CORE
Metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
Provided by Research Papers in Economics

A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games

Michael Finus and Bianca Rundshagen

NOTA DI LAVORO 31.2003

MARCH 2003

Economic Theory and Applications

Michael Finus, *Department of Economics, University of Hagen*
Bianca Rundshagen, *Department of Economics, University of Hagen*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
http://www.feem.it/web/activ/_wp.html

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games

Summary

We identify the core as an appealing stability concept of cooperative game theory, but argue that the non-cooperative approach has conceptual advantages in the context of economic problems with externalities. Therefore, we derive a non-cooperative foundation of core-stability for positive externality NTU-games. First, in the spirit of Hart/Kurz (1983), we develop a game that we call H-game and show that strong Nash equilibria coalition structures in this game are identical to α- and β-core stable coalition structures. Second, as a by-product of the definition of the H-game, we develop an extension called an I-game. Finally, we compare equilibria in the H- and I-game with those in the Δ- and Γ-game of Hart and Kurz (1983).

Keywords: Core-stability, non-cooperative game theory, positive externality games

JEL: C72

The authors would like to thank Johan Eyckmans for comments on an earlier version of this paper. The paper has been inspired by discussions with Carlo Carraro, Alfred Endres and Henry Tulkens as well as by the articles of Bloch and Hart and Kurz mentioned in the paper.

Address for correspondence:

Michael Finus
Department of Economics
University of Hagen
Profilstr. 8
58084 Hagen
Germany
E-mail: Michael.Finus@Fernuni-hagen.de, Bianca.Rundshagen@Fernuni-hagen.de

1. Introduction

Since the book by von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944), there has been an increasing interest in economics to study coalition formation. A coalition is a group of agents that coordinate their economic strategies in order to raise the welfare of its members. Examples include firms that coordinate their output or prices in oligopolistic markets (cartels), jointly invest in research assets (R&D agreements) or completely merge (joint ventures). Countries coordinate their tariffs (trade agreements and customs unions) or their environmental policy (international environmental agreements). The various contributions in the literature can be grouped into two approaches - cooperative and non-cooperative game theory - where most scholars take sides.[1] In this paper, we briefly review both approaches in the remaining part of the Introduction, stressing not only differences but also similarities. We identify the core as an appealing stability concept of cooperative game theory, but argue that the non-cooperative approach has conceptual advantages in the context of economic problems with externalities. Therefore, we present in subsequent sections a non-cooperative foundation of core-stability for positive externality games. Throughout, we restrict ourselves to non-transferable utility games (NTU-games).

The classical distinction between both approaches is that binding agreements between agents are possible in cooperative but not in non-cooperative game theory. However, as will become apparent below, this classification misses the point. On the one hand, also most concepts of cooperative game theory assume (at least implicitly) some punishment if players deviate from some agreement. On the other hand, also non-cooperative game theory assumes implicitly some form of commitment to cooperation within coalitions. Following Bloch (1997), a more appropriate distinction relates the two approaches to the tools and the foci of the analysis.

The analysis in cooperative game theory is based on the characteristic (also called coalitional) function v(.) that assigns a worth, $v(I^C)$, to a group of players (coalition) I^C. In an NTU-setting, this worth is a vector and assigns each member of I^C his individual payoff. The worth is a vector of payoffs that can be secured irrespective of players' behavior outside a coalition. What irrespective means depends on the specific definition of the characteristic function. Widely used definitions are the α- and β-characteristic functions. If we let I be the set of

[1] For an excellent overview of the two approaches with applications in the field of economics see Bloch (1997). A very good overview of non-cooperative coalition theory with applications is provided by Yi (1997 and 1999).

players, S the set of economic strategies and Π the set of payoffs, then $v^{\alpha}(I^C)$ are the highest payoffs that a group of players I^C can secure regardless of the strategies of external players. That is, $v_i^{\alpha}(I^C) = \pi_i(s^{I^C*}, s^{I\setminus I^C*})$ where $(s^{I^C*}, s^{I\setminus I^C*})$ is determined by $\min_{s^{I\setminus I^C}} \max_{s^{I^C}} \sum_{j\in I^C} \pi_j(s^{I^C}, s^{I\setminus I^C})$. $v^{\beta}(I^C)$ are the highest payoffs of I^C that external players $I\setminus I^C$ cannot prevent. That is, $v_i^{\beta}(I^C) = \pi_i(s^{I^C*}, s^{I\setminus I^C*})$ where $(s^{I^C*}, s^{I\setminus I^C*})$ is determined by $\max_{s^{I^C}} \min_{s^{I\setminus I^C}} \sum_{j\in I^C} \pi_j(s^{I^C}, s^{I\setminus I^C})$. This implies that if a player or group of players deviate from some agreement, the remaining players will punish the deviators by playing either their minimax or maximin strategy.

