CHAPTER: 2

CONCEPTUALISING REPRESENTATION & LEADERSHIP IN POLITICS FROM A FEMINIST STANDPOINT:

CHAPTER OUTLINE

2.1.INTRODUCTION

Political participation is the hall mark of a democratic setup. Nature, success and effectiveness of democracy largely depend on the extent to which equal, effective and actual participation is provided by the system to all its citizens. Participation in politics is a pre-requisite and minimal requirement for a successful democratic political system. Political participation has been defined in various terms. Political participation is a broader and complex term, expresses itself in various kinds of overt and manifest political activities. In more clear terms, the concept of political participation includes activities like-

- ➢ voting,
- ➢ campaigning in elections,
- ➢ convincing other persons to vote in a particular way,
- ➢ attending public meetings,
- ➢ distributing party literature,
- ➢ joining an organization or a party,
- ➢ contributing money to a party,
- ➢ contesting election and
- ➢ holding public or party office, etc (Lester, 1965, p.17-19).

Political participation means not only exercising the right to vote, but also power sharing, co-decision making, co-policy making at all levels of governance of the state(Singh, 2000, p. 619).

Modern-day democracies are indirect, representative democracies. It is through the electoral process that individuals choose their representatives who perform the act of governing on their behalf. It is through their elected representatives that the adult citizens indirectly take part in the process of policy making. The electoral process not only helps to realize the individual's right to political participation, but through it another essential function of a political system is also performed, that is the function of political recruitment. An individual can take part in the electoral process in a number of ways- as a voter, as a candidate, getting involved in the nomination of candidates, taking part in election campaigns, discussing politics, distributing party literature, attending political meetings and so on. In whatever ways he/she takes part, the individual actually performs the act of political participation. Such participation naturally assumes greater importance

in a democratic political system. There is also a close interrelationship between the electoral process and an individual's political consciousness. A higher level of political consciousness may lead to an increased rate of electoral participation. Again, an increased rate of participation may in turn help in a higher degree of political consciousness (Roy, 2015).

As people's participation is needed in democracy and participatory democracy cannot be practicedproperly without leadership it is essential to focus on leadership. Democratic leadership is embedded in an institutional context that aims to prevent corruption and the abuse of power. In fact the nature of ademocratic state depends on the qualities of leadership. So, in the study of political process, in order to understand political participation we must concern about the concept of leadership along with representation.

With this brief note about political participation in the electoral process, we will now focus on the concept of 'Representation'. This is necessary because representation is also a form of electoral participation which constitutes just one of the many aspects of political participation.

2.2.REPRESENTATION: GENERAL &THEORETICAL CONCEPT

The concept 'Representation' is defined and used in several ways by different writersor thinkers. The representation concept has been developed more by politicians and propagandists than political scientists. The concept of representation is crucial to the modern representative democracies, because it is identified with democracy generally indirect democracy. The word 'representation' derives from the Latin word 'representare' which means literally to bring before one, to bring back, to exhibit, to show, to manifest, to display (Beard& Lewis, 1967, p.98).

The origins of the concept of representation can be traced back to ancient times. The ancient Greeks elected some officials and sometimes sent ambassadors, involving in those activities which include acts of present conception of representation, though they did not have a corresponding word to representation. The Romans had the word 'representare' from which the present word 'representation' is derived. But they used it to mean the literal bringing into presence of something previously absent or the embodiment of an abstraction in an object. They did not apply it to human beings acting for others, or to their political institutions (Pitkin, 1967, p.244-51).

Representation as a concept may be understood as the making present again, of some entity whether personal or abstract. Representation, in the sense of human being representing other human being is particularly a modern conception. This development could be seen mainly from the 14th century. This is clear from a detailed linguistic study made by Hanna Pitkin (1967). To her, probably late in the fourteenth century, the Oxford English Dictionary used the word 'represent' to mean to bring oneself or another into the presence of someone, to symbolize or embody concretely, to bring before the mind; whereas the adjective 'representative' means 'serving to represent, figure, portray or symbolize. During the fifteenth century, the concept of representation expanded to mean also to portray, depict or delineate. It came to be applied to inanimate objects which stand in the place of or correspond to something or someone. At the same time the noun 'representation' appears to mean image, likeness or picture. Human beings are not entirely absent from these early usages, they appear in these usages primarily in two ways. On the one hand, representation was meant as an inanimate object or image standing for a human being, on the other, it was used to represent a human activity of presenting, of depicting, of painting a picture or staging a play, though not as an activity of acting for others (Pitkin, 1967,p.244-51). It is found in the record of Oxford Dictionary, there are no illustrations of the concept of representation in political sense till the 16th century.

Also, the meaning of representation has changed in different times and contexts of history of political thought and theory. The concept of representation is very important and complex in nature and the meaning of the representation applied in different ways in different contextsof history like in ancient times, in medieval or in modern age the concept of representation has been used in different way. Therefore, in the following sectionswe will enlighten the origin history of representation and will try to understand the several usageof representation in ancient, medieval and modern contexts of political thought.

2.2.1. ANCIENT POLITICAL THOUGHT AND THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION:

The concept of representation has undergone different changes with respect to the political and social context in history. The Greeks and the Romans conducted public business through representative institutions, but their political theories could not provide adequate understanding of representation as an instrument of power. However, for our

general understanding of the unique trajectory of the concept of representation we have focussed on the Greek and the Roman thought.

2.2.1.1.ANCIENT GREEK POLITICAL THOUGHT AND REPRESENTATION:

Plato's political thought was mainly concerned about the characteristics and education of a philosopher-king. He felt that the philosopher-king need not follow any laws or regulations as he can act by virtue of his wisdom. Jellinek, holds that the Greeks had no notion of representation as applied to the creation of legislative assemblies. Aristotle, the father of Political Science, believed that propertied-classes should play a large role in the government and through their assembly citizens should pass upon fundamental questions, chooses the magistrates and holds them to account for their official action. As observed by Gewirth, to Aristotle, "the legislator or the primary and proper cause of the law, is the people or the whole body of citizens, or the weightier part thereof, through its election or 'will' expressed by words in the general assembly of citizens, commanding or determining that something be done or omitted with regard to human civil acts, under temporal pain or punishment".Thus, Aristotle considered legislator as primarily a law-maker whose law-making functions include passing of new legislation and repealing of unnecessary laws. In saying that the legislator is the people, or the whole body of citizens or the weightier part thereof, he did not specify about who is a legislator. A reference to elected representatives could also be noted in this context. Law-making function, according to Aristotle, could be exercised directly by the legislators or could be delegated to some person or persons who exercise the law-making power on behalf of the legislator. Thus the persons to whom this function is entrusted are not the legislator in the absolute sense. But they became legislators only in a relative sense as they function only as agents. This gives an idea of representative as delegate and representation as an instrument limiting the power of the ruler. Aristotle is mainly concerned about direct democracy in small city-states rather than representative democracy, as it exists in large nation – states(Lakshmi,1990, p.29-31).

2.2.1.2. ANCIENT ROMAN POLITICAL THOUGHT AND REPRESENTATION:

Like ancient Greeks, the Romans favoured a more democratic form of government. Roman conception of state lies between the organic theory of state, where the state fully includes the individual, and Epicurean conception, which considered state as a non-essential institution, giving the highest place to individual freedom. The Roman thought

conceived state as a natural institution, allowing the possibility of creating laws, where new laws were enacted in the form of an agreement between the magistrates and the people in their assemblies (Lakshmi,1990,p.32).

Roman thinkers, particularly Polybius and Cicero, favoured a mixed type of government. Polybius adopted the Greek classification of government (monarchy, aristocracy and democracy). To him, it was essential to combine the better elements of all forms of governments. Accordingly in the Roman constitution, the consuls represented the monarchic principle, the senate was essentially aristocratic and the popular assemblies were democratic. He also envisaged an elaborate structure of checks and balances, so that no single branch of government becomes dominant to ignore the opinion of others. Polybius speaks of the responsibility of the consuls to the senate and to the people, and of the responsibility of the senate and tribunes to the people. But he does not look upon the Roman officers of state as peoples' representatives even does not consider the actual composition of the Roman senate as representative as in modern sense (Lakshmi, 1990,p.32-33). Observed by Beard and Lewis (1967), that it is not correct to say, representatives were unknown to Greek and Roman politics and thought, rather it's presence were in very few cases. Hence, the modern concept of representation in legislative bodies has no historical connections with Greek and Roman representative agencies. Even, it is also difficult to find the notion of popular representation in early medieval thought which was dominated by religion.

2.2.2. MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT AND REPRESENTATION:

Throughout the middle ages, there seem to be two views about the origins of political authority - descending and ascending theories of authority which were to some extent, pertinent to the problem of representation. According to the descending theory, the authority of some men over others could only be regarded as rightful if it were divinely sanctioned.The ascending theory of political authority developed during the later medieval period, the chief exponent being Marsilio of Padua who considered that authority originated with the people and was delegated by them to the rulers.He preferred an elective monarch for this purpose whose duty was to interpret and administer law rather than making it. The monarch, in his view, was just a delegate of the people who acts on behalf of his people in upholding their laws. He subordinated the church to state though he does not intend to build an egalitarian society in any modern sense.Maude

Clarke, in her study of the origins of representation in the middle ages, found that different kinds of representation such as personification and specific acts, undertaken for reasons of administrative convenience and political action hearing directly upon public laws could be seen in this period (Lakshmi,1990, p. 34-35).

The concept of representation of classes emerged in medieval Europe as a device of administrative convenience, where the king summoned the parliament for the purpose of levying taxes.Beard and Lewis (1967) traced four principal stages in the development of representative government in England. The first parliaments were called by monarchs primarily for the purpose of voting taxes for the royal treasury and represented the estates of the realm, mainly two estates-land and commerce. In the second stage, the tax-voting body became a law-making body where the members of parliaments began to list their protests in the form of petitions to the king for redressal. If the king approved a petition, then it became a law, binding on his officers and subjects. The third stage was reached by a gradual process culminating in the revolution of the seventeenth century, when the king was substantially deprived of law-making and tax-voting powers, and his civil and military administration was confined within the limits laid down in constitutional measures. During the final stage, under the influence of the French Revolution and American Revolution which declared all men were equal and that each one was entitled to an equal share in governing and with the gradual extension of the suffrage, the modern concept of representative government finally emerged (Lakshmi,1990,p. 35-36).

2.2.3. EARLY MODERNTHINKERS AND THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION:

2.2.3.1.THE CONTRACTUALISTS AND REPRESENTATION:

At the beginning of the modern age, the Social Contractualists namely Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau asserted that state was not a divine creation and that political authority is something which has been conferred on the government by the people. Thus, they made people the source of power. Their emphasis on the problems of political authority and obligation regarding the formation and legitimisation of the state led each of them refer to the concept of representation (Lakshmi,1990, p. 36).

Hobbes' analysis of representation proceeds from the notion of a person to distinguish between natural and artificial persons. He concludes that a representative is a kind of artificial person. He defined representative as an agent who has the right or authority to

make the represented obliged to whatever actions or policies that the representative thinks appropriate. The state of nature led Hobbes defend political absolutism and to try to convince people that they are morally obliged to obey the orders of the 'Leviathan' whom he called as their representative (Lakshmi,1990, p. 37).

John Locke in his "Two treatises on Civil Government" endeavours to provide more rights to represented than to the representatives, and to make representative in some sense responsible to the represented by placing the right to change the government in the hands of the people, though he never defined the terms representative or representation as such (Birch, 1971, p.35).

Rousseau, the major exponent of direct democracy in modern times, argues that political representation is not possible as it involves 'willing for other' which is not feasible in actual practice as no man can will on behalf of others. He considered that real freedom is not possible in a representative form of government as a representative might look after another person's interests, if they were clearly known, but he would hardly formulate another individual's will. To solve this problem, he expounded the theory of General will,which is neither a majority will nor the sum of individual wills (Eulau, 1978, p.43).

Thus, the social contructualists provide some insightful aspects of political representation, though they did not provide any definitive requisite of the concept of representation and could not explain clearly the essential links between the representative and the represented.

2.2.3.2.EDMUND BURKE AND THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION:

According to Burke (1729-1797), political representation is the representation of interest which has an objective, impersonal and unattached reality and government should rest on wisdom but not on will, as the good of nation emerges not from a general will but from the general reason of the whole.Burke emphasised that a representative should be and capable of conceiving broad based and relatively fixed interests such as agricultural interests, mercantile interests rather than particularised and narrow interests like individual businessman's interest or a single farmer's interest (Lakshmi,1990, p.40). Burke conceived that representation has a substantive content, and election of members of parliament is intended to supply this content and bring about an effect of virtual representation. To him, "virtual representation is that in which there is a communion of

interests and sympathy of feeling and desires, between those who act in the name of any description of people and the people in whose name they act, though the trustees are not actively chosen by them". To him, such representation is even better than the actual representation as "the people may err in their choice, but common interests and common sentiments are rarely mistaken" (Burke, 1887, p.293). Thus, various sets of ideas – elite representation of nation, actual and virtual representation of constituencies, parliamentary deliberations, accurate reflection of popular feelings together give rise to comprehensive Burkean theory of political representation (Pitkin,1967, p.188).

