 3), speaks to the notion that one does not have to have 'won' on a particular issue to be and/or feel well-represented.

The Second-Generation: Feminist Democratic Representation

Unfortunately, too much of what first-generation theorists had to say about representation and representative democracy failed to define what came to be the gender and politics 'acquis'. The sophistication of their critique was lost. We aim to show how these ideas can be updated and translated into more concrete and implementable forms. First, we update – *re*present - the principle of inclusion in a manner that embraces and foregrounds contemporary accounts of women's heterogeneity. Refashioned, the principle of inclusion demands the presence of diverse women's voices in a constitutive politics of identifying and forming what is in the interests of women. Understood ideologically and intersectionally, our approach recognizes not only differences amongst women, but also the structural power relations that position them unequally. Relative privilege and marginalization can create differences of experiences, perspectives, and interests; each is not only multiple but also at times in competition and oppositional (see also Norris in this SI). Where there is no agreement about ends, politically representing women well must attend to *which women* get what, when and how. Updating the 'all affected' principle, fair and just decision-making requires the inclusion not just of women but of what we term 'differently affected women'. In our intersectional incarnation, this is a claim for differently affected women being included in decision making such that no policy is made nor judged fair when, as for the first-generation, the representative process "excluded a marginalized group that is affected by it" (Williams 1998, 172, 242; Montanaro 2012, 1099; Urbinati 2006, 2).

Our second response is to supplement the first-generation advocacy of quota. Whilst these have brought about unprecedented re-gendering to representative politics (see Phillips 1995; Krook 2009; Franceshet et al 2012), they add women to existing representative institutions – parties and parliaments – without intervening in ways that incentivise diverse women's good representation by all representatives, hold elected representatives collectively and political institutions to account, and/ or sanction poor representation.[3] Putting our critique more starkly still: when quota are adopted nothing else is *automatically* put in place to ensure diverse women elected representatives gain the

---

[3] We cannot do justice to the literature which documents the women (and some men) who see their roles at least in part about representing women and have undertaken political acts to those ends (see Paxton et al 2020 for an overview). Our point is neither to discredit their labour nor existing scholarship.

institutional power to represent women, or that women in society have sufficient means by which to judge the quality of their political representation.

Our final response connects the revised principle of women's group representation with its enactment (Saward 2020), specifying how best to realize the inclusion of differently affected women in particular contexts. Interlocking three feminist principles[4] - *inclusiveness, responsiveness* and *egalitarianism* - with the ideal representation process as described by first-generation presence theorists and contemporary democratic theorists generates a feminist democratic process of representation (see Figure 1).

The *advocacy* moment enacts:

(i) Inclusiveness when the interests, opinions, and perspectives of all relevant groups of women are voiced and heard, ensuring that women's partial and subjective views are forcefully articulated

(ii) Responsiveness when representatives of women can act as passionate and partial advocates, speaking in their own voices and registers, and articulating the subjective conceptions of women's interests, of those experientially close to the issue

(iii) Egalitarianism when the representatives of women are treated, and are seen to be treated, with equal respect and consideration, and no *a priori* assumptions are made about which women and which interests should be privileged

The *deliberation* moment enacts:

(i) Inclusiveness when all the interests, opinions and perspectives articulated in the advocacy moment are taken and are seen to be taken into account as representatives' debate and decide upon what is the fairest and most just decision

(ii) Responsiveness when representatives examine and take into account the relationship between the representation of subjective and partial interests and what constitutes just and fair decisions. Representatives must be open to transform their views on what is in the interests of women, rather that holding onto pre-existing positions which might very well be partial and gender unequal

(iii) Egalitarianism when all women's interests are considered and have the potential to affect the decision under consideration irrespective of political, socio-economic, or cultural power hierarchies

The *accountability* moment enacts:

(i) Inclusiveness when elected representatives' explanations and justifications are addressed to and are received by women in their diversity