A payoff vector $\pi^*(s^*)$ resulting from some strategy vector s^* is said to belong to the α-(β-) core if no group of players can improve the payoff of at least one player through a deviation without reducing the payoff of another member of the group: There is no $I^C \subset I$ such that $v_i^{\alpha}(I^C)\,(\,v_i^{\beta}(I^C)) \geq \pi_i^*(s^*)\ \forall i \in I^C \wedge \exists\, j \in I^C : v_j^{\alpha}(I^C)\,(\,v_j^{\beta}(I^C)) > \pi_j^*(s^*)$.[2]

Thus the core is the set of weakly undominated payoff vectors – an appealing feature for a stability concept - explaining its widespread application in game theory.

From the examples it is evident that the focus of the analysis is on stable allocations of payoffs rather than on the actual coalition formation process itself. The strategic variables are economic and not coalition strategies. From the perspective of a coalition, all other players are a residual and act as a benchmark for deviations with punishment. Thus, in games with externalities, spillovers between coalitions are insufficiently captured. This explains why cooperative game theory has predominantly focused on stability of the efficient grand coalition.

In contrast, the analysis of non-cooperative game theory is based on the valuation function w(.) that assigns a vector of individual payoffs $w(C) = (w_1(C_j, C), ..., w_N(C_k, C))$ to each possible coalition structure $C \in X$. A coalition structure $C=(C_1, ..., C_M)$ is a partition of I, i.e., $C_j \cap C_k = \varnothing\ \forall\ j \neq k$, $\bigcup C_i = I$, $w(C) \in W(X)$ where W(X) is the set of payoff vectors. The first argument in $w_i(C_i, C)$ refers to the coalition to which player i belongs, the second to the particular coalition structure. The payoffs are typically derived from the assumption that players cooperate within their coalition but compete across coalitions. That is, coalition

[2] For consistency we use the weak dominance relation for deviations throughout the paper in the definitions of the core, strong Nash equilibrium, α.- and β-core stable coalition structures and Pareto-optimal coalition structures. That is, a group of players I^C deviates with a resulting change of its payoff vectors from x to y, if $y_i \geq x_i\ \forall i \in I^C$ and $\exists\, j \in I^C : y_j > x_j$. All results would be unaffected if we assumed a strict dominance relation as for instance in Bloch (1997).

members act as one player and choose their economic strategies in order to maximize the aggregate payoff to their coalition taking strategies of outsiders as given. Formally, let $w_i(C_i, C) = \pi_{i \in C_i}(s^*)$ where for a fixed coalition structure C=(C_1, ..., C_M), s^* satisfies

$$\forall C_i \in C : \sum_{i \in C_i} \pi_i(s^{C_i *}, s^{I \setminus C_i *}) \geq \sum_{i \in C_i} \pi_i(s^{C_i}, s^{I \setminus C_i *}) \quad \forall s^{C_i} \in S^{C_i}$$

where S^{C_i} is the set of possible strategies of coalition C_i. Thus, the valuation of player i, $w_i(C_i, C)$, is derived as a Nash equilibrium between coalitions in economic strategies. In order to study coalition formation three more steps have to be taken.