2.2.4. MODERN POLITICAL THINKERS AND THECONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION:

2.2.4.1.FEDERALIST'S PERCEPTION OF REPRESENTATION:

The Federalists Madison, Hamilton and their supporters were not successful in their efforts to arrive at a final theory of representation. As pointed out by De Grazia, although they may have wanted certain interests in society to be finally and definitely represented in the structure of government, they could not imagine how that would be possible (De Grazia, 1951, p.99).

2.2.4.2.BENTHAM, JAMES MILL - UTILITARIAN THEORY AND THE CONCEPT OF REPRESENTATION:

The Utilitarians and the Individualists provided a highly individualistic conception of representation. Based on their conception of pleasure and pain, Bentham and James Mill put forward the microcosmic view of representation, where the representatives share the interests of the represented. To them the representative should be able to recognise the common interest of the society and should have enough motivation in terms of his own private interest to enact the appropriate legislation. In the words of James Mill, "as the community cannot have any interest opposite to its interest, the interest of the representatives to be identified with those of the community". Bentham argued in favour of frequent annual elections to keep representatives alert, to keep them under the control of the represented and to see that they would not be given enough time to develop distinct interests of their own, different from those of community in their capacity of politicians. James Mill held that 'the benefits of the representative system are lost in all cases in

which the interests of the choosing body are not the same with those of the community' (Mill,1955, p.73).

2.2.4.3.JOHN STUART MILL AND REPRESENTATION:

To J.S.Mill, representative government is "the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state in which the whole people participate"(Shields, 1958, p.66-67). He advocated representative form of government, extended suffrage through proportional representation as devices to safeguard fundamental human freedoms.J.S.Mill visualised representative government as the ideal form of government, with proper weightagegiven to the better educated and more responsible members of the community, denying illiterates and non-tax payers the right to vote.He did not specify the exact term for the members of Parliament. He supported trustee role of the representative and believed that the representative should be more educated and experienced than the represented and that while the representatives owed to their electors the benefit of their wisdom, they should not be bound to follow their constituents' judgement (Lakshmi,1990, p. 44-46).

2.2.4.4.IDEALISTS, MARXISTS, COLLECTIVISTS, GUILD SOCIALISTS AND REPRESENTATION:

To, idealist political thinkers like T.H.Green and Bernard Bosanquet, representation is not to encourage or emphasize diversity of opinion but to reduce such difference by harmonizing various conflicting sectional interests in a society or community (Lakshmi,1990, p. 46). Their argument can be best summarised in Ernest Barker's opinion, who considered the real basis of democracy as the "discussion of competing ideas, leads to a compromise in which all ideas are reconciled and which can be accepted by all because it bears the imprint of all" (Barker, 1942, p. 36).

According to the Marxian conception, in a class bound society where political system and institutions among others is the superstructure, whose base is the mode of production, representative institutions of liberal democracies work as stooges in the hands of ruling class, which works for perpetuating its own class interests. Marxists rule out the possibility of real representation in a class bound society (Lakshmi,1990, p. 46).

The Collectivists and the Guild socialists like G.D.H. Cole and David Truman viewed modern society, distinct from feudal and agrarian society is composed of sections and

groups with overlapping interests and affiliations. This pluralistic view of society led them to believe that elected representatives will inevitably act, to a considerable extent, as delegates of particular interests (Lakshmi, 1990, p. 46-47).

2.2.4.5.HEINZ EULAU, HANNA F. PITKIN, A.H. BIRCH, ALFRED DE GRAZIA'S PERCEPTIONOF REPRESENTATION:

The concept of representation is widely used in modern age mainly due to its linkages with other modern concepts like democracy, liberty and equality. According to Heinz Eulau (1978), in the context of modern government, neitherresponsibility nor responsiveness can be assured through thetechnique of representation as a representative cannot possiblybe responsive to each of the hundreds of thousands ofconstituents he represents and for the same reason it ispractically impossible for the electorate to hold the representative responsible for his decisions. He felt that the Burkean conception and other normative theories of representation are obsolete as they are based on the behavioural assumption that responsibility and responsiveness are assured by "some similarity, achieved mechanically through relevant psychological processes,between the characteristics, attributes, attitudes, or goals ofthe representative and represented". He argued that such anassumption is false and a viable theory of democraticrepresentation must be based on the assumption in of an inevitablestatus difference' between the representative and there presented (Lakshmi, 1990, p.48).

Pitkin (1967), who has made a comprehensive study on the concept of representation, assumed that representation has an identifiable meaning applied in different but controlled and discoverable ways in different contexts.She considered representation as acting in the interests of represented in a manner responsive to them and it is necessary that both representative and represented must act independently and in case of conflict, it is the representatives that should act in a way which prevents conflicts. Pitkin's study is useful in that it laid emphasis on the need for responsiveness, but she failed to give guidelines which will be useful to measure or assess the level of responsiveness (Lakshmi, 1990, p.48-49).

Another prominent theorist, A.H.Birch (1971), used the concept of representation not only in political and non-political situations but also in a variety of ways. He expounded three main ways in which the term 'representation' is commonly used, together with

various specialized or subsidiary usages. The three main usages, each logically distinct from the others, are as follows:

I. To denote an agent or spokesman who acts on behalf of his principal;
II. To indicate that a person shares some of the characteristics of a class of persons;
III. To indicate that a person symbolizes the identity or qualities of a class of persons (Birch, 1971, p. 15).

On the basis of these three different usages, Birch classified the concept of representation into different types (which we would discuss in the latter part of this chapter) and unlike Hanna Pitkin, he believed that there is no need at all to reduce the various usages and theories to a single definition.

Alfred de Grazia (1951), in his "Public and Republic" suggested that the search for broader meanings of representation both in the present and the past, must be conducted at three levels-community level, discussion level and administration level (De Grazia, 1951, p.3).Grazia defined representation as "a condition that exists when the characteristics and acts of one vested with public functions are in accord with the desires of one or more persons to whom the functions have objective or subjective importance". Representation exists on three distinctive levels: community, discussion, and administration. The first of these involves symbolic or expressive representation, and is common to all types of government since it concerns the consensus between ruler and ruled. Discussion includes legislation and the bargaining part of the political process. In administration, general acts are brought to bear on the individuals in the community (Hogan, 1951, p.586).

Thus, there are several concepts and definitions of representation that have been advanced by various political theorists in different historical periods under the aegis of different dynamic social and political circumstances. And in this perspective we should remember one of the most important arguments of Hanna Pitkin that "one must know the context in which the concept of representation is placed in order to determine its meaning". For Pitkin, the contemporary usage of the term 'representation' can significantly change its meaning (Dovi, 2018).

However, with the introduction of modern age the concept of representation started to become popular and widely applied to the modern political system in the senseof political

connotation. Basically the modern concept of representationmeans thepolitical representation and it become prime concern to contemporary modern thinkers. The following section will enlighten the concept of political representation in the context of modern democracy.

2.3. THE CONCEPT OF POLITICAL REPRESENTATION:

Political representation is not a simple concept, there are hardly few who share the same content or agree unanimously on a single definition. The literature concerning political representation contains many different definitions. Now we will throw light on several interpretations and definitions given by a number of major scholars. As Hanna Pitkin (1967) defines: to represent is simply to "make present again"; it is a most brief and simple definition, so that is not adequate to understand clearly the concept of political representation. While, Pitkin more precisely defines: political representation is, in fact, representation particularly in the sense of "acting for", and that this must be understood at the public level. The representative system must look after the public interest and be responsive to public opinion, except, insofar as non responsiveness can be justified in terms of the public interest. At both ends, the process is public and institutional. Pitkin considered political representation as primarily a public, institutionalised arrangement involving many people and groups operating in complex ways of large scale social arrangements, as the modern representative acts within an elaborate network of pressures, demands and obligations.The individual legislator does not act alone, but as a member of a representative body. Hence his (representative) pursuit of the public interest and response to public opinion need not always be conscious and deliberate anymore than the individual voter's role. Representation may emerge from a political system in which many individuals, both voters and legislators, are pursuing quite other goals. Pitkin specifically said, "We must be cautious, also, about the absence of rational pursuit of the public interest by individuals. I do not wish to suggest that it is totally expendable, for I doubt whether any institutional framework could produce representation without conscious, rational, creative effort by some individuals. But there is latitude in a political system for apathy ignorance and self seeking. That the social institution can produce a 'rationality' most individual members seem to lack is easier to believe at the level of the voter than at the level of the legislator. And this may well be because a higher degree of individual rationality, of conscious representing and pursuit of the public interest is required in the legislative system than in the public. Undoubtedly, creative leadership is needed in any

political system, and such leadership does not just happen. But when we speak of political representation, we are almost always speaking of individuals acting in an institutionalized representative system, and it is against the background of that system as a whole that their actions constitute representation, if they do" (Pitkin, 1967, p. 224-25).

Nancy L. Schwartz (1988) provides, perhaps, radically a new understanding of representation. As she sees it, representatives should be- and, in the past, have been- more than mere delegates or trustees of individual desires and interests and the process of representation more than the appropriation of power and control. Ideally, representation should transform both representatives and citizen. Representatives should be caretaker of the community, not the watchdogs of special interest of groups and individuals. Moreover, representatives should serve as founder of their constituencies, constituting communities whose members value citizenship as an end itself. Schwartz describes political representation is an activity and an institution which connects the people, however defined, to the government. Representation 'makes present that which is not literally present' in political life, it makes the people present in the actions of the governing power of the state. Legislative representation is a medieval and modern notion; the origins of political representation occur in the medieval practice of the monarch summoning the great men of the realm to give their assent to certain taxes he wishes to levy. Political representation is modern in its connection to the idea of sovereignty. Modern political representation starts as a device of political rule from the center, in the territorial ruler's search for human sovereignty(Schwartz, 1988, p.2-3). She contended to see representation as a device for democratizing and limiting the state rather she sees representation as a way to constitute national sovereignty.

Another eminent political thinker on representation J. Ronald, Pennock (Pennock & Chapman, 2017) prescribes, the word 'representation' may not always have had the same meaning. In a particular time, somewhere the word representation meant that a 'representative' was a person who should do only what his constituents demanded of him, and also it meant, in other places, at the same time, that a 'representative' was a person empowered to do whatever he choose on behalf of those whom he represented. Considering the concept of political representation Pennock said that, all legitimate governments are "representative". Further, he explained, from the time of medieval kings to modern totalitarian dictator or rulers, all regimes obtained legitimacy from their

subjects through several means. On this ground, Pennock argued that political representation is not a modern concept and not confined to the democratic state as well. Though, in contemporary modern democratic state system all representatives are the members of the elected legislature as the representative body, where elections are providing the great sanction for assuring representative behaviour. More precisely, he said, in the modern state political representation meant representation of elected persons, particularly, they are the members of a legislature with power, collectively, to make laws and determine national policy. Thus, the political representation relates to responsiveness, accountability and authorizations and it is supposed to believe that political representatives tend to secure governmental action in the interest of those whom they are represented.

Thus, traditional as well as modern understandings of political representation are related to the formal procedures or concepts of authorization and accountability, that Pitkin called formal representation (discussed in detail in the section of types of political representation). Election become very much crucial within nation states, as a consequence, in the context of modern democracy or representative government the main focus of most of the theories of representation is on the role and behaviour of representatives as should they act in favour of their constituents or should they act independently of constituents' wishes. Specifically, "political representation is understood as a way of (1) establishing the legitimacy of democratic institutions and (2) creating institutional incentives for governments to be responsive to citizens" (Dovi, 2018).

But, it would be incorrect if we think that the theoretical discussion of political representation is static rather it is appear as dynamic and subject to changing political realities. Hence, the contemporary understanding of political participation is changing due to domestic and international political transformation. Increasingly international, transnational and non-governmental actors play an important role in advancing public policies on behalf of democratic citizens—that is, acting as representatives for those citizens. Such actors 'speak for,' 'act for' and can even 'stand for' individuals within a nation-state. It is no longer desirable to limit one's understanding of political representation to elected officials within the nation-state. After all, increasingly state 'contract out' important responsibilities to non-state actors, e.g. environmental regulation. As a result, elected officials do not necessarily possess 'the capacity to act,' the capacity

that Pitkin uses to identify who is a representative. So, as the powers of nation-state have been disseminated to international and transnational actors, elected representatives are not necessarily the agents who determine how policies are implemented. Given these changes, the traditional focus of political representation, that is, on elections within nation-states, is insufficient for understanding how public policies are being made and implemented. The complexity of modern representative processes and the multiple locations of political power suggest that contemporary notions of accountability are inadequate (Dovi, 2018). Within such changing perspective, representation is no longer contained within the formal representative arenas. Therefore, some political thinkers presented alternative conceptions of representation which are non-elective in nature. Political thinkers John Dryzek and Simon Niemeyer (2008) proposed a concept of non-elective representation that is– discursive representation, where transnational actors represent discourses.Discourses means "a set of categories and concepts embodying specific assumptions, judgments, contentions, dispositions, and capabilities", not real people. The concept of discursive representation can potentially revisits the promise of deliberative democracy. Also, Michael Saward has thrown the lights on non-elective representative claims and rejected the "idea that representation is first and foremost a given, factual product of elections" (Saward, 2006, p. 298).Saward suggests that non-elected representatives would have the advantage of not being subject to the "temptations of the election-snapshot", focusing on more continuous and long-term ideas. They would also be able to follow their own ideas; they can be partial because they are a randomly selected member of the citizenry, not elected on the basis of a proposed programme (Saward, 2009, p.8). [Here we would not go through in detail about non-elective representation, as the main concern of our study is elective representation, though such kind of representation increasingly recognized as important in contemporary study of political representation]

Apart from them, there are various political thinkers – Jane Mansbridge (2003), Mark Warren (2008), Lisa Disch (2015) –who provides an important insight for contemporary discussions of democratic representation.Mansbridge identifies four forms of representation in modern democracies: promissory, anticipatory, gyroscopic and surrogacy (detail discussed in the section of types of political representation). By specifying the different forms of representation within a democratic polity, Mansbridge teaches us that we should refer to themultiple forms of democratic representation.