(ii) Responsiveness when representatives engage with women's approval, contestation, and/or rejection of decisions. Only in this way will all women witness and experience reciprocity in the representative relationship and regard the institution as accountable to them

(iii) Egalitarianism when representatives give accounts in ways that give equal weight and consideration to the multiple and at times competing women's interests articulated during the earlier advocacy moment, as well as to the potential objections of various

---

[4] Galligan (2012, 3) similarly writes of inclusion, accountability and recognition as the requisites for a gender democracy and Walsh (2011) refers to access, voice and contestation capacity.

groups of women. Women in their diversity should see that their views and interests were taken seriously irrespective of the substantive outcome

To bring our second-generation design to life, we call for the formal, institutionalized political presence within existing legislatures of a new set of political actors - *the affected representatives of women*. Legislatures are now by design required to bring in the representatives of differently affected women, including the most marginalized women who will rarely find themselves elected representatives under the current rules of the political recruitment game, even with quota.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

The naming of our new representatives as *affected* representatives captured a number of aspects of who these representatives are and how they represent. First, the prefix refers to the *differently affected principle*, which we put forward as an 'intersectional update' of the *all-affected principle*. The latter states that democratic decision-making requires that all participate when they are affected by the matter (Williams 1998). Our update consists of the specification that women differently affected due to their intersectional or ideological positionality merit representation. Secondly, we wanted to highlight that affected representatives are epistemologically and experientially, but importantly also affectively close to those they represent. They are thus better able to know and present factual and affective knowledge (e.g. how an issue is experienced and felt by the represented). Here, our concept of 'affected representatives' marries Dovi's 'preferable descriptive representatives', as factual and affective knowledge is produced through "strong mutual relationships with dispossessed subgroups of historically disadvantaged groups", reciprocal recognition and linked fates (Dovi 2002, 729). Thirdly, our new concept reflects the 'affective turn' in politics (Ahmed 2014), acknowledging how affects - emotions such as recognition, trust, pride- are co-constitutive of the representative relationship. Turning to the noun affected *representatives* are not merely witnesses or informants to parliamentary proceedings undertaken by elected politicians (for example, witnesses to committees or spokeswomen in legislative hearings). They are representatives of a constituency of women. Granting them the status of representatives *and* giving them an institutionalized role in the representative process, makes affected representatives 'equal of sorts' with elected ones. Elected representatives undisputedly retain their primacy, reflecting their electoral mandate, but the affected representatives of women play highly visible, high status, formal roles within legislatures.

The presence of affected representatives is not a one-off, compensatory intervention but a permanent institutional provision.[5] It is triggered when a legislature discusses women's issues and/or where there is discrepancy between the political and institutional agenda, and civil societal debates about women's issues. It has, in other words, become an institutional responsibility to reach out to, and crucially bring in, affected representatives of women.[6] It is for the represented – women in civil society

---

[5] The new processes advocated in *Feminist Democratic Representation*, to be clear, neither replace gender quota nor gender mainstreaming but augment these democratic innovations.

[6] The actors (e.g. academic experts, women's policy agencies) and processes involved (e.g. research, open call) in mapping the differently affected groups of women is part of the third phase of democratic design from which we refrain in this contribution (see fn3).

– to determine who is the best representative of their interests.[7] Because women must 'own' not only how they are represented but also the process of identifying their representatives (Dovi 2007, 155–59), we do not specify how many affected representatives there should be, nor the (s)election process or the societal spheres they would come from (these might include organized civil society organizations, ad hoc groups, artists and social media influencers, for example).

