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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of representation accountability</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Implications for decentralised and local governance structures and accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traditional                               | Burke and supporters, through to British Political Tradition ('Westminster Model'): Representative democracy with selection, reward/sanction mechanisms at elections/fixed points in time | • Local elected member-led and controlled/members-only.  
• Decentralisation to local governance structures  
• Delegation of powers to ward or area committees  
• Citizens have roles as voters, with power to select, and sanction/reward  
• Little if any activity between elections |
| Representative, responsible, & responsive I | Pitkin: representative democracy which is also responsive (i.e. decisions communicated between elections) | • As above, but  
• More emphasis on communicating decisions to constituents between elections  
• ‘Community leadership’ – Mk 1 |
| Representative, responsible, & responsive II | Mansbridge: representative democracy which is also responsive and adapts to constituent preferences between elections | • As above, but  
• Individual citizens have additional roles as constituents, feeding into preferences between elections.  
• Additional mechanisms in place for collecting, collating and feeding in preferences e.g. opinion polls etc.  
• Representatives accommodate, adapt or adjust decisions as necessary to constituent preferences |
| Border-straddling                          | Pahl and supporters: pluralist democracy, with representative democracy supplemented by ‘surrogate representation’ by a range of interest groups | • Local elected member-led and controlled governance structures, but could include representations and/or membership from interest groups  
• Citizens roles as voters are supplemented by citizens forming and/or aligning with interest groups; some citizens are also ‘surrogate’ representatives.  
• Elected representatives accommodate, adapt or adjust decisions as necessary to representations from interest groups – ‘Community leadership’ Mk 2 |
| Complementary                             | Ostrom/Fung/Stone/Lindblom: collaborative governance; democratic problem solving | • Allows for citizen-led or controlled governance structures  
• Decision-making authority could be shared across networks  
• Accountability is not solely through electoral mandate  
• Citizens and groups of citizens are ‘local experts’.  
• Can generate consensus for collective action/problem solving, but different views are possible within/across different (poly) centres  
• Overlap with principles and activity of co-production |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles/Models</th>
<th>Representative/responsible</th>
<th>Representative/responsible I</th>
<th>Representative/responsible II</th>
<th>Representative/responsible III</th>
<th>Self-government/poly-centrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td>Hierarchical. Exercised responsibly by representatives. Handed over to politicians by citizens at election</td>
<td>Reps' policies/decisions</td>
<td>Representatives' policies and their decisions</td>
<td>Competing power centres provide balance</td>
<td>Relational. Power with not power over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Past performance and/or future manifestos of sitting representatives and candidates for election</td>
<td>Representatives’ policies and their decisions</td>
<td>Mechanisms for expressing views or changing decisions</td>
<td>Decision-making processes</td>
<td>Representatives’ policies and their decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Results of feedback/changed decisions</td>
<td>Decisions, and rationales for them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-electoral accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles for citizens</strong></td>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>Voters and recipients of communications</td>
<td>Voters and givers of individual preferences</td>
<td>Voters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further participation actively precluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of interest groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest group reps accountable for claims to represent wider constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some are ‘surrogate representatives’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local experts with experiential expertise, local knowledge, and different forms of authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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