Democratic representation should not be conceived as a monolithic concept. Mark Warren shows in his studyof democratic representation apart from elected representatives there exists another kind of representatives who play very important role in participatory democracy that he considered ascitizen representatives who mainly work as supplements of the elected representatives in areas of functional weakness, usually related to communication, deliberation, legitimacy, governability, or attentiveness to public norms and common goods (Brown 2006, Warren 2008). Unlike the elected representatives citizen representatives are non-elected which involve non-professionals means who are selected or self-selectedfor representative purposes. Mark Warren's concept of citizen representatives (Warren, 2008) opens up a theoretical framework for exploring how citizens represent themselves and serve in representative capacities. Disch offers an alternative approach, what she calls "the citizen standpoint". This standpoint does not mean taking at face value whomever or whatever citizens regard as representing them(Political Representation, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Rather, she describes it as an epistemological and political achievement that does not exist spontaneously but develops out of the activism of political movements together with the critical theories and transformative empirical research to which they give rise (Disch, 2015, p.493).

However, the concept of political representation is an elusive concept. According to Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, political representation, on almost any account, will exhibit the following five components:

1. **Some party that is representing** (the representative, an organization, movement, state agency, etc.);
2. **Some party that is being represented** (the constituents, the clients, etc.);
3. **Something that is being represented** (opinions, perspectives, interests, discourses, etc.); and
4. **A setting within which the activity of representation is taking place** (the political context).
5. **Something that is being left out** (the opinions, interests, and perspectives not voiced).

Theories of political representation often begin by specifying the terms for the first four components. For instance, democratic theorists often limit the types of representatives

being discussed to formal representatives — that is, to representatives who hold elected offices. One reason that the concept of representation remains elusive is that theories of representation often apply only to particular kinds of political actors within a particular context. How individuals represent an electoral district is treated as distinct from how social movements, judicial bodies, or informal organizations represent.

The concept of political representation is described in many ways by many scholars and already we have mentioned in our discussion that political representation is no longer confined to only one kind of representation, so within the changing political context several scholars specified the different forms of political representation. Hence in the next section we will discuss about different types of political representation.

2.3.1. TYPES OF POLITICAL REPRESENTATION:

The concept of representation has risecontroversy among political theorists regarding 'style' and 'focus' of representatives.There is no unanimous view about the conflicting interest of representation, whether the representatives should represent local or national interest. There arevarious political thinkers those who presented different views on the types of representation. Here we have tried to focus on different kinds of representation.

2.3.1.1.HANNA F. PITKIN'S TYPOLOGY:

Sheconceptualizes four different views of representation: formalistic representation, descriptive representation, symbolic representation, and substantive representation.

I. *Formalistic Representation*: The institutional arrangements that precede and initiate representation.According to Pitkin, the formalistic representation basically aims to give authority to representatives through elections, referring the institutional arrangements like prescribed rules and regulations that precede and instigate representation. Formal representation has two dimensions: authorization and accountability.By authorization a representative obtains his or her standing, status, position or office and accountabilityis an ability of constituents to *punish* their representative for failing to act in accordance with their wishes (e.g. voting an elected official out of office) or the *responsiveness* of the representative to the constituents.

II. **_Symbolic Representation_**: Symbolic representation for Pitkin is a kind of "standing for", and refers to the extent to which a representative can represent the represented. She equalizes it with a flag which does not reflect actual power or ability, but represent a nation (Pitkin, 1967, p.92). She places more importance not on the power that a symbolic representative exercise rather emphasizes on the feelings it evokes among the represented (Pitkin, 1967, p.97).

III. **_Descriptive Representation_**: For Pitkin, "descriptive representation", means that representatives should reflect the descriptive characteristics of their electorate. The extent to which a representative resembles those being represented. Descriptive representation focuses mainly on the number of elected representatives in the political institutions. In this kind of representation, electoral systems are playing role in determining the number of elected representatives.

IV. **_Substantive Representation_**: Substantive representation is a view that concentrates on "the activity of representing" or "the role of a representative" (Pitkin, 1967, p.115). Substantive representation means 'acting of representatives in favour of represented', specifically 'more support for represented's interests'. Pitkin's (1972, p. 209), substantive representation is "acting in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them". This definition puts forward three criteria for substantive representation. Firstly, it is about representative acts as opposed to, for instance, intentions or attitudes. Secondly, the results of these representative acts should be in the interest of the represented. Thirdly, the representatives should be responsive towards the ones they represent. Applying this to the substantive representation of women, Pitkin's definition implies that women's interests and female citizens are central to the representative process (Celis, 2008, p. 3).

2.3.1.2. ANTHONY HAROLD BIRCH'S CLASSIFICATION:

He classified four different types of representation which can be described as symbolic representation, delegated representation, microcosmic representation and elective representation.

I. **_Symbolic Representation_**: It refers someone who is representing a number of persons in a symbolic way. The term 'symbol' is normally applied to an emblem or physical object which calls to mind some larger and usually more abstract entity. As

examples,the hammer and sickle is a symbol of the U.S.S.R., Christian cross is a symbol of the crucifixion. In a similar fashion, a symbolic representative calls of mind, or serves as a concrete embodiment of, a whole group or category of persons.

II. *Delegated Representation*:The term designates a person who has the acknowledged duty of defending or advancing certain interests specified by his or her principal. A sales representative, an ambassador, a lawyer all are a representative in this sense of the term. The function of this kind of representative is to achieve certain goals set by his or her principal, and the extent to which these goals are achieved is a criterion of successful representation. However, delegated representation conveys only functions and probable behaviour of the representative.

III. *Microcosmic Representation*:It is well exemplified in the term 'representative sample', which indicates a sample of the relevant population chosen by statistical methods so that the main characteristics of the population will be mirrored in the sample. The term denotes a person who is in some respects typical of a larger class of persons to which he or she belongs, for instance, the varied membership of the club is fairly well in the composition of the executive committee. This kind of representation explores something about personal characteristics of the representative.

IV. *Elective Representation*: It recognizes that elected assembly members are representatives because they have been appointed by a particular process of election to occupy that role. In practice, most elected representatives pay at least some attention to the interests and values of their constituents, but also feel free to exercise their independent judgement about what is best for their party or their country. How far they lean one way or the other depends upon the nature of the governmental system within which they work. It is also important to notice that the behaviour of elected representations may vary from one period to another within the same polity due to the requirement of time and situation (Birch, 1971& 2007, p.133-39).

2.3.1.3.JANE MANSBRIDGE'S CLASSIFICATION:

JaneMansbridge (2003)in her important work "Rethinking Representation" identifies four forms of representation in modern democracies: promissory, anticipatory, gyroscopic and surrogacy, all these are legitimate forms of representation. Exceptpromissory

representation, all the three forms representation does not have any relation to 'mandate' or 'trustee', all are new concept of representation.

I. *Promissory representation*focused on the idea that during campaigns representatives made promises to constituents, which they then kept or failed to keep. Itis a form of representation which resembles Pitkin's concept of formalistic representation.

II. *Anticipatory representation*, flows directly from the idea of retrospective voting. Representatives focus on what they think, their constituents will approve at the next election, not on what they promised to do at the last election.

III. In*gyroscopicrepresentation*, the representatives 'looks within', as a basis for action, to conceptions of interest, "common sense," and principles derived in part from the representative's own background.

IV. Finally, *surrogaterepresentation* occurs when a legislator represents constituents outside their own districts (Mansbridge, 2003, p.515).

2.3.1.4.REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION:

It is a method which ensures equal representation of population in the Parliament/Assembly. Representation by population means that the number of members of the legislative assembly should depend on the number of voters. More clearly, the number of representatives or the number of allocated seats for each constituency depends on the number of population that means elected representatives will be chosen by more or less numerically equivalent blocks of voters. The higher population province allocated a large number of seats whereas low population province allocated less number of seats. Representation by population is popularly known as "rep-by-pop", which is the shortened term also. If we consider the necessity of rep-by-pop will find the reality that it become essential for low population electoral province in order to give equal and meaningful representation to remote communities. Rep-by-pop is also the alternative to rep-by-area (Representation by area).

2.3.1.5.REPRESENTATION BY AREA:

America is the best example of representation by area. In the American Constitution, there is the provision of two senators per state, at least one representative per state. In some country,such as America, Canada, and many federal and provincial electoral

districts having few numbers of voters that is less than the population of a city blockthough cover larger areas. To avoid the unequal representation due to the population imbalance factor between larger rural areas and small urban areas "rep-by-pop" method become significant.

2.3.1.6.DYADIC REPRESENTATION:

The process of dyadic representation we can see in the U.S. Congress system. It is the degree to which the policy positions of legislators reflect the policy preferences of their constituents—a form of representation that has become known as dyadic representation (Weissberg, 1978, p.535-47), clearly, the elected representatives must follow the mass opinion, preferences and there would be the electoral linkage between individual legislators and their constituents.

Within the context of party affiliation, the policy preferences of the constituents, and the policy preferences of an individual legislator play in an interweaving manner in shaping the actions and preferences of the members of Congress. Dyadic representation means how well the sitting legislator acts as an agent for the constituency on legislative decisions (Ansolabehere and Jones, 2011).

2.3.1.7.PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION:

Proportional representation (PR) is a term used to describe a range of electoral systems in which the distribution of seats corresponds closely with the proportion of the total votes cast for each party or individual candidate. PR offers alternatives to first past the post and other majoritarian voting systems based on single-member electoral areas, which tend to produce disproportionate outcomes and to have a bias in favour of larger political groups. PR allows diverse voices and interests to be heard and considered in parliament, government, and the policymaking process. It also enables better representation of minority groups (Shugart 1994), as well as women (Darcy, Hadley, and Kirksey 1993; Norris 1985), and better ideological congruence between the government and voters in comparison to majoritarian systems (Huber and Powell 1994; Powell 2000; Powell and Vanberg 2000). There are several forms of proportional representation. Some are focused solely on achieving the proportional representation of different political parties (such as Party List PR) while others permit the voter to choose between individual candidates (such as STV-PR). Apart from these, another common form of representation is mixed

member proportional representation (MMPR). The degree of proportionality also varies; it is determined by factors such as the precise formula used to allocate seats, the number of seats in each constituency or in the elected body as a whole, and the level of any minimum threshold for election.

In case of **Party List** voting system, legislators are elected in large, multi-member districts. Each party puts up a list or slate of candidates equal to the number of seats in the district. Independent candidates may also run, and they are listed separately on the ballot as if they were their own party. On the ballot, voters indicate their preference for a particular party and the parties then receive seats in proportion to their share of the vote. Lists can be "closed" or "open"; open lists allow voters to indicate individual candidate preferences and vote for independent candidates. In a closed list system,the party fixes the order in which the candidates are listed and elected, and the voter simply casts a vote for the party as a whole ("Fair Vote",n.d.)

The **Single Transferable Vote**(STV) system is known by several names.It is called the "*Hare-Clark system*" in Australia. In the United States, electoral reform activists have taken to calling it "*choice voting.*" Currently this system is used to elect parliaments in Ireland and Malta ("FairVote", n.d.).Single transferable vote uses in small multiple-member districts, with voters ranking individual candidates in order of preference. During the count, as candidates are elected or eliminated, surplus or discarded votes that would otherwise be wasted votes are transferred to other candidates according to the preferences. STV enables voters to vote across party lines and to elect independent candidates.

Mixed-Member Proportional Representation(MMPR) goes by a variety of other names, including "*the additional member system,*" "*compensatory PR*", the "*two vote system,*" and "*the German system.*" It is an attempt to combine a single-member district system with a proportional voting system. Half of the members of the legislature are elected in single-member district plurality contests. The other half are elected by a party list vote and added on to the district members so that each party has its appropriate share of seats in the legislature ("FairVote", n.d.).In this system,a voter exercises two votes. On polling day, a registered voter receives two ballot papers—one for their single-member district and the other for a party of his or her choice.The party list vote determining the balance of the parties in the elected body.

2.3.1.8.QUOTA SYSTEM/ QUOTA REPRESENTATION:

Quota representation is defined as an affirmative action which applies to confirm a fixed percentage of representation of a specific group. Generally, this measure is used to increase the number of participation and representation of this specific group in the formal decision making bodies. Sometimes, it used to represents a critical minimum such as 30 or 40 percent. There can be two models of quota representation,*gender-specific* and *gender-neutral*. In case of gender-specific quota, a particular group of people require a minimum percentage within the total percentage, for instance women represent a minimum percentage among total candidates, whereas in gender-neutral quota, there is a provision of minimum and maximum of both genders while in some countries gender-neutral quota actually led to represents men candidates.