Affected representatives have bespoke representative responsibilities during group advocacy and account giving – the institutional input and output phases of the representative process, respectively. In group advocacy their representative work ensures that elected representatives hear from, and listen to, the voices of differently affected women, increasing the available 'store of knowledge' (Young 2002, 83). An exhaustive account of what is at stake for women is realised, with affected representatives speaking about their experiences, knowledge, preferences, and interests, and doing so in their own voice, both factual and affective. Women's interests are thus shown to be multiple, revealing competition and at times conflict over what is in the interests of women. This is especially the case regarding the differing interests of privileged and marginalized women, something that can all to easily be absent or hidden today (Young 2002, 7; Urbinati 2006). Because of group advocacy, some elected representatives might change their policy positions. Nor can there be pretence on behalf of elected representatives (or wider society for that matter) that an issue is not gendered, nor assumptions amongst elected representatives that there is a universal women's interest.

Account giving is where affected representatives hold elected representatives to account – it is systemic recursiveness and reflexivity *in practice* (Mansbridge 2019; Disch 2011). Elected representatives explain and justify the content, course, and conclusions of their deliberations to the affected representatives of women. As a high profile, public moment, media coverage enables women beyond parliament to see and learn about what is going on within it, permitting, autonomous, considered, reflective and robust judgment (Warren 2019, 40, 45; Mansbridge 2009, 391; Runciman 2007). Occurring under conditions of publicity (Young 2002), and a collective affair, elected representatives are incentivized to deliberate and take decisions in ways that are inclusive, responsive, and egalitarian, with elected representatives appealing to principles higher than self-interest (Dovi 2007; Williams 1998, 145, 222, 227; Young 2002, 115). Affected representatives have power over elected representatives in terms of judging the quality of representation.[8] They are institutionally positioned to question, probe, and seek justifications, providing for Disch's (2012, 219; 2011, 8) 'disidentification' or a 'not in our name' judgement (following Pitkin, 1967), or Dovi's (2015) 'naysaying'.[9] If not for genuine reasons of wanting to do good by women, elected representatives are incentivised to avoid 'looking bad' for strategic or electoral reasons.

Complementing each other, our twin augmentations together create and embed conducive contexts to make the throughput phase – the deliberation and decisions by elected representatives – better

---

[7] We recognize the difficulties of civil society participation, and note some refuse engagement with formal politics. We trust our design will engender women's civil society mobilization – a claim we return to when we discuss representational effects.

[8] As asserted by feminist institutionalists (e.g. Mackay and Kenny 2007; Krook and Mackay 2011), we acknowledge the inclusion of affected representatives will not change institutional gendered power relations overnight.

[9] The affected representatives do not have the right to veto elected representatives' decisions (Young 1990 a/b), which would render them akin to decision makers.

meet the representational interests of women and produce just and fair outcomes. With a new set of actors, a diversity of women's voices are spoken, heard, and responded to, in our legislatures. The good representation of women is now an institutionalized obligation of elected representatives, indeed, of institutions *qua* institution. The intended representational effects affect both elected representatives and the represented, and are both direct and indirect. Overall, the representative process is characterized by improved relationships between the represented and the elected representatives, and with new representative relations also created between the represented and affected representatives.[10]

Direct Representational Effects on Elected Representatives: Knowing, Caring and Connected

Five design features incentivise the transformation in the quality of women's representation[11] achieved by elected representatives, male and female: (i) exposure via affected representatives to the direct and lived experiences of the represented; (ii) the constitution of affected representatives *as* representatives, equal of sorts with elected representatives; (iii) the formal and public character of account giving; (iv) the institutionalization of group advocacy and account giving as part of the routine and iterative practices of parliaments; and (v) the collective responsibility of elected representatives.

By design, our new democratic practices ensure elected representatives are institutionally required to hear from affected representatives. In this way elected representatives give formal recognition to women's views - symbolizing and legitimizing women as a representable constituency. Group advocacy and account giving intentionally provide for elected representatives to know more about the representational issues and interests of differently affected women (see also Bonish in this SI). Our twin practices maximise the available *knowledge* critical for elected representatives to engage in an exploratory, recursive and reflexive politics about what is just and fair for women (Phillips 1995; Mansbridge 2019; Disch 2011). Competition amongst diverse women regarding a particular women's issue, policy, or legislative intervention - and the strength of the feeling about them held by different women - is revealed, as affected representatives advocate for the women they represent. When elected representatives later deliberate, they will be better appraised of the cacophony of views (Dodson 2006), with better appreciation of why particular issues and interests are advanced. During the representative process elected representatives are active in (re)constituting women's interests. Because our new democratic practices are normalized as part of everyday parliamentary process, elected representatives appreciate and accept that representing women is a collective responsibility, with individual, institutional, and systemic costs if it is done poorly. We go so far as to suggest that, as elected representatives accept the democratic responsibility to represent diverse women, they would become more confident in their deliberations, emboldened in making their decisions, and with greater trust in their individual and collective judgement.