First, the set of membership (coalition) strategies Σ has to be specified where a particular strategy of player i is denoted by $\sigma_i \in \Sigma_i$. For instance, in the exclusive membership Δ- and Γ-game of Hart and Kurz (1983) each player announces a list of players with whom he would like to form a coalition. Hence, for each $i \in I$, the set of strategies of i is $\Sigma_i = \{C_i \subset I \mid i \in C_i\}$. Second, an output function $\psi(\sigma)$ that maps membership strategies into coalition structures has to be specified. For instance, in the Δ-game ψ^{Δ}: $C_i = \{i\} \cup \{j \mid \sigma_i = \sigma_j\}$ and in the Γ-game ψ^{Γ}: $C_i = \sigma_i$ if and only if $\sigma_i = \sigma_j \ \forall j \in \sigma_i$, otherwise $C_i = \{i\}$. That is, in the Γ-game the coalition only forms if and only if all members on a list make exactly this proposal. In contrast, in the Δ-game it suffices if a subgroup of players on the list makes the same proposal. Then the coalition is formed by this subgroup. Hence, a higher degree of unanimity is required in the Γ- than in the Δ-game to form a coalition. In both games membership is exclusive since players can only join a coalition with the consent of its members. In the Δ-game a deviation by a player or group of players (change of announcement) implies that the remaining players stick together whereas in the Γ-game the coalition of the deviators will break apart. Third, stability has to be defined. Typical concepts are Nash equilibrium (NE), considering only single player deviations, or Strong Nash equilibrium (SNE), considering also multiple player deviations. Formally, let $\tilde{X}^{I^C}(\sigma)$ be the set of coalition structures that a subgroup of countries I^C can induce if the remaining countries $j \in I \setminus I^C$ play $\sigma^{I \setminus I^C}$. Then σ^*, inducing coalition structure C^*, is called a SNE if no subgroup I^C can induce a coalition structure $\tilde{C} \in \tilde{X}^{I^C}(\sigma^*)$, which weakly dominates C^*. That is, $C^*(\sigma^*)$ is a SNE if there is no $I^C \subset I$ and a coalition structure $\tilde{C} \in \tilde{X}^{I^C}(\sigma^*)$ such that $w_i(\tilde{C}_i, \tilde{C}) \geq w_i(C_i, C^*) \ \forall i \in I^C \wedge \exists j \in I^C: w_j(\tilde{C}_j, \tilde{C}) > w_j(C_j, C^*)$. For a NE, $I^C = \{i\}$.

From the examples it is evident that the focus of the analysis is on the coalition formation process itself and economic strategies follow from Nash equilibrium behavior between

coalitions. Spillovers between coalitions are explicitly accounted for. Hence, non-cooperative game theory is useful for studying the incentive to cooperate in the presence of multiple coalitions and to rationalize inefficient outcomes particular in the context of externalities. Moreover, there is a clear conceptual distinction between the rules of coalition formation (strategies and output function) summarized under the definition of a coalition game and stability that follows from the definition of the equilibrium concept. This has at least two advantages. First, the reaction after a deviation follows from the rules of coalition formation and can thus be better related to the rational behavior of players. Second, a study of the effect of the coalition formation rules on equilibrium coalition structures allows drawing policy conclusions about the optimal institutional design of agreements. For instance, Bloch (1997) and Yi (1997) compare various membership rules for different economic problems that can be structured according to positive and negative externality games. In positive externality games the merger of coalitions benefits outsiders whereas this harms outsiders in negative externality games.[3] Roughly speaking, in positive externality games it turns out that exclusive membership sustains more stable coalition structures than open membership and under exclusive membership a high degree of unanimity is conducive to cooperation. In negative externality games this conclusion is more or less reversed.

In what follows we derive a definition of α- and β-core stable coalition structures for positive externality games in the context of the valuation function approach in section 2. In section 3, we present a non-cooperative foundation of α- and β-core stable coalition structures by defining a coalition game, called an exclusive membership H-game, and show that strong Nash equilibria coalition structures are identical to α- and β-core stable coalition structures. As a by-product of the definition of the H-game, we develop an extension in section 4 called an exclusive membership I-game. Finally, in section 5 we compare equilibria in H- and I-game with those in the Δ- and Γ-game of Hart and Kurz (1983) and point to some topics for future research.

---

[3] Typical examples of positive externality games are output cartels (international environmental agreements) where firms (countries) not involved in a merger of single firms (countries) or a group of firms (group of countries) benefit from lower output (lower emissions) via higher prices (lower environmental damages). Firms competing in an oligopoly but jointly reducing production costs through cooperating on R&D exhibit a positive (negative) externality on outside firms if spillovers are high (low) as long as the positive spillover effect is larger (lower) than the negative competition effect. See Bloch (1997) and Yi (1997) for details.

2. A Definition of α- and β-Core Stable Coalition Structures for Positive Externality Games Based on the Valuation Function

In order to capture core-stability in a non-cooperative setting, we recall that the valuation of players depends on the coalition to which they belong and on the coalitions that other players form. Thus, following Bloch (1997), core-stability can be defined as follows:

Definition 1: α- and β-Core Stable Coalition Structures

A coalition structure C is α-core stable if there does not exist a group of players I^C *and a partition* C^{I^C} $(\cup C_i^{I^C} = I^C)$ *such that for all partitions* C^{I/I^C} *formed by external players* $w_i(C_i^{I^C},(C^{I^C},C^{I/I^C})) \geq w_i(C_i,C)$ $\forall i \in I^C$ *and* $\exists\, j \in I^C : w_j(C_j^{I^C},(C^{I^C},C^{I/I^C})) > w_j(C_j,C)$.