In this system it becomes obligation of the political parties to field a certain proportion of women candidates in their final list of candidates selected for contesting in the election. The proportion of female candidates contesting, sometimes vary from five to ten percent of the total candidates contesting. This system of quota helps the female candidates to certainly enter into the final candidate selection list, which otherwise contain the influential male politicians (Dahlerup, 2007). Candidate quotas according to Htun and Jones do necessarily ensure the increase in the number of female candidates in the decision-making bodies, since there is a chance of female candidates being placed at the bottom of the list and therefore might be able to get elected (Htun and Jones, 2002).

There are several types of quota systems distinguished on the basis of various criteria.If one takes into account where the quota system is mandated, then quotas may be either statutory or voluntary. **Statutory candidate quotas** are included in the constitution (e.g. in Burkina Faso, Nepal, the Philippines and Uganda) or in electoral law (in many parts of Latin America, and in Belgium, France, Slovenia and Bosnia-Herzegovina), and they relate to the gender composition of the electoral lists of all political parties. **Voluntary party quotas** are adopted by political parties and take the form of internal party requirements to nominate at least a minimum number or percentage of women. In general, statutory quotas are considered more effective than voluntary party quotas. However, some countries including Denmark, Sweden, Finland and the Netherlands, have achieved high levels of women in parliament without the use of statutory quotas.

If the stage of the selection process at which the quota is applied is the criterion of division, there are three types of quotas depending on whether they aim to change the gender composition of the pool of aspirants (potential candidates), candidates or those elected.

The first kind of quota – often dubbed "*aspirant*" or "*primary*" quotas – have been used in countries with plurality (single winner) electoral systems. So-called "all-women shortlists" – a controversial model introduced by the British Labour Party –may serve as an example.In the second case a *typical quota* rule is that a certain minimum percentage of female candidates must be placed on lists of candidates for public election by political parties. This type of quota is primarily used in countries with proportional electoral systems.In the third case, quotas take the form of *seats reserved for one gender*. Reserved seats can be found mainly in Asia, the Middle East, and in post-conflict African countries (e.g. Rwanda and Uganda). The electoral systems of EU Member States do not provide for reserved seats; voluntary party quotas at candidate level are the most commonly used quota type within the EU ("Quotas in Politics", 2012).

2.3.1.9.GROUP REPRESENTATION:

Group Representation is an electoral measure which is used to establish representation of minority group in the formal electoral bodies. Instead of single candidate, a number of candidates come together as a group to stand for election. The objective of group representation is similar to quota representation where a minimum representation of minorities is ensured. In Singapore, the whole electoral area is divided into the single member constituency and the group representation constituencies. In a group representation constituency a voter casts a ballot for a team of candidate instead of individual candidate, as a consequencethe nature of parliament become multiracial insteadof single race. Thus, the group representation is effectively represents the interest of every social group which is requires for the success of every democratic country. In practice, group representation is highly implemented to ensure women representation in the parliament.

In the above,discussion about political representation in democratic arena we have found that in the history before 18th century political representation was advocated only men's representation in the political process, and there exists a gap of women's representation

which was properly highlighted by the feminist scholars, so in this context without discussing feminist interpretation of representation we would not be able to understand the fact of political representation, so in the below section we will focus particularly on feminist's views on political representation.

2.3.2. FEMINIST ARGUMENT ABOUT POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

Since the French Revolution the women's movement has demanded the right to vote and to be present in political assemblies as women citizens in order to influence political decisions and place women's interests, issues and concerns on the political agenda (Marques, Pereira and Siim, 2002, p.170). French suffragist.*Jeanne Schmahl* was one of the leading head of French women's and suffrage movement. Her dedication to the advancement of women was important in France and allowed women of all classes to become active members of society and politics.She fought for equal universal suffrage for women, French women were excluded from this right (until 1944) while men's universal suffrage was formally ratified during the Revolution of 1848 in France. She argues that women deserved the equal right to vote, because they were working in increasing numbers in the economy and were having a responsibility for the future of their children and family (Schmahl, n.d.).

'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman' (1792), where Mary Wollstonecraft expressed that, women were rational beings who should be able to be educated, earn their own livings, and develop their characters "regardless of the distinction of sex" (Gurko, 1974, p. 16). To justify this statement, the woman's rights movement and the demand for woman suffrage emerged in Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century from a variety of other movements (Baker, 2002, p.21). Initially, suffrage was one of several reforms intended to end the significant legal, political, religious, and cultural discriminations against nineteenth-century women. In the 1840s and 1850s, activists targeted injustices ranging from child custody laws that favoured fathers to prohibitions against women speaking in public, the denial of equal education, and the existence of a double sex standard (Baker,2002,p.3).

Voting became the essential political utility by which women could achieve other improvements in their status (Baker, 2002, p.3). *Susan B. Anthony*, a well known American women suffragist, and others believed that once women won the right to vote, they would instantly force the passage of laws that they had been demanding for decades.

Other reforms may have been sacrificed by activists who focused on suffrage, but the vote also provided women with a clear common goal and an agenda that was compatible with both assertions of natural equal rights and equal citizenship in the American republic (Baker, 2002, p.23-24). *Elizabeth Cady Stanton*, a prominent leader of the women's right movement (one of the principal organizers of the first women's right convention, which is known as Seneca Falls Convention, 1848), argued that the elective franchise is the first right of a citizen, without it women are unable to make their presence in the functions of legislation and subjected to all forms of oppressions. To her, right to vote is the basic right to establish equal opportunities in educations, earnings, abilities, and civil status and in all rights which were restricted by unequal laws. Suffrage became the primary goal of the woman's rights movement during the 1850s and remained so until women finally achieved the right to vote in 1920 (Baker,2002,p.21). Nearly seventy-five years battle of American women finally ended by the enactment of prohibiting the denial of the right to vote "on account of sex" in 1920.

One of the important figure head, *Emmeline Pankhurst*, along with her two daughters Christabel and Sylvia, gave a new impetus to women movement in United Kingdom. Through her various speeches she incited women to fight for enfranchise in Britain. She believed only through political power women can secure themselves, to redress the grievances women must have political right, suffrage, if women have not got the vote then they must either submit to laws which just or unjust, administration which just or unjust. She found that freedom and liberty are entirely for male and not for women. Taxation of men without representation is called tyranny but taxation of women without representation is not matter of concern of anyone. In addition, she said that the liberal principle 'Government of the people, by the people and for the people' is also included only male where in half of the people, women, totally ignored; women do only their duty to pay their taxes and obey the laws but when they tried to execute the principle of liberty in practice, then they found themselves in a very unfavourable situation. In her speech she expressed that due to unwillingness of British government to respond in constitutional methods women had to follow the militant path in order to get political right.

Pankhurst expressed that '*the only way to deal with this thing is to raise the status of women; first the political status, then the industrial and the social status of women. You must make women count as much as men; you must have an equal standards of morals;*

and the only way to enforce that is through giving women political power so that you can get that equal moral standard registered in the laws of the country. It is the only way' (Emmeline Pankhurst's Freedom or Death speech, delivered at Hartford, Connecticut, 13th November, 1913). It is very remindful that Pankhurst gave huge contribution to the life of women. However, in 1918, British women achieved partial right to vote and finally in 1928 full ratification of equal suffrage with men.

Universal franchise has been recognized as a means to the representation of different group interests in democratic institutions. Women are now acquired their formal citizen status, but there is still a problem with their citizenship as a practice. They can be represented in politics by the right to vote, but they are not fully exercising their capacity to be representative, since their right to be elected is far from being effective (Marques-Pereira and Siim,2002, p.173-74). In feminist thought the main emphasis has not been on political representation but rather on women's participation in politics and on their mobilisation and organisation in the context of civil society. Representation and participation can be seen as two different perspectives on how to include women in politics. One has focused on women's participation and empowerment 'from below' and the other on representation 'from above' in political institutions. The two perspectives may indeed be interpreted as two different models to include women in politics in order to give them 'a voice and a vote' (Marques-Pereira and Siim,2002, p. 170).

Representation is contested in both political theory and feminist scholarship. The liberal republican and deliberative approaches to democracy have not been able to explain why women's exclusion from politics has been reproduced in modern democracies after women have gained the vote. The feminist paradigms have challenged universal models of democratic citizenship based on the male norm that have not addressed the exclusion of women and marginalized social groups from democratic institutions. Feminist scholarship has recently proposed new models to include women and marginalized social groups (Marques-Pereira and Siim,2002, p.171).

Due to several interconnected reasons representation become central political issue to many feminists. Through universal franchise democratic political system assures equal representation of all groups. The under representation of specific group in formal political institutions, decision making bodies is considered to be a democratic problem of justice, legitimacy, responsiveness and effectiveness (Phillips, 1995). There is a variety of

feministliterature about women'spolitical representation and participation. Most of the literature focuses on what **Anne Phillips** has outlined as the four distinct arguments for women's equal participation in formal politics; the argument about *role models*, the argument concerning *justice*, the argument concerning *women's interests* and the argument concerning the *revitalization of democracy* (Phillips, 1995, p. 62-63). The first is based on the belief that (a) women bring different skills to politics and provide *role models* for future generations; the second implies that (b) women appeal to *justice* between sexes; the third holds that (c) it helps in the representation of particular *interest of women* in state policy; and the fourth rely on that (d) it results in 'a *revitalised democracy* that bridges the gap between representation and participation' (Philips,1998, p. 228).

The advocates of a balanced representation of women and men in politics have five basic arguments: *justice, proportionality, utilitarianism, differences of interests and needs,* and *behaviours and values.* The argument of justice is based on the idea that expression must be given to the interests of the different social groups and so doing give substance to a deliberative democracy. The argument of proportionality implies that political representation must reflect as faithfully as possible, in quantity, the relative size of the different social groups in the community. The utilitarian argument underscores the lack of efficiency and legitimacy of a political system where half of society involved. This is sometimes followed by a belief that an increase in the political representation of women would lead to change in politics, which would take greater account of 'women's interests'. The argument of specific value and behaviour is based on the idea that women have their own identity, separate from men's. From this perspective, an increase in the number of women representatives would mean a change in political values and the way in which politics is conducted (Marques-Pereira and Siim,2002, p.175).

For some, it is an obvious matter of justice that there should be an approximate gender balance, and it simply does not seem right that one sex should be able to dominate to the near exclusion of the other. In contrast to the under-representation of the very young or the very old, which can be seen 'as part of a normal and natural life cycle' (Phillips,1993, p. 63), many feminists argue that this exclusion is politically significant because it both reflects and helps maintain discrimination and oppression. In the influential *Justice and the Politics of Difference,* **Iris Young** has argued that justice requires that we give

political recognition to existence of gender difference (and also to other group differences such as those based on ethnicity and physical ability), and that denying their existence contributes to oppression rather than equality. She therefore argues for an elaborate system of representation in which all oppressed groups, including women, would have a guaranteed role in policy formation; such guarantees would not be necessary for the privileged, who already have access to decision-making positions (Bryson,1999, p.112). For Young, representation of the social groups in the political processes, that means representing the social perspective of these groups deriving from its structural position in society. Social groups are structured around differences such as gender, race, nationality and religion, but these groups cannot be defined through common interests or through similar opinions (Celis, 2008, p.5-6). This kind of representation implies the right to propose policies based on their own interests and even a right of veto when general policies risk affecting them. This argument comes from a critical perspective on universalism. Young considers that the idea of equal treatment for all groups is a false universalism that only excludes those who do not comply with the dominant norms and perpetuate de factodiscrimination (Marques-Pereira and Siim,2002, p.176).

Such arguments assume that women have shared interests as members of an oppressed group. For some **radical feminists**, these interests are directly opposed to men's; if women are to use the state to improve their situation they must be represented in it, for they can expect only opposition from their oppressors. Although others argue that men can benefit from or support feminist demands, experience suggests that they are unlikely to prioritise them. To the extent that women's claims for better pay and employment opportunities involve exposing and attacking men's privileged workplace situation and its basis in inequalities within the home, the interests of the sexes would appear to be in conflict, at least in the short term (Bryson,1999,p.112-13). As Joni Lovenduski has argued: 'The core of women's interests is comprised of their disadvantaged position in the division of labour within the family, and for as long as that division persists it is sufficient reason for insisting that women's interests may be represented only by women' (Lovenduski, 1986, p. 208).

Although **liberal feminists** are less likely to see the issue in terms of group oppression, they too can agree that women's biology and social situation can give rise to distinct concerns and priorities that they need to articulate themselves. Most feminists therefore

believe that it is wrong that men can legislate on issues to do with reproduction or sexual violence without women's voices being adequately heard. Most also see that, as the primary carers of children, disabled adults and elderly people, and as the bulk of poorly paid, part-time workers, women also have particular concerns and interests in relation to welfare and employment policies, even when these appear to be gender neutral (Bryson,1999, p.113).

A further set of arguments stems from the claim that women can bring special qualities and or experiences to politics. Such claims have a long history, and formed an important strand of earlier claims for the vote, when it was asserted that the 'womanly values' of temperance, purity and peace would lead to an improvement in the standard of public life. Today, the idea that women are more peaceful, compassionate and caring remains a powerful one, as does the claim that they have a distinctive way of thinking about justice. At a more practical level, many claim that women politicians would have no time for the infantile. As in the west, the British politician Shirley Williams has argued that women members of parliament are more able than men to provide the caring qualities needed for effective constituency work. Although some argue that such 'womanly' values are based in biology, many others see them as a product of women's experiences; from this perspective, it may be important to have decision-makers who have had experience of caring (Bryson, 1999, p.113).

None of the above claims is straightforward, and they have all been heavily criticized. For many critics, they seem to rest upon a freezing of gender identities, and an essentialism, which labels individuals by one attribute and ignore both the differences between women and the interests, which some women share with some men. As such, they can counter to post-modern accounts of the fluid and changing nature of gender, and, as so often in the past, they tend to equate the interests of women with those of the minority who are the most likely to win political office (Bryson, 1999, p.113-14).

Such criticisms are not without foundation. Quite clearly, women are not all mothers or badly paid, part-time workers, nor do they all feel themselves to be sexually exploited or oppressed, and many are positively opposed to feminist goals. Moreover, the kind of women most likely to be elected to parliament are those who have most access to political resources and whose lives most clearly resemble those of successful men; unlike men, this means that they are disproportionately childless, as well as being white and middle

class (in the early 1990s, 40 per cent of British women MPs did not have children, and only one was black). Such women may not be no more likely than many men to understand the needs and priorities of women intimidated by racism, or struggling to survive on state benefits; they may also have even less experience of childcare than male legislators, most of whom are or have been part-time fathers (Bryson,1999, p. 114).

This does not mean that the under-representation of women is not important, but that it cannot be isolated from other forms of inequality. Feminists interested in improving the situation of all groups of women, rather than of an elite minority, must therefore retain as awareness of the complex nature of a 'politics of solidarity'. They must also remember that it is not simply the number of women in political office that is important, but what women do when they get there, and Anne Phillips cautions that 'However plausible it is to say that male dominated assemblies will not adequately address the needs and interests of women, it cannot be claimed with equal confidence that a more balanced legislature will fill this gap'(Bryson,1999, p. 114). Increasing the presence of women in politics is not the solution of democratic problem of what Philips has called responsiveness and effectiveness rather there must be substantive representation. There are many instances of female political representatives who have done nothing for their sex. Hanna F. Pitkin defines substantive representation is "acting in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them" (1972, p. 209). Substantive representation should not only focus on quantitative evolutions but also take qualitative dimensions into account such as the diversity of women's issues addressed. The substantive representation of women are gendering policy debate frames and policy decision content, and developing feminist policy feedback in policy implementation (Celis, 2008).

There have also been debates among feminist about the methodologies of change although the most have argued that women experience and need to resist what Skjeie calls 'the duty to yield' (1991) when it comes to pressing gender claims in politics; liberal feminists until recently worried about moving away from the principle of meritocracy, but Kymlicka opened up the debate on group representation in order to take into account historical injustices (1995); Philips argued for a participatory mode of consultation of women linking the local community with party conferences and representatives (Philips,1998, p.238); Marxists feminists wanted to work with raising consciousness as a means for not only mobilizing women but also changing their thinking about the sexual

division of labour, which they found to be at the heart of gender inequality. More recently, there is emerging a consciousness in both academic and policy circles that affirmative actions or quotas are 'a fast-track to quality' (Dahlerup and Freidenwall, 2005). However, some still do worry that this emphasis on increasing the presence of women in politics absorbs too much of the energy from women's movement without producing enough rewards in the form of progressive changes in women's lives (Hassim, 2016). This aligns with some of the earlier worries about the focus on what Hannah Pitkin has called 'descriptive representation' (Rai &Spary, 2019, p.17-18).

However, different strands of feminism have emphasized different arguments but most are agreed that their needs to be more women in political institutions. Women's movements formulate women's interests and lobby or work together with the state to represent women. Women representatives should act to prioritise needs and interests, which male politicians have overlooked. The more limited experience of women representatives in the United States and Britain also suggests that they have had an impact of political agendas and they are generally more supportive of feminist issues than men, regardless of their party affiliation. Therefore, reinforces the claim that increasing the numbers of women in parliament is still an important feminist goal (Rai & Spary, 2019; Celis, 2008; Bryson, 1999).

After discussing feminist concept of representation we understood that representation could be two types in general viz. "from below" and another is "from above". After the French revolution feminist activists were only concern about right to vote means participation from below, but after getting the right to vote the feminist activists shifted their thoughtto women must participate or represent from above. More clearly, participation from aboveindicates that women must represent in the political bodies and shouldbe anintegral part to decision making bodies. Women through exercising political representationthey enter into political leadership role and even without being a part of leadership it is impossible to uplift the condition of women socially as well aspolitically. So, it is clear thatrepresentation is the primary way to enter into the leadership role and that is very much require to change the deprived condition of them and for the sustainable development of the society. Hence, the concept of leadership and political leadership become pertinentto our study and we will focus on it in the following sections of this chapter.

2.4. DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP

Leader, generally, defined as one person who is able to influence a group of people or individuals towards the achievements of specific goals. On the other hand, leader, operationally, means a person who possesses position of power in any organization or in the formal structures of the government or otherwise. Leadership is a broader concept; it is very difficult to define leadership unanimously. Eminent personalities had their own views and hence have defined leadership in their own way. Some of the definitions on leadership are as follows:

Leadership is an attempt at influencing the activities of followers through the communication process and toward the attainment of some goal or goals.

Leadership is a process of influence between a leader and those who are followers (Hollander, 1978, p. 1).

Leadership is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal (Hemphill & Coons, 1957, p. 7).

Leadership is an influence process that enables managers to get their people to do willingly what must be done, do well what ought to be done (Cribbin, 1982).

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement (Rauch & Behling, 1984, p.46).

Leadership is that process in which one person sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons and gets them to move along together with him or her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment (Jaques & Clement, 1994, p. 4).

Leadership is interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals (Tannenbaum, Weschler &Massarik, 1961, p.24).

Leadership is the accomplishment of a goal through the direction of human assistants. A leader is one who successfully marshals his human collaborators to achieve particular ends (Prentice, 1961, p.143).

Leadership is the art of influencing others to their maximum performance to accomplish any task, objective or project(Cohen, 1990, p. 9).

Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz, & Kahn, 1978, p. 528).

Leadership is the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction (Stogdill, 1974, p.411).

Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives (Yukl, 2006, p. 8)

Leadership is an attempt at influencing the activities of followers through the communication process and toward the attainment of some goal or goals (Donelly, Ivancevich, & Gibson, 1985, p. 362).

Leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose (Jacobs & Jaques, 1990, p. 281)

Leadership is the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for the shared aspirations (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 30).

Leaders are those who consistently make effective contributions to social order, and who are expected and perceived to do so (Hosking, 1988, p. 153).

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey, & Blanchard, 1988, p. 86).

Leadership is typically defined by the traits, qualities, and behaviours of a leader (Horner, 1997).

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, p. 86).

Leadership is the ability to step outside the culture to start evolutionary change processes that are more adaptive (Schein, 2010).

Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2010, p.3).

Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of members...Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Any member of the group can exhibit some amount of leadership.... (Bass, 1990, p.19).

Leadership occurs when persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality (Burns, 1978, p. 20).

However, the various definitions of leadership revealthe following ideas:

- The individual as leader, and the leader as a man,

- The leader as hero and leadership as heroism,

- The leader as decision maker,

- The leader as embodiment of character and integrity,

- The leader as provider of vision, mission goals and strategy for the enterprise, and motivating others to share those goals

- The capacity to influence, inspire and motivate others behaviour and actions (Batliwala, 2010).

- Most importantly, the core context of leadership is the personality.

Thus, leadership is a broader concept and many disciplines have interpreted it in many ways, here the focus of our study is political leadership so we will illuminate the concept and theories of political leadership in the following manner.

2.5. THE CONCEPT OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

'*Leadership*' is not just a word, it's a more complex concept, and there is no unified definition. It was first included in English dictionaries in the nineteenth century (Rost, 1991, p.18). Yet concepts closely connected with leadership are fundamental to many texts of political philosophy. Leadership pervades the familiar concepts of sovereignty, ruling, and representation. In its broadest sense, leadership is central to all human social activity: 'Leaders determine or clarify goals for a group of individuals and bring together

the energies of members of that group to accomplish those goals' (Keohane, 2010, p.23). Political leadership is an especially prominent example of this behaviour, the type that springs to mind when most of us think about leadership. The concept of power and authority is closely connected with, specifically, political leadership; leaders generally exercise power; but not all powerful persons are leaders. Authority is attained by performance. Yet not all political leaders have formal positions of authority, and not all persons who hold official authority provide leadership (Keohane, 2014, p.1). Political thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Lenin, Michels, Arendt, and Weber - all were defined political leaders in terms of power and authority.

Plato's conception of statesmanship or leadership is exceptionally lofty, almost godlike in its scope. Plato elaborates plans for preventing his rulers (philosopher guardians) from abusing their power over other citizens, not by external constitutional restraints on the leader's authority, but by internal restraints of character, education, and a profound sense of duty, whereas **Aristotle** concentrated on constructing a framework for the use of power (Keohane, 2014, p.3). Aristotle defines the statesman as one who 'exercises his authority in conformity with the rules imposed by the art of statesmanship and as one who rules and is ruled in turn' (Barker, 1995, p.1252a). According to Aristotle, as ruler/statesman and as the citizen shall show a distinctive art or skill. To him, men must learn to be ruled as well as learn to lead by having good followers. The distinctive form of skill or excellence that sets the citizen as statesman or leader apart from the same citizen in his capacity as follower is practical wisdom—prudence, or good judgement. This shared prudential leadership, exercised only within a constitutional framework.**Marcus Tullius Cicero** gives his highest praise to 'a ruler who is good and wise and versed in all that contributes to the advantage and prestige of the state. He favours a mixed form of governance (combining elements of kingship, aristocracy, and democracy) where the leader's political skill shall be the merits of the nobler classes, and the rights of the many are all accommodated. Also, Cicero acknowledges the role of luck in obtaining and maintaining power. **Machiavelli** provides the paradigmatic statement in the Western political tradition of the view that effective leadership is personal, powerful, and, to a large degree, unconstrained. Actually, he believed that the success of the individual prince in obtaining and retaining power (Keohane, 2014, p.4). Machiavelli notes that the success of rulers

depends on their innate abilities (*virtú*)—qualities such as courage, decisiveness, good judgement, and ruthlessness—but also by luck (*fortuna*) (Skinner & Price, 1988).

Montesquieu favoured representative forms of governance where representatives of the people undertake what they cannot do for themselves. He asserts that a monarch should hold executive power because of the need for rapid and expeditious action; the legislative power should be exercised by the people's representatives. He also talked about the restraints, as the legislative restrained by executive power, and the executive is by the legislative' (Keohane, 2014, p.6). **Rousseau** combines absolute popular sovereignty with effective political leadership provided by a few (Keohane, 2014, p.10). He was referring the rule by a small number of wise men rather than a monarch, believing that monarchs will inevitably abuse their power. To prevent such an outcome, instead of Montesquieu's system of elaborate institutional checks and balances, Rousseau preserves the legislative sovereignty of the community assembled as a whole. Rousseau was insistent that the people are the only appropriate sovereign in any state though he believed that ordinary people are not good at making complex political decisions (Keohane, 2014, p.6). His goal is to find a way to bring them together in a form of leadership that will provide both effectiveness and accountability. Like Montesquieu, **Michels** also had little faith in the political competence of ordinary people or their potential for sustained political involvement. From the viewpoint of him, leadership is about making and implementing decisions for large numbers of other people (Keohane, 2014, p.7).**Lenin** agreed with Michels on the 'technical indispensability of leadership' (Keohane, 2014, p. 8). In the view of Lenin, the political consciousness necessary to make a revolution would never emerge spontaneously among the working class; it must be brought to them 'from without', by a small group of enlightened, battle-tested leaders (Lenin, 1929, p. 32). Lenin asserted firmly that 'professional revolutionists' are essential to making a successful revolution, a 'stable organization of leaders to maintain continuity' (Lenin. 1929, p. 116). 'Without the "dozen" of tried and talented leaders…..professionally trained, schooled by long experience and working in perfect harmony, no class in modern society is capable of conducting a determined struggle' (Lenin. 1929, p. 114). **Arendt** asserts that political power can only be a pluralistic gathering of perspectives and wills (Keohane, 2014, p.10). Arendt's theory can be read as describing a 'leaderless' form of political activity. She can also be interpreted, however, as presenting an alternative theory of leadership. Instead of identifying 'ruling' over others as the distinctive activity of

political leadership, Arendt describes a situation in which citizenscollectivelycraft solutions to common problems, define and clarify their common goals, and mobilize the energies of their community to act in concert. No one is ruling and no one is being ruled, instead, Rousseau's vision of a truly democratic decision making process is developed in a direction that proved very fruitful for later theorists of deliberative democracy (Keohane, 2014, p.8). **Weber** emphasizes the lonely initiative of the leader constrained by his own internal judgement and sense of responsibility (Keohane,2014, p. 10). Weber asserted that anyone who holds political power needs three qualities: 'passion, a feeling of responsibility, and a sense of proportion'. Passion in this sense means serving a cause, having a goal larger than your own advancement as a leader. A good leader, however, does not just pursue such a passion single-mindedly. The leader must also be aware of his responsibility for those he leads and for the state, and show a sense of proportion in pursuing the chosen purpose. For Weber, the sense of responsibility is so crucial to leadership because a leader cannot just step away and refuse to decide; he is responsible for the society he leads and has to take one course or another, even when every alternative is fraught with moral ambiguity (Keohane, 2014, p.9). A leader is also 'responsible for what may become of himself under the impact of these paradoxes', once he 'lets himself in for the diabolic forces lurking in all violence' (Gerth and Mills,1958, p. 125). Also, for Weber, proportion is 'the decisive psychological quality of a politician: his ability to let realities work upon him with inner concentration and calmness. The leader must be able to step back and look coolly at his own behaviour (Keohane, 2014, p.9).

However, Plato had depicted leadership as rooted in the military duty of the guardians to protect the state. Machiavelli asserted that the first business of the prince should always be preparation for war, and Lenin saw his vanguard party as an embattled group of revolutionary leaders. Weber, like Plato, appears to assume that the structures are less likely to be effective than the internal character and motivations of a political actor dedicated to providing responsible leadership for his community (Keohane, 2014, p.9).

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (2010), a leader is variously 'a person who commands a group, organization, or country: a member of the government officially responsible for initiating business in Parliament', or 'the person or team that is winning a sporting competition at a particular time' (Shore, 2014, p.2). From an anthropological perspective, political leadership is a system of social relationships involving authority,

charisma and other forms of personal or institutional power, whose rules are specific to, and embedded within, particular cultural contexts. Anthropologists have long recognized that leadership as an institution hinges on culturally specific and relational understanding of authority, or, as Sahlins (Sahlins, 1963, p. 290) put it, 'leadership is a creation of followership' acquired by demonstrating that the leader 'possesses the kind of skills that demand respect'. Max Weber's classical distinction between 'legal rational', 'traditional', and 'charismatic' ideal typical forms of authority continues to inform most anthropological analyses of leadership. Legitimate authority in every society constitutes a type of power in which leaders (as rulers) successfully uphold the claim that they govern in accord with law or tradition and in which people willingly obey commands because they perceive the exercise of power to be legitimate (Shore, 2014, p. 3). Bailey (Bailey, 1988, p. 5) states, more specifically, political leadership is the art of controlling followers through the strategic mobilization of morality, rituals, and symbols (Shore, 2014, p. 8). Being an art, it necessarily requires 'cultural capital'—or talent. Stanley Renshon developing this idea (Renshon, 2000, p. 200) uses the term 'leadership capital' to highlight the way the competences and capacities for the performance of leadership are 'deeply embedded in and reflective of the cultures in which they operate'. Prime ministers and presidents are not only speaking for their countries; they often symbolize them too. When institutions fail to work properly, it is often put it down to a 'problem of leadership'—yet people still look to leadership to solve the problems. Political leaders are expected to be adept performers in that social field called the 'political stage', or 'public life' (Shore, 2014, p. 2). However, leadership, as a field of study, focuses in understanding the qualities, abilities, and behaviour that make for effective leadership.

Furthermore, understanding political leadershipthrough the lens of leaders takes one to the province of psychology. It rests on the idea that it matters who governs us. It entails an agent-centred view of politics and government. In other words, public debates and decisions are shaped by the views, drives, skills, and styles of individuals who occupy formal office (Hart, and Rhodes, 2014, p.3). From a political psychology perspective, leadership is an umbrella concept that can be understood only by examining these ingredients in combination (Hermann, 2014, p.8).

From the feminists perspective political leadership is also power relationship. Feminists defines leadership is a gendered concept, in addition to power-as-domination, feminist

work has looked at power-as-empowerment and power-as-the-ability to work in concert, or power-to and power-with (Allen, 1998, p. 32). In other words, they are looking for power as the ability to work together or fight against oppression, rather than just to dominate or oppress (Dahl, 2000, p. 475–94). This sort of power can be seen as deconstructive of top-down, coercive forms of leadership, and provide direction towards cooperative, empathetic, bottom-up forms of leadership (Sjoberg, 2014, p.8).

In recent decades, the development of representative democracy on a large scale has created new forms of popular participation. Nonetheless, governance by a small number of leaders continues to be a defining characteristic of our political associations (Keohane,2014, p.1). To many scholars democratic practice cannot do without leadership. Modern democracies depend on at least some kind of political leadership (Blondel, 1987). In contemporary democratic regimes, in which political leadership has become vested in the executive branch of government in particular, power is subjected to a series of limits and constraints. Democratic leadership is embedded in an institutional context that aims to prevent corruption and the abuse of power and to ensure that leaders are responsive to their followers, through a variety of accountability mechanisms (Hendriks, 2014, p.2).

However, the concept of political leadership reveals the following ideas:

- Political leadership is closely connected with power and authority.

- Political leadership extents the concepts of sovereignty, ruling, and representation.

- It rests on the idea that who governs us.

- It entails an agent-centred view of politics and government.

- It is a system of social relationships involving power, authority, charisma, abilities, views, behaviours and the style of individual (who occupy formal office) as well.

- It also determines the success and failure of political institutions.

- Finally, political leadership is an art of controlling followers through the strategic mobilization of morality, rituals, and symbols.

2.5.1. THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

In the study of leadership, there are various types of theories, is detailed below:

Sl. No	THEORIES	PARAMETERS	CORE-THEME (MAIN IDEA)
1.	**Great Man Theory**	**1.** Leadership ability is innate. **2.** Motive is welfare of mankind. **3.** Hereditary qualities of leadership.	Based on the belief that leaders are exceptional people, born with innate qualities, destined to lead. Advocates of this theory believe that leaders are God gift to mankind and they have come on earth for seeking welfare of mankind by using their gifted qualities. No one else can become such a great leader because these qualities of leadership cannot be acquired through formal education and training. It is also assumed that the set of qualities which the leader uses for influencing others are entirely his personal possession which he must have received from his family members and cannot transfer it to others. Great Man was born not made.
2.	**Trait Theory**	**1.** Physical factors of leaders (height, appearance, age, etc.). **2.** Aspects of personality of leaders (self-esteem, dominance, emotional stability, conservatism, etc.). **3.** Aptitudes of leaders (general intelligence, fluency of speech, creativity, etc).	The Trait approach focuses on the leader himself. Trait theories emphasize the personal qualities of leaders and focus attributes that distinguish leaders from non-leaders. The basic assumption of this approach is that leaders tend to be bigger and brighter than the rest of the members of the society, and therefore, they are characterized by distinct physical, intellectual and personality traits which enable them to exercise influence over the followers.
3.	**Behavioural Theory**	**1.** Behavioural patterns of leaders. **2.** What leaders actually do, how they	The Behavioural Theory concentrates on what leaders actually do rather than on their qualities. Different patterns of

		motivate subordinates, how they communicated, how they carried out their task.	behaviour are observed and categorised as 'styles of leadership'. From the point of view of the subordinate, leadership is experienced as a 'style'. Researchers were particularly interested in identifying leader behaviours that enhanced the effectiveness of subordinates. In leader behaviour theories, the focus was on what leaders did, how they delegated the tasks, how they communicated, how tried to motivate their subordinates, how they carried out their tasks, and so on. The theories underline that the behaviours can be learnt and an individual trained in the appropriate leadership behaviours would be able to lead more effective.
4.	**Situational/ Contingency Theory**	**1.** Leadership style depends on the situation. **2.** Leaders may change their behavioural patterns or way of functioning by the demand of the situation.	This theory sees leadership as specific to the situation in which it is being exercised. For example, whilst some situations may require an autocratic style, others may need a more participative style. It also proposes that there may be differences in required leadership styles at different levels in the same organisation. The Situational theory subscribes to the notion that a leader can change his behavioural patterns demanded by needs of the situation. The Contingency theory is a refinement of the situational viewpoint and focuses on identifying the situational variables which best predict the most appropriate or effective leadership style to fit the

			particular circumstances.
5.	**Path-Goal Theory**	1. Leaders clarify paths to goal attainment. 2. Leaders decide the behavioural patterns of subordinates for goal accomplishment.	The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership is a direct extension of the expectancy theory of motivation. This theory of Leadership arguing that the principal function of a leader is to make valuable organisational awards available in the workplace and to clarify for the subordinates the kinds of behaviour that will lead to goal accomplishment and valued awards. In other words, the leader should clarify paths to goal attainment.
6.	**Functional Theory**	1. Main function of leader is to help the groups or subordinates because leader emerges as a consequence of the needs of a group of people.	The functional perspective interprets leadership in terms of functions to be performed in helping the groups not in terms of qualities inherent in certain persons. The functionalists regard that the leader emerges as a consequence of the needs of a group of people and of the nature of the situation within which that group is to function.
7.	**Motivation Theory**	1. Motivate subordinates to achieved designed goals as well as rewards.	Based on the assumption that the effective leader can increase subordinates motivations by. (a.) Clarifying subordinate perception about the goals of work. (b.) Explaining how goals and designed rewards can be achieved, (Linking meaningful words with goal attainment).
8.	**Life Cycle Theory**	1. Association of subordinates with the leader through telling, selling, participating and delegating. 2. Effective leadership depends upon the maturity of	Contends that the most effective leadership style depends upon the maturity of subordinates. The theory defines maturity, not as age or emotional stability, but as desire for achievement, a willingness to accept responsibility and task related

		subordinates that means a willingness to accept responsibility and task related experiences and ability.	experience and ability. The leadership style is described by the association between superior and subordinates through a "life cycle" of four phases: Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating.
9.	**Acceptance Theory or Followership Theory**	**1.** Acceptance and satisfaction of subordinates is most important. **2.** Leader must be a person who is able to fulfil follower's basic needs.	The theory asserts that followers are important in deciding whether a person is a leader or not. If followers accept a person their leader he is leader irrespective of his traits or behaviour. According to this theory, followers must form groups. The theory cannot be applied without group of followers. The theory is based on the assumption that groups have certain basic needs which they want to fulfil through their leader. A person who is successful in satisfying their basic needs is assumed to be their leader. On the contrary, if he does not succeed in getting their needs satisfied he can neither said to be a good leader nor he will be allowed to function as such. The major weaknesses of this theory are that it ignores the quality aspect of leadership.
10.	**System Theory**	**1.** Leader combined the efforts of the people to achieve the goals. **2.** It considers all the variables present at the same time, i.e. leader, follower's situation, goals, leadership traits, environment and group's nature, characteristics and	It follows that leadership is a sole behaviour which co-ordinates the efforts of the people and stimulates them towards the achievement of their goal in a particular situation. It considers all the variables present at the same time, i.e. leader, follower's situation, goals, leadership traits, environment and group's nature, characteristics and needs, role, behaviour of the leader and his coordinating efforts. This theory

		needs, role, behaviour of the leader and his coordinating efforts.	is recognized as the modern theory of leadership and it is more acceptable to followers.
11.	**Group and Exchange Theory**	**1.** Positive exchange between the leader and the followers in order to achieve group goals. **2.** Rewards given by the leader to the subordinates in form of praise, increase in pay, promotion, etc. help in the accomplishment of group goals. **3.** The rewards have a positive impact on attitudes, satisfaction and performance of the followers, who in turn give due regard and respect tothe leader.	According to this theory, there must be a positive exchange between the leader and the followers in order to achieve group goals. It stated that the leader provides more benefits to the followers who help him to achieve the goals of the organisation on or the leader may consider followers as burden or cost. The rewards given by the leader in form of praise, increase in pay, promotion, etc. help in the accomplishment of group goals. The rewards have a positive impact on attitudes, satisfaction and performance of the followers, who in turn give due regard and respect tothe leader. The leader emphasizes initiating structure when followers do not perform well, and on the contrary leader increases his emphasis on consideration when followers perform the job well. Thus, to this theory, if the exchange between leader and followers is positive, it leads to mutually beneficial relationship.
12.	**Nurturing-Task Theory**	**1.** Leader demands task performance and maintains a high level of productivity. **2.** Leaders also show care and affection for the well-being of their people and are committed to their professional growth. Such leader also plays	The nurturing-task (NT) leadership style has two components: concern for the task and nurturing orientation towards the subordinates. A nurturing task leader demands task performance and maintains a high level of productivity. However, such leaders also show care and affection for the well-being of their people and are committed to

		a pattered role and encourages participation as well as understands expectations of subordinates.	their professional growth. Such leader also plays a pattered role and encourages participation. He understands expectations of his subordinates. He knows that they realise dependency and personalized relationship, accept his authoring and look towards him for guidance and direction.
13.	**Crucible Theory**	**1.** An absorbing event or experience, which transforms an individual into a leader.	It has given importance to crucibles in the formation of leadership. A 'crucible' (an absorbing event or experience, which transforms an individual) is critical in the development of leaders. A crucible can be a tragedy such as war, death of a loved one, losing an election, or a joyous experience.
14.	**Attribution Theory**	**1.** Leader as a processor of information. **2.** Leader find out factors which affect subordinate's behaviour.	The attribution theory depicts the leader as a processor of information. The attribution leader determines whether the subordinate behaviour was caused by the subordinate, by the nature of task, or by the nature of work situation. In other words, the leader must categorize the subordinate behaviour into the three dimensions: (1) person, (2) entity task, and (3) context.
15.	**Transactional Theory**	**1.** Leader - follower relationship. **2.** Mutual benefits that mean rewards given by leaders to follower and in return received loyalty of the followers.	This theory emphasises the importance of the relationship between leader and followers, focusing on the mutual benefits derived from a form of 'contract' through which the leader delivers such things as rewards or recognition in return for the commitment or loyalty of the followers.
16.	**Transformatio nal Theory**	**1.** Leaders try to accommodate with the	The central concept here is change and the role of leadership in

		changes in the environment. **2.** Leader looks for new direction. **3.** The aim is the empowerment of the followers and their involvement in the organisational process as well as the encouragement of self-confidence and autonomy. **4.** Shift goals from personal interests and security to greater good.	envisioning and implementing the transformation of organisational performance. Transformational leadership is a process in which the leaders take actions to try to increase their associates' awareness of what is right and important, to raise their associates' motivational maturity and to move their associates to go beyond the associates' own self-interests for the good of the group, the organization, or society. Such leaders provide their associates with a sense of purpose that goes beyond a simple exchange of rewards for effort provided.

Source: Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, and Dennison, 2003, A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks; Leadership: Theoretical Framework, 2013; Bryman, 1992; &Leadership Theories. Retrieved from

https://refubium.fu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/fub188/8415/02_Kap2.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

In the above we have discussed about the several theories of leadership and found that woman values have been overlooked and there is no such theory which incorporated women qualities. However, now we will focus on feminist arguments on leadership.

2.5.2. FEMINIST STANDPOINT ABOUT LEADERSHIP

The above mentioned core ideas of leadership are related to masculine leadership and create stereotypes, therefore, it can be deduced that the concept of leadership is a gendered concept. The characteristics attributed to leadership are those associated with masculinity. There is a substantial co-relation between characteristics that define a good man and characteristics that define a good leader. Many women have met or almost met the criteria of masculinity had some success as political leaders (e.g. Margaret Thatcher, Condoleeza Rice, Madeline Albright, Golda Meir etc). Therefore, men are assumed to have leadership capacity while women's masculinity is doubted until proven (Sjoberg, 2009).

Generally, the word 'sex' means biological differences between 'women' & 'men'. The word 'gender' describes socially constituted differences between those perceived to be

women and those perceived to be men. In other words 'sex' is a term that describes different biological characteristics and 'gender' describes the social perceptions born of those perceived biological differences (Sjoberg, 2009). Social gender categories can be classified as masculinities and femininities, where masculinities are characteristics associated with perceived manhood and femininities are characteristics associated with perceived womanhood. Masculinities and femininities are constituted by behaviour expectations, stereotypes, and rules which apply to persons because they are understoodto be membersof particular sex categories (Enloe, 2004). The definition of gender as 'assumed' group characteristics makes it clear that gender is a social construction. Quite opposite is true, social construction such as gender construct social life (Prugl, 1999).

However, in gender discourse, some characteristics are generally associated with masculinity and others with femininity. Characteristics associated with masculinity include strength, objectivity, power, autonomy independence, rationality and aggressiveness and characteristics associated with femininity include weakness, sympathy, marginality, dependence, emotion and passivity. Men are associated with the public sphere i.e. work, politics and public life, while women are associated with private sphere i.e. motherhood, the household and the bedroom. Men are the protectors while women are the people that men protect (Sjoberg, 2009). A leader is denoted as the one who is like a lion, fearless, physically strong and ready to take challenges. The attributes that a leader has is socially constructed to match with a biological male whereas, femininity is socially constructed as physically weak, timid someone to be protected and guided which as attributes do not match with the definition of a leader.

Traditional definitions of leadership emerged at a time when both political leadership and the scholars who studied it were almost exclusively male (Sjoberg, 2009). It is of this reason that gender related social conceptions female and femininity remain neglected in our concepts of leadership and males and masculinities became the central account of leadership.

Naturally, we look at the concept of leadership through a 'gender lenses'. The gender lenses 'focus on gender as a particular kind of power- relation'. Gender lenses also focus on the everyday experiences of women as women and highlight the consequences of their unequal social position (Steans, 1998, p.5). Women though very few in numbers, who do lead are often neglected in the discussions of leadership or treated differently than their

male colleagues. Studies of female leaders show that their personal lives receive substantially more attention than those of male leaders, and that their leadership capacity is more likely to be questioned for the same decision that a male colleague makes (Tickner 1992, 2001; Sjoberg 2006; Sjoberg and Gentry 2007; Duerst- Lahti and Kelly 1995a).

The definitions of '*feminine leadership*' recognize that women bring different qualities to leadership, with a greater attention to collaboration, co-operation, collective decision making and above all relationship building (Batliwala, 2010,p.7). Studies that have discussed women leadership have often done so within the constraints of the traditional interpretations of both femininity and leadership.

Consequently, masculine character of leadership definitions produced leadership theories or approaches which are naturally masculine in nature. Theories/approaches were made in the consideration of maleness character of leaders where women consideration had been massively neglected. Studies of leadership often neglect women who are leaders. Leadership is not only sex-specific but also gender specific. There is a bias against women in political leadership even when women have the same traits as male leaders. As D'Amico and Beckman pointed out, there is actually a higher burden of proof of masculinity on women leaders than there is on male leaders. Gendered power plays a role in leadership opportunities and judgments about the quality of leadership. Therefore, it must be said that on the basis of above mentioned leadership discourse a woman can be a leader when she can convince her constituency that she is as capable as a man in areas traditionally understood as domains of masculine prowess. Leadership will not be un-gendered until our understandings of successful leadership account for and deal with gender assumptions (Sjoberg, 2009).

2.6. REPRESENTATION AND LEADERSHIP IN POLITICS

Representation and leadership, both are requisite concept in the study of politics and we must understand that both are not simple concept, there is no single definition about these. The concept of representation becomes meaningful with the introduction of modern representative democratic political system but leadership is an indigenous concept. The concept of political representation,traditional as well as modern, relates to the formal procedures of authorization and accountability, in fact it means particularly acting for others (Pitkin). More precisely, in the modern state political representation meant

representation of elected persons, are the members of a legislature with power, collectively, to make laws and determine national policies. Thus, the political representation relates to responsiveness, accountability and authorizations and it is supposed to believe that political representatives tend to secure governmental action in the interest of those whom they are represented (Pennock).Leadership is an attempt at influencing the activities of followers through the communication process and toward the attainment of some goal or goals; and the political leadership is a system of social relationships involving power, authority, charisma, abilities, views, behaviours and the style of individual who occupy formal office as well.Here, we would focus on the question that why both the concepts are require to understand properly the theory of political process.

In feminist thought,women's exclusion from politics has been criticised and focus has been given on their inclusion in politics. So, to feminist scholars participation and representation are considered as significant means to include women in politics, though both are different perspectivesand may be interpreted as two different models to include women in politics in order to give them 'a voice and a vote'(Marques, Pereira and Siim, 2002).Participation is a means to include women in politics 'from below'and representation is another means to include women 'from above' in political institutions.By the right to vote women can be participated in politics but without the right to be elected they are not fully exercising their capacity to be representative.

Feminist scholarship has challenged the dominant principles of political representation and has introduced new visions of democracy that allow for the inclusion of women as well as marginalized social groups (Young, 1990; Philips, 1993, 1995). In this regard, election plays a crucial role, firstly, as an agent of mobilization whereby it works to educate people politically; and secondly, as a means to elect representatives for the representation of different group interestsin formal political institutions. Until early 1990s, gender identity was not an issue in political representation. During the 1990s feminist scholars have analysed demands for gender quotas and parity as a means to include women in politics, place women's concerns, interests and social perspectives on the political agenda and transform political institutions (Philips, 1995). The political arena is no longer limited to the competition for political power. It has today become one of the places where identities are expressed and recognised. In this context parity and quota can therefore be interpreted not as the response to a crisis of representation, rather one of the

reflections of the claim for political equality. Anne Phillips introduced the notion of 'the politics of presence' (1995) institutionally reflected in parity and quota as a means of 'democratizing the public'(Marques, Pereira and Siim,2002, p.174).More broadly speaking, in recent decades, a significant number of political parties have taken steps to increase the representation of women in national assemblies, often by introducing gender quotas. Phillipsactually proposesfour key arguments: *first is the role model that successful women politicians offer; the second is principles of justice between the sexes; third is to identify particular interests of women that would otherwise be overlooked; and the last key argument is that to see women as introducing new forms of political behaviour.* The case for quotas depends on the idea that interests are gendered, but should not presume a unitary set of women's interests. The use of quotas raises new questions about the accountability of representatives to their constituents(Phillips, 2003).The quota is exactly a means to open up a space where women can acquire the necessary expertise that has been denied to them (Hust,2004, p. 31). Though, there are various critical points raised against gender-quotas, some critics oppose gender-quotas as affirmative action which refer to women's lack experience whereas some concerned with social divisiveness; and some expressed doubt that quotas do not guarantee women's interests or needs will be addressed in the political bodies.

In this context, arise relevant questions: Whether quotas or equal gender representation in political institutions is a key to gender equalityor not? Whether elected women representatives would also promote women's interests or not? The question of accountability is still open. At an intuitive level, an increase in the number of women elected seems likely to change both the practices and priorities of politics, increasing the attention given to matters of child care, for example. But what does it mean in terms of political representation? Elections are typically organised by geographical constituencies, which hardly ever coincide with concentrations of women or men. In the case that elections are held on a party basis (what Phillips assumes for democracies in the West and at national level), the candidates are assumed to represent a party's interests. In what sense then can the women elected through this process carry the additional responsibility to represent women? (Hust,2004, p.38).

Yet, there is already some empirical evidence from Western democracies that female legislators do indeed promote women's issues, though this evidence is sometimes

contested. Wangnerud (2000) has argued that studies conducted by men normally declare gender differences among politicians to be insignificant, whereas female researchers found that women did indeed make a gender-specific contribution to policies. Dahlrup, who studied the effect of women increased presence in Nordic politics, came to the conclusion that though it is difficult to isolate the effect of the growth in women's political representation from the general social development, certain changes can be directly attributed to the increase in women's political representation. Among these are a lessening of the stereotyping of women, the creation of new role models of women in public life, a change in some social conventions (though the main features of the political culture remain untouched), and the removal of open resistance against women politicians (Dahlrup, 1988, p.295). Furthermore, Lena Wangnerud (2000) has empirically tested that women do represent women's interest (defined as the recognition of women as social category; the acknowledgement of the unequal balance of power between sexes; and the occurrence of politics to increase the autonomy of female citizens) more than their male colleagues in the Swedish Riksdag (The Riksdag is the unicameral national legislature and the supreme decision-making body of Sweden). Empirically, this was measured by female verses male attitudes and behaviour in areas such as gender equality and social welfare policy. Pippa Norris and John Lovenduski (2001) got a similar result from a survey carried out in British Parliament after the election of 1997 (Tony Blair elected as the British Prime Minister). They found that on the scales related to women's interests, namely affirmative action and gender equality, women and men differed significantly across party lines. Concerning other issues like free market economy or stand towards the European Union, however, party affiliation proved to be more significant than gender. Sarah Childs (2001) has excluded the party factor, but found in a qualitative survey of 33 newly elected Labour women MPs in the 1997 British Parliament that more than two-thirds are 'attitudinally feminist'. Also in Norway several studies since the mid-1980s have indicated a consensus among the political leadership that gender makes a difference in politics. A series of issues were specified where women differ from men, which included representational politics, labour market politics, body politics and care politics. However, also in Norway, party alliances are maintained as the primary political identification (Skjeie, 2001). Thus, there is empirical evidence that some women's interests are more likely to be pursued by women than by men in politics, though on established political issues gender might not be the decisive factor. However, it is not so easy to know beforehand whether and where party loyalty or the autonomy of the

representative might succeed, especially when we look at politics across different cultures (Hust,2004, p.38-39).

In principle, the autonomy of the representative is immensely significant, though representatives are party members and the party discipline is more important in Western democracies. Nonetheless, critics argue that in many countries especially rural countryside, women are not autonomous in their decision making usually they are depicted as proxies and dependent on the wishes of influential males as well. The concept of autonomy is the core content of Western notions of individualism though there is found identified regional differences.

In respect of leadership, we can remember the concept of what Phillips called role models that elected successful women can serve. Inspiring by such role models many women do believe themselves to be capable of performing well in politics. When more women become present in politics and they could serve as role models as a result they inspire others to come forward. We can expect with this fuller inclusion of previously excluded groups will alter the direction of policy or the content of the decisions that are made as well as the way politics is done (Hust, 2004, p. 36). The point is that transformation of politics would provide the way to open up a space where new range of policy options will be included. For instance, citizens can pressure political parties to take new issues and once these issues are on the agenda then they can use the ballot box to punish those who still ignore them (Hust,2004, p.38), in that way new ideas will be included in political bodies and later turns into public policy.

In connection with the argument for the transformation of politics, some feminists have argued from a completely different direction. They argue against the dominance of interest group politics and believe that this would be challenged by the inclusion of women. They expect women politicians to introduce a different set of values and concerns. This view has a long-standing tradition in feminist thought, and is also seen in recent developments. In the West, this is captured by, for example, the concept of a 'politics of care' (Jean Bethke Elshtain, 1990 & 1993) focused on the implication of motherhood and caring for women's political role. This belief is grounded in assumptions that the traditional role of women and the socialization of girls as caretaker of the family, as nurture and guardian of dependents, be it children or the elderly, leads to a different way of dealing with politics. Women are supposed to be more concerned about the

common good; their style of doing politics would be less aggressive. Some believe that women are more co-operative and concerned about the environment and sustaining the community (e.g. Vandana Shiva's notion of 'eco-feminism' in India)(Hust,2004, p.40). Also, in discussing about the gender inequality in the study of international relations, feminist thinker *J. Ann Tickner* talked about different qualities of women than men soldiers and the diplomats of realpolitik, such as the quality of mediation, quality of finding cooperative solutions and the quality of caring for others as well. She granted greater values to these women's qualities and advocating for more women in positions of power. While Cynthia Enloe clearly explained in her works *Bananas, Beaches &Bases, &The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*, women are still in disadvantageous position in international politics, economy and military bases even feminists perspectives is invisible in the account of international relations in spite of their significant contributions in shaping stable political and military relations among nations. Enloe shows in her writing the existence of major arenas of gendered international politics where women qualities had been completely ignored. Although Tickner tries to avoid essentialize stereotypical traits of 'masculine' or the 'feminine', she actually wants to erase constructions of gender difference and to create a concept of security which is non-gendered (Griffiths,1999). Furthermore, it is also voiced in India that women possess moral power (shakti) which renders them not, or less, corrupt and women would thus introduce cleaner politics (Hust,2004, p.40). The 'womanly values' of temperance, purity, peace and caring make women more able than men in order to promotes the common interest and improve the standard of public life and to provide the caring qualities for effective constituency work.

Anne Phillips is rather unconvinced by those types of arguments that propose a female superiority in moral terms, and she was proved right at least in the study's investigation concerning corruption. One reason is that this expectation overburdens the elected women representatives with a responsibility that only very few see themselves able or willing to shoulder. Furthermore, it is not advisable to base the argument for an inclusion of women into politics on premises that they will be 'better' politician than men. Are such arguments really necessary? Why do women need to be better than men to qualify for a political office? It does not mean that women will not introduce changes in the political process, but we cannot know beforehand what these changes will look like. One should also be cautious concerning the magnitude of these changes. As mentioned above,

Dahlerup had pointed out that though changes occurred because of a greater number of women being present in Scandinavian politics, the basic political culture has not changed (Dahlrup, 1988,p.295). There are definitely social differences between men and women that do result from their different responsibilities and social locations, and one can expect that these also translate into different approaches to politics and power (Hust,2004, p.41). But Phillips makes us aware that *'[t]hese initial differences may be far outweighed by the common experiences men and women will later share in making their way through political life. I incline to the view that politics is more formative than sex, and that the contrast between those who get involved in politics and those who do not is deeper difference between those who are elected'* (Phillips, 1995,p. 75).

This down-to-earth view is much more appealing and should be taken seriously if we do not want to get severely disappointed. It is important to take into consideration the formative power of the political system in which the women have to act. But, there is no guarantee that women's needs or interests will be addressed when the gender composition of political bodies will be change (Hust,2004, p.41). Phillip's statement on the effect of a quota for women makes the matter more clear: *It is possible-if highly unlikely- that assemblies composed equally of women and men will behave just like assemblies in which women have a token presence; it is possible- and perhaps vey likely- that they will address the interests of certain groups of women while ignoring the claims of others. The proposed change cannot bring with it a certificate of interests addressed or even a guarantee of good intent. In this, as in all areas of politics, there are no definite guarantees* (Phillips, 1995, p. 82). Despite, changing the composition of decision making bodies is especially important because women's interest are not precisely demarcated and might only be developed and formulated once women are also drawn into the political process (Hust,2004, p.38). However, structural transformations are slow to happen where the quota can be worked as an instrument to accelerate the motion of change.

Phillips stated in '*The Politics of Presence*' (1995) that in the understanding of traditional liberal democracy representation more or less depends on how well it reflects the opinions or preferences or beliefs of the voters where the personal characteristics of the representatives – gender, race or other social attributes- are not important. Here we should turn our focus towards, what Phillips noted, the shift from direct to representative democracy where the emphasis shifted from 'who' the politicians are to 'what' (policy,

preferences, ideas) they represent. Thus, themechanism of accountability to the electorate becomes the main concern of representation. Where such processes are successful, the discretion and autonomy of representatives would be reduced and it seems also to minimize the importance of who the politician is or the representative is (Phillips, 1995). Considering this explanation we should reconsider the concept of leadership disregarding the notion of gender, as mentioned earlier the concept of leadership is a gendered concept. Studies of leadership often neglect women who are leaders. If we remember what Phillips noted, *politics is more formative than sex*(i.e. formative power of the political system) then it can be expected, in the discourse of leadership a woman can be a leader without attaining the, traditionally defined, masculine characteristics (e.g. strength, aggressiveness, power etc) and without convincing others that she is capable as a man in areas traditionally understood as domains of masculine prowess rather through adding some new different values and qualities such as- greater attention to collaboration, co-operation, collective decision making and above all relationship building (Batliwala, 2010) to political system and which will provide the possibility to develop a different style of leadership based on feminine attributes. The definitions of 'feminine leadership' recognize that women bring different qualities to leadership. However, it must be said on the basis of above mentioned emphasis that we should less, or not more, concerned about the sex or gender of leaders, i.e. whether woman or man, which is in Phillip's notion 'who', rather should concern more about policy, preferences, ideas which leaders are addressing or representing , which is in Phillip's notion 'what'. When we are concerning about 'who' naturally we look at the concept of leadership through a 'gender lenses' and unconsciously promoted gender inequality to leadership studies as we done in almost all areas of politics. We must think about the characteristics of good leader not about the gender of leader. Only a good leader can able to promote the interests and needs of all masses and it possible only when we will change our understandings about the successful leadership account.

2.7. CONCLUSION

In modern representative democracies universal franchise has been recognized as a minimum standard for equality and justice in societies. Representation of women in the domain of politics is a matter of justice and democracy because all the sections of the society should have the right to participate in decision making process. However, presently in most countries it has become clear that universal suffrage did not in itself

lead to the establishment of balanced representative legislatures. Representation and leadershipcan be seen as means to involve women 'from above' in political institutions. To eradicate the problem of women's under-representation in formal political structures, feminists voiced to introduce gender quotas to increase women's political representation. Electoral gender quotas that are not just symbolic but actually are embedded in the electoral system in place may rapidly increase women's political representation, as seen in South Africa, Costa Rica, Mozambique and Argentina (Dahlerup, 2005). Feminists not only want to increase the number of women in the national legislatures, they actually tried to address the issues related to women which male politicians have overlooked. Also, feminists pointed out that in politics gender is manifested in the highlighting of major characteristics of men politicians and women politicians have to conform to gender expectations as well as the punishing of certain characteristics of women politicians that defy gender expectations. Women are under-represented in political leadership. Feminist work on political leadership across academic disciplines has asked important questions about gendered ideas of leadership as well as gendered expectations of political leaders. Gendered lenses have been used to examine how women are under-represented in positions of political leadership and to encourage consideration of 'how the epistemological and ontological bases of conceptual frameworks may misrepresent the experiences of women as leaders, thereby distorting our specific knowledge of such experiences and our general knowledge of the phenomena of leadership as gender-encompassing' (Bensimon, 1989, p. 149).

In the study of politics, representation and leadership both are important concepts in order to understand the democratic political process. To feminists, both the concepts are gendered concept where women and their role have been overlooked since the inception. People's participation, irrespective of gender, class, caste etc, is the pre-condition for the success of participatory democracy, while the means of people's participation are gendered. As a consequence of it we find that the absence of women in the decision making process. In the context of participatory and representative democracy during the 1990s feminist scholars have challenged the legitimacy of male-dominant principles of political representation and decision making.So, in the feminist political thought, women's exclusion from politics has been criticised and focus has been given on their inclusion in politics. In this regard, representation and leadership are considered as significant means to involve women in politics, focuses on women's empowerment 'from

above' in political institutions. The matter of inclusion of women into politics has been described in two respects- *justice and difference arguments*. The justice argument is about women should have equal opportunity to play a role in public decision-making process on the basis of right to equality and that may results to descriptive and symbolic presence of women in the formal political structures. This argument does not rely on the concept that women have different quality that can bring change in the behaviour of political structures and in the practice of political process. The difference argumentsencompass the view that women and men have different ideas, values, perspectives and experiences. So both genders in politics will bring a different way of doing politics as well as different policy perspectives. As we mentioned in the earlier discussion of this chapter the fact that masculinities and femininities are associated with different set of characteristics for that different values, interests and perspectives of both genders may be addressed by them, though there exists several confrontational perceptions regarding the role of male and female representatives and leaders. Difference arguments also reflect the view that if women, particularly, achieve critical mass then they will bring a different way of doing politics as well as different policy perspective. Considering the women's family roles we can say that a new approach to politics based more on consensus-seeking and consultation and less on power-aggression and head-kicking will be or has been developed with the inclusion of women in politics and that will promote democratizing the public and common interest. Women leaders exercise the power as capacity developing means and to bring changes, to empower others rather than exercising power over others. With the inclusion of women in politics not only women interests will be addressed, also womanly values (temperance, purity, peace etc) will change the nature of politics, the identities of all social marginalised class will be expressed and recognised, the power of endurance of politics will be increased, the political process will be transparent and might be corruption free or less-corrupted and most importantly women's leadership would improve the standard of public life.

Therefore, in a different way the representative roles would be performed by the women leaders that may create a way for transformative leadership rather than transactional models of political influence. Also, we should think about the inclusion of women in politics in respect of difference arguments, rather than justice arguments, which promote substantive representation. As we all know, in our social and political structures there are a higher burden of proof of masculinity on women leaders because gendered notion of

power plays an important role in leadership opportunities and judgments about the quality of leadership. In the leadership discourse, a woman can be recognised as a leader when she able to convince her constituency that she acquired the qualities of a male leader because leadership is an area as we traditionally understood the domains of masculine prowess. Feminist approaches to politics and political theory have shown gendered situations where women are yet obligated to fulfil the gender expectations. Hence, the leadership discourse will not be un-gendered until our understandings will not change about leadership account. In this regard, we should concern about the concept of good leaders rather than the gendered concept of representation and leadership. Although we must try to avoid essentialize stereotypical characteristics of the 'masculine' or the 'feminine', and should try to erase constructions of gender difference and to grant greater values to good qualities of human that may create a concept of 'Good leader' which would be non-gendered.

> ### *SUMMARY*:

- Representation and leadership, both are requisite concept in the study of politics. The origins of the concept of representation can be traced back to ancient times. Representation as a concept may be understood as the making present again, of some entity whether personal or abstract. Representation, in the sense of human being representing other human being is particularly a modern conception. This development could be seen mainly from the 14th century. The concept of representation is crucial to the modern representative democracies.

- Traditional as well as modern understandings of political representation are relates to responsiveness, accountability and authorizations and it is supposed to believe that political representatives tend to secure governmental action in the interest of those whom they are represented. In the context of modern democracy or representative government "political representation is understood as a way of (1) establishing the legitimacy of democratic institutions and (2) creating institutional incentives for governments to be responsive to citizens" (Political Representation, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy).

- The concept of representation has rise controversy among political theorists regarding 'style' and 'focus' of representatives. There is no unanimous view about the conflicting interest of representation, whether the representatives should

represent local or national interest. There are various political thinkers those who presented different views on the types of representation.

- In feminist thought the main emphasis has not been on political representation but rather on women's participation in politics and on their mobilisation and organisation in the context of civil society. Representation and participation can be seen as two different perspectives on how to include women in politics. One has focused on women's participation and empowerment 'from below' and the other on representation 'from above' in political institutions. The two perspectives may indeed be interpreted as two different models to include women in politics in order to give them 'a voice and a vote' (Marques-Pereira and Siim, 2002, p. 170).

- There is a variety of feministliterature about women's political representation and participation. Most of the literature focuses on what *Anne Phillips* has outlined as the four distinct arguments for women's equal participation in formal politics. The first is based on the belief that (a) women bring different skills to politics and provide *role models* for future generations; the second implies that (b) women appeal to *justice* between sexes; the third holds that (c) it helps in the representation of particular *interest of women* in state policy; and the fourth rely on that (d) it results in 'a *revitalised democracy* that bridges the gap between representation and participation' (Philips, 1998, p. 228).

- Leader, operationally, means a person who possessed position of power in any organization or in the formal structures of the government. Leadership pervades the familiar concepts of sovereignty, ruling, and representation. The concept of power and authority is closely connected with, specifically, political leadership. Political thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Lenin, Michels, Arendt, and Weber - all were defined political leaders in terms of power and authority. Political leadership is a system of social relationships involving power, authority, charisma, abilities, views, behaviours and the style of individual (who occupy formal office) as well. It entails an agent-centred view of politics and government. Different theories of leadership emerged on the basis of different parameters.

- From the feminists perspective political leadership is also power relationship. Feminists defines leadership is a gendered concept, in addition to power-as-domination, feminist work has looked at power-as-empowerment and power-as-the-ability to work in concert, or power-to and power-with (Allen, 1998, p. 32). In

other words, they are looking for power as the ability to work together or fight against oppression, rather than just to dominate or oppress (Dahl, 2000, p. 475–94). This sort of power can be seen as deconstructive of top-down, coercive forms of leadership, and provide direction towards cooperative, empathetic, bottom-up forms of leadership (Sjoberg, 2014, p.8).

****