Our augmentations do not only educate - they make elected representatives *care* more about representing women. Group advocacy and account giving are 'close encounters' between elected and affected representatives. Passionate and partial advocacy starkly contrasts with the witnessing of

---

[10] This ensures some feminist substance remains in play (Saward 2016, 9; Dodson 2006).
[11] Arguably, feminist democratic representation would also incentivise the establishment of gender-sensitive parliaments (reference to be supplied on acceptance).

disembodied and dry knowledge. The represented is now a "concrete other" (Benhabib 1992). In the minds of elected representatives, differently affected women are made 'conversationally' and 'imaginatively present', expanding elected representatives' knowledge and *sensibilities* (Goodin 2000, 83, 95, 98). Affective knowledge makes it harder for elected representatives to summarily ignore or dismiss claims (Kantola 2018), or depict affected representatives and those they represent as unworthy of representation. And even when elected representatives refute claims or choose some over others, as in some instances they must, affected representatives and their representative claims will still have been formally aired and acknowledged within the institution (Disch 2011).

Changes in the content of elected representatives' deliberations – the consequence of elected representatives knowing and caring more about diverse women's interests - are matched by changes in how elected representatives deliberate and communicate within parliaments and extra-institutionally. Because they know that they will be held to account, elected representatives are incentivized to communicate with the affected representatives on the latter's terms. By speaking in ways that resonate with those they seek to persuade in the account giving moment, elected representatives' style shifts away from dominant political forms - adversarial, detached, formal, and elite. These new modes engender institutional and societal recognition of the legitimacy and validity of (diverse) women's speech.

Direct Representative Effects on the Represented Women: Recognized and Legitimized, More Knowledgeable, and Interested and Mobilized

The success of our second-generation feminist design lies centrally in the transformation of the attitudes and behaviour of elected representatives. Yet it is the views of the represented – what they think about the quality of their representation - that we value most. Five design features incentivise representational effects regarding the represented: (i) the formal and institutionalized presence of affected representatives; (ii) the constitution of affected representatives *as* representatives, equal of sorts with elected representatives; (iii) the right and practice of affected representatives advocating partially, and speaking in one's own voice and for one's own interests; (iv) 'ownership' by the represented over how they are represented by affected representatives; and (v) affected representatives' active power over elected representatives during account giving. First, the represented feel *recognized and legitimized* (Dovi 2007, 155-6). Responsive to shifting and evolving societal debates, and built around concrete political issues and events, over time a wide variety of women engage with formal politics; previously absent groups of women are formally included as active participants in the 'public speech for the nation' and see themselves reflected amongst the affected representatives (Urbinati 2006, 35). As elected representatives collectively respond to diverse women, and affected and elected representatives adopt new styles of language and tone in their interactions, parliamentary politics becomes less exclusive,[12] and the gap between elected representatives, the legislature, and the represented lessened. Women should come to acknowledge that the long antipathy and indifference to their representation has ended and that parliaments are an amenable site for the redress of gender inequality.

---

[12] When elected representatives deliberate amongst themselves, they may switch back to their preferred mode of communication (Urbinati 2006, 43-6).

Second, women in society become *more knowledgeable*. Through repeated encounters between elected and affected representatives, women in society become more aware of different, and at times oppositional views. Different groups of women and their affected representatives may reflect upon the particularity of their views (Young 2002, 113, 116); 'recalibrate' their thoughts and emotions (Mansbridge 2019, 316); 'transcend the immediacy of their biographical experience and social and cultural belongings and interests' (Urbinati 2006, 5); and better appreciate how their 'situation looks to others' (Young 2002, 116). This might alter or transform how some women conceive of their interests, even if for others original conceptions of these will be reconfirmed. Either way, interactions that lay out the structure of any conflict open up the potential for mutual appreciation. The saliency of individual women's issues may change over time too. This is not because all women suddenly agree, rather, that with additional factual and affective knowledge, initial preferences might be considered partial and new solutions and alliances become imaginable. Contestation in an agonistic sense allows citizens to understand the nature of their struggle and to identify the terms on which citizens might align or oppose (Mouffe 2000, 13–20, Disch 2019, 179). For some or all these reasons, there may be recognition that sub-groups of women are part of something bigger; new alliances and mobilizations, perhaps even the temporary identification of a collective women's agenda, is possible.

Third, a wide diversity of women will be *interested in and mobilized for* electoral politics. Seeing their affected representatives face-to-face with elected representatives, and witnessing a different form of politics, women should feel: content that their affected representatives have contributed to better understandings of the issue at hand; pride that their efforts have led to their interests being acknowledged and responded to; positive about their contribution to the education of representatives and the improvement in the quality of the overall representative process. Such inclusive, responsive, and egalitarian presence should in turn generate greater feelings of worth, efficacy and affinity with the actors and institutions of representative democracy (Rosanvallon 2011). This should give rise to greater self-organization of women, with diverse women constituting themselves as representational constituencies (Saward 2010), putting forward affected representatives, and seeking direct participation as representatives, both elected and affected.

Indirect Representational Effects: Role Models and the Appreciation of Diversity

If the institutional presence of affected representatives improves women's descriptive representation in straightforward numerical terms, as more women participate in the legislature, and qualitatively in terms of which women are now participating in formal politics,[13] it might also boost descriptive representation in more indirect ways. Experiences gained may influence individual affected representative's ambition and resources, prompting them to seek (s)election as elected representatives. They will have acquired - and be seen to – the experiences, skills, and resources for formal politics. As time passes, affected representatives have wider role model effects outside formal politics; seeing 'women like them' in politics can increase the numbers wishing to participate in formal politics, whether as elected or affected representatives (Piscopo and Kenny 2020; Hinoyosa & Kittilson 2020).

---

[13] We assume that most affected representatives will be women, Dovi's (2002) 'preferable descriptive representatives'.

The contrast between who comprises a parliament's elected and affected representatives should throw additional light on the problematic homogeneity of so many institutions. The presence of affected representatives has the potential to re-educate parties about the value of diverse representation, and may challenge leaders and selectorate perceptions of women's credentials and capacities for elected office. Rather than the artificial demand for women candidates created by gender quota, changes in gatekeeper attitudes towards women as candidates should engender 'genuine' demand for more and, importantly, diverse women in politics. Were this to happen we would witness a profound change in the demand side of recruitment (Norris and Lovenduski 1995), fundamentally overturning ideas about gender and merit. As mentioned above, this has proven singularly impossible to achieve (Murray 2014; Annesley et al. 2019).

CONCLUSION

In the face of women's ongoing poverty of representation, we were emboldened to undertake what we came to regard as second-generational feminist democratic design. We reflected once again on the 1990s politics of presence literature as well as reviewed contemporary democratic theory for what it might offer women. We were confident that the case for women's group representation could be remade, and that classic ideas regarding women's political inclusion could be updated to address what it might mean for women in their diversity to be well represented (following Phillips 2012). Our design thinking identified three feminist principles reflecting a full appreciation of women's intersectional and ideological differences that we would infuse with newer democratic ideas regarding deliberation, advocacy, and accountability.

Feminist democratic representation establishes new institutional practices and introduces new political actors – the affected representatives of women - incentivizing transformations in the relationship between the represented and elected representatives and engendering new representational outcomes. Affected representatives have roles distinct from elected representatives. And whilst our design maintains the latter as the key actors of representative democracy it nevertheless disrupts their established ways of working and, in party democracies, the norms of party politics. Affected representatives are critical to the new input and output phases of parliamentary representation - group advocacy and account giving. Reinforcing each other, these augmentations incentivize elected representatives to better meet the representational needs of women, notably when they later deliberate and take decisions. Crudely, elected representatives can no longer claim ignorance of the diversity of women's interests (they know more), and they are affected by and responsive to what they have heard (they care more). There is a reputational risk, individual and institutional, in turning their backs on representing women: inviting criticism from the affected representatives within the legislature during account giving, and more generally from women outside.

Our design importantly moves the responsibility to realize women's good representation from the personal preference of (mostly) descriptive representatives operating in highly constrained masculinized contexts to the collective interest of elected representatives, male and female, and the responsibility of the institution overall. The institutionalization of affected representatives' means that our designed-in incentives – and hence the potential to effect substantial representative change – deepens and broadens over time. Parliamentary politics becomes more conducive to women's representation. In ongoing moments of advocacy, deliberation and decision-making, and account giving, the affected representatives' judgement of whether elected representatives have deliberated

and decided in a just and fair manner feeds into subsequent consideration of the next women's issues and interests to be decided upon.

With its two new democratic practices and a new set of political actors, a virtuous circle is formed: affected representatives put particular interests on the parliamentary table, are treated responsively and in an egalitarian fashion, and hold elected representatives to account; women's motivation to participate is reinforced. In turn, greater participation by women in electoral politics - as affected and elected representatives – opens up the possibility that representative democracy becomes an everyday practice of ordinary women. We would suggest that these stronger representative relationships encourage greater support for the procedures, institutions, and substantive outputs of representative politics on the ground, and at a higher level, to the idea of representative democracy. Feminist democratic representation moreover allows for the possibility that women who fail to have their interests (as they would define them) met by elected representatives can nonetheless judge the overall representative process fair and just. The classic dimensions of representation are now recognized as thoroughly entwined: being well-represented encompasses how women feel about their formal, elected representative relationships, the workings of democratic institutions and processes, as well as how those who stand and act for them speak, act and decide. Whether women feel and experience good representations is wrapped up with ideas and feelings of affinity, trust, legitimacy, symbolism, and affect.

We cannot guarantee such feminist outcomes, just like first-generation designers could not guarantee women's substantive representation: we have spoken of conducive contexts, talked in terms of incentives, and outlined intended and hoped for representational effects. Nor do we think that building our design will be easy or quick - there is a lot more to institutional (re)building (Lowndes and Roberts 2013). Indeed, we are cognizant of feminist institutionalists scholarship to imagine such a rosy scenario, and there should be a feminist building process to inform bespoke institutional blueprints (Lowndes and Paxton 2018). Furthermore, what we are suggesting is hugely demanding of political institutions, and of elected representatives and their parties, and at least in the first instance it will slow down politics. Even so, we have some confidence that the remade case for women's group representation should have appeal. Representative democracy is not in the best of health. By making our political institutions feminist and thus more democratic – and extending this design for other currently underrepresented groups, including marginalized men – might just be one, very good, way of underpinning what at present look like rather shaky political institutions.

Bibliography

Ahmed, S. (2014). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
Benhabib, Seyla. 1992. "The Generalized and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory." Chapter 5 in Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics, 402–24. New York: Routledge.
Celis, Karen, Sarah Childs, Johanna Kantola, and Mona Lena Krook. 2014. "Constituting Women's Interests through Representative Claims." Politics & Gender 10 (2): 149–74.
Celis, Karen, and Joni Lovenduski. 2018. "Power Struggles: Gender Equality in Political Representation." European Journal of Politics and Gender 1 (1–2): 149–66.

Celis, Karen, and Liza M. Mügge. 2018. "Whose Equality? Measuring Group Representation." Politics 38 (2): 197–213.

Childs, Sarah, and Lena Mona Krook. 2008. "Critical Mass Theory and Women's Political Representation." Political Studies 56 (3): 725–36.

Childs, Sarah, and Joni Lovenduski. 2013. "Representation." In Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics, edited by Georgina Waylen, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and Laurel S. Weldon, 489–513. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clayton, Amanda, Diana Z. O'Brien, and Jennifer M. Piscopo. 2018. "All Male Panels? Representation and Democratic Legitimacy." American Journal of Political Science 63 (1): 113–29.

Dahlerup, Drude. 1988. "From a Small to a Large Minority", Scandinavian Political Studies 11 (4): 275-98.

Dahlerup, Drude. 2017. Has Democracy Failed Women? Cambridge: Polity Press.

Disch, Lisa. 2011. "Toward a Mobilization Conception of Democratic Representation." American Political Science Review 105 (1): 100–114.

Disch, Lisa. 2019. "The Silent Partner in Political Representation's Constructivist Turn." In Creating Political Presence. The New Politics of Democratic Representation, edited by Dario Castiglione and Johannes Pollak, 162–85. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dodson, Debra L. 2006. The Impact of Women in Congress. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dovi, Suzanne. 2002. "Preferable Descriptive Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black, or Latino Do?" American Political Science Review 96 (4): 729–43.

Dovi, Suzanne. 2007. The Good Representative. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Dovi, Suzanne. 2015. "Representing women: The importance of resistance." Paper presented at the ECPG Conference in Uppsala, Sweden, June 11–13, 2015.

Fukuyama, Francis. 2018. Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Galligan, Yvonne. 2012. Deliberative Processes and Gender Democracy (Report EU 6th Framework Project). Case Studies from Europe. Oslo: ARENA.

Goodin, Robert E. 2000. "Democratic Deliberation Within." Philosophy & Public Affairs 29 (1): 81–109.

Hughes, Melanie, M., Paxton, Pamela, Clayton, Amanda, and Zetterberg, Par. 2019. "Global Gender Quota Adoption, Implementation, and Reform", Comparative Politics 51 (2): 219-38.

Jónasdóttir, Anna G. 1989. "On the Concept of Interest, Women's Interests, and the Limitations of Interest Theory." In The Political Interests of Gender, edited by Kathleen B. Jones and Anna G. Jónasdóttir, 33–65. London: Sage Publications.

Kantola, Johanna. 2018. "Gender and the Economic Crisis: Political Parties as Sites of Feminist Struggles." Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society 25 (3): 361–82.

Kantola, Johanna, and Emanuela Lombardo. 2017. "Gender and the Politics of the Economic Crisis in Europe." In Gender and the Economic Crisis in Europe. Politics, Institutions and Intersectionality, edited by Johanna Kantola and Emanuela Lombardo, 1–25. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krook, Mona Lena. 2009. Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krook, Mona Lena, and Fiona Mackay. 2011. "Introduction: Gender, Politics, and Institutions." In Gender, Politics and Institutions, edited by Mona Lena Krook and Fiona Mackay, 1–20. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Lovenduski, Joni. 2019. "Feminist Reflections on Representative Democracy." In Rethinking Democracy, edited by Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright, 18–35. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Lowndes, Vivien, and Marie Paxton. 2018. "Can Agonism Be Institutionalised? Can Institutions Be Agonised? Prospects for Democratic Design." The British Journal of Politics and International Relations 20 (3): 693–710.

Lowndes, Vivien, and Mark Roberts. 2013. Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism in Political Science. London: Red Globe Press.

Mackay, Fiona, and Meryl Kenny. 2007. "Women's Representation in the 2007 Scottish Parliament: Temporary Setback or Return to the Norm?" Scottish Affairs 60 (1): 80–93.

Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" The Journal of Politics 61 (3): 628–57.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2002. "Practice–Thought–Practice." In Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance, edited by Archon Fung and Eric Olin Wright, 175–99. New York: Verso.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2009. "A 'Selection Model' of Political Representation." The Journal of Political Philosophy 17 (4): 369–98.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2019. "Recursive Representation." In Creating Political Presence. The New Politics of Democratic Representation, edited by Dario Castiglione and Johannes Pollak, 298–338. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, David Estlund, Andreas Føllesdal, Archon Fung, Cristina Lafont, Bernard Manin, and José Luis Martí. 2010. "The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy." Journal of Political Philosophy 18 (1): 64–100.

Montanaro, Laura. 2012. "The Democratic Legitimacy of Self-Appointed Representatives." The Journal of Politics 74 (4): 1094–1107.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2000. The Democratic Paradox. London & New York: Verso.

Murray, Rainbow. 2014. "Quotas for Men: Reframing Gender Quotas as a Means of Improving Representation for All." American Political Science Review 108 (3): 520–32.

Newton, Kenneth. 2012. "Curing the Democratic Malaise with Democratic Innovations." In Evaluating Democratic Innovations. Curing the Democratic Malaise?, edited by Brigitte Geissel and Kenneth Newton, 3–20. New York: Routledge.

Norris, Pippa, and Joni Lovenduski. 1995. Political Recruitment: Gender, Race and Class in the British Parliament. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Palmieri, Sonia. 2019. "Feminist Institutionalism and Gender-Sensitive Parliaments: Relating Theory and Practice", in Sawer, Marian and Baker, Kerryn. (Ed). Gender Innovatoin in Political Science, New Norms, New Knowledge. London; Palgrave. Pp 173-194.

Paxton, Pamela, Melanie M. Hughes, and Tiffany, D. Barnes. 2020. Women, Politics, and Power. Lanham, Boulder, NY and London. Rowman and Littlefield.

Phillips, Anne. 1992. "Must Feminists Give Up on Liberal Democracy?" Political Studies, 68–82.

Phillips, Anne. 1995. The Politics of Presence. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Phillips, Anne. 2012. "Representation and Inclusion", Politics & Gender 8 (4): 512-518.

Piscopo, Jennifer, and Meryl Kenny. 2020. "Rethinking the Ambition Gap: Gender and Candidate Emergence in Comparative Perspective." in ed. Jennifer Piscopo and Meryl Kenny, special issue, European Journal of Politics and Gender 34 (1): 3–10.

Pitkin, Hanna F. 1967. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rosanvallon, Pierre. 2011. Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Saward, Michael. 2010. The Representative Claim. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saward, Michael. 2016. "Towards Democratic Design: A Note on Methods of Theory'." Paper presented to APSA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, September 1–4, 2016.

Saward, Michael. 2020. Democratic Design. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A., and Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson. 2011. "Critical Perspectives on Politics and Gender: The Meaning and Measurement of Women's Interests." Politics & Gender 7 (3): 417–18.

Smooth, Wendy. 2011. "Standing for Women? Which Women? The Substantive Representation of Women's Interests and the Research Imperative of Intersectionality." Politics & Gender 7 (3): 436–41.

Trimble, Linda and Jane Arscott. 2003. Still Counting Women in Politics Across Canada. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Urbinati, Nadia. 2006. Representative Democracy: Principles and Genealogy. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Verloo, Mieke. 2018. Varieties of Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Walsh, Denise. 2011. Women's Rights in Democratizing States: Just Debate and Gender Justice in the Public Sphere. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warren, Mark. 2019. "How Representation Enables Democratic Citizenship." In Creating Political Presence, edited by Dario Castiglione and Johannes Pollak, 39–60. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Williams, Melissa. 1998. Voice, Trust, and Memory. The Failings of Liberal Representation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990a. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990b. Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory. Bloomington and Indianapolis. Indiana University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 2002. Inclusion and Democracy. New York: Oxford University Press.