A coalition structure C is β-core stable if there does not exist a group of players I^C *such that for all partitions* C^{I/I^C} *of external players there exists a partition* C^{I^C} *of* I^C *such that* $w_i(C_i^{I^C},(C^{I^C},C^{I/I^C})) \geq w_i(C_i,C)$ $\forall i \in I^C$ *and* $\exists\, j \in I^C : w_j(C_j^{I^C},(C^{I^C},C^{I/I^C})) > w_j(C_j,C)$.

It is evident that α-core-stability corresponds to a minimax and β-core-stability to a maximin strategy in terms of coalitions. Hence, what punishment means after a deviation depends on the kind of externality between coalitions. We concentrate on positive externality games with the following property (Bloch 1997 and Yi 1997).

Assumption 1: Positive Externality Games

Let a coalition structure with M coalitions be denoted by $C=(C_1, ..., C_M)$*, a coalition structure with M-1 coalitions by* $C' =(C_1, ..., C_{M-1})$ *where* C' *is derived by merging two coalitions in C, and let* C_k *be a coalition not involved in the merger, then* $w_k(C_k, C) < w_k(C_k, C')$.

For Assumption 1 it is evident that the harshest punishment after a deviation of players I^C is if all other players $I \backslash I^C$ break up into singletons. That is, all coalitions to which the deviators belonged break up into singletons but also all other coalitions. Moreover, in the present context there is no difference between maximin and minimax. Hence, in terms of coalition structures, we can state the following lemma (without proof).

Lemma 1: α-β-Core Stable Coalition Structures in Positive Externality Games

A coalition structure C is α- and β-core stable if and only if there does not exist a group of players I^C *and a partition* C^{I^C} $(\cup C_i^{I^C} = I^C)$ *such that* $w_i(C_i^{I^C},(C^{I^C},1,...,1)) \geq w_i(C_i,C)$ $\forall i \in I^C$ *and* $\exists\, i \in I^C : w_i(C_i^{I^C},(C^{I^C},1,...,1)) > w_i(C_i,C)$ *under Assumption 1.*

From section 1 we know that coalition structures are derived from membership strategies and that stable coalition structures follow from the application of an equilibrium concept. Hence, two more steps are necessary for a complete non-cooperative foundation of core-stability. First, we have to construct a coalition game that implies that deviations lead to a resolution of all players not involved in a deviation. We call this an exclusive membership H-game because of its close similarity to Hart and Kurz´s exclusive membership Δ- and Γ-game. Second, Lemma 1 suggests that we have to apply an equilibrium concept that defines stability in terms of multiple deviations. We show that a strong Nash equilibrium (SNE) does this job. Taken together, we show that the set of SNE coalition structures in the H-game, $X^{SNE}(H)$, is equal to the set of α-β-core stable coalition structures, $X^{\alpha,\beta}$, in positive externality games.

3. Exclusive Membership H-game

The H-game is constructed in a similar fashion as the Δ- and Γ-game. That is, each player announces a message. However, different from the Δ- and Γ-game, the message is not a list of coalition members but a list that comprises the complete coalition structure. In addition, the outcome function, relating strategies to coalition structures, requires not only one but two steps. More specifically:

Definition 2: Exclusive Membership H-game

Let the strategy set of country i be given by $\Sigma_i = \{C^i \in X / i \in C_1^i\}$ *with* X *the set of coalition structures. A particular strategy* $\sigma_i = C^i = (C_1^i; C_2^i, ..., C_{M_i}^i)$ *of player i is composed of a list of players with whom he wants to form a coalition,* C_1^i*, and his preferred residual coalition structure,* $C_2^i, ..., C_{M_i}^i$*. Then the resulting coalition structure C is derived from output function* ψ^H *in two steps.*

First, a preliminary coalition structure $\tilde{C} = (\tilde{C}_1, ..., \tilde{C}_{\tilde{M}})$ *is determined:* $C_1^i \in \tilde{C}$ *if and only if* $C_1^i = C_1^j \ \forall j \in C_1^i$*, otherwise* $\{i\} \in \tilde{C}$**.**

Second, the final coalition structure $C = (C_1, C_2, ..., C_M)$ *follows from:* $\tilde{C}_j \in C \Leftrightarrow C^j = \tilde{C}$ $\forall j \in \tilde{C}_j$ *otherwise* $\tilde{C}_j$ *splits up into singletons in C.*

There are four things to be noted about Definition 2. First, step 1 in the output function ψ^H requires the same degree of unanimity to form a coalition as in the Γ-game. Step 2 is an additional requirement implying that also the formation of external coalitions must have been announced correctly. However, this announcement must only match with respect to the preