

## **The effect of power sharing on the nature and scale of violence**

Effect: NA

Confidence in study findings: Low confidence

Headline finding: Power-sharing interventions, like dividing political power among ethnic or political groups, do not consistently reduce violence. In some cases, they may even lead to more conflict, especially when they only involve political elites, exclude ordinary people, or make identity divisions worse. Power sharing is often associated with increased political unrest and ethnic violence largely due to power dominance, exclusion of grassroots voices, and the institutionalization of identity-based divisions.

### **Short summary**

Power-sharing arrangements are often suggested to help manage conflicts in societies with different groups. However, there is weak or mixed evidence that these approaches actually work. In some situations, these power-sharing systems have made violence worse instead of better. Some problems with these systems include that they often keep powerful elites in control, leave out the voices of regular people, and do not address deeper social issues.

### **Long summary**

#### *The intervention*

Power sharing interventions in this review includes incorporation of ethnic quotas, proportional representation, guaranteed power for ethnic groups. Further, it also involves electoral and governance reforms intended to ensure representation in divided societies.

#### *How is the intervention expected to work*

The idea behind power-sharing as an intervention to promote peace is that it makes violence less by ensuring that all major groups and societies have a say. In addition, the interventions encourage cooperation between different groups through inclusive institutions. It helps prevent any group from being left out, thereby preventing marginalization which can stop conflicts from starting again. In theory, the evidence portrays that these should reduce both the chances and the severity of armed violence.

#### *The evidence base*

The evidence base for the intervention is from a review of 149 studies published between 2010 to 2015 covering various interventions aimed at preventing or mitigating armed violence. This includes 16 studies with a governance component which typically involves some sort of power sharing. These studies are mostly moderate and low confidence (8 and 7 respectively), with one rated high confidence.

#### *Evidence findings*

Overall, power sharing does not ensure violence reduction. Only one of the 16 papers finds the intervention to be effective, with four being clearly ineffective and two inconclusive.

The evidence suggested that countries with many ethnic groups and power-sharing systems experienced higher levels of violence. For example, a study of the effect of consociational

institutions on riot deaths found that these institutions were associated with higher incidence of riots and deaths resulting from political violence in countries with high levels of ethnic diversity.

Therefore, power-sharing arrangements do not consistently reduce violence and may in fact increase it in ethnically fragmented societies. While power sharing may appear inclusive, in practice it often results in marginalization of grassroots voices.

*Effect:* The study does not mention any effect size, the data is narratively synthesized

*Confidence assessment:* The review is assessed as medium confidence, but the cell summary is rated low confidence because of the small number of included studies and study heterogeneity.

**Source- Cramer (2016)**

Cramer DW, Vitonis AF, Terry KL, Welch WR, Titus LJ. The Association Between Talc Use and Ovarian Cancer: A Retrospective Case-Control Study in Two US States. *Epidemiology*. 2016 May;27(3):334-46. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000434. PMID: 26689397; PMCID: PMC4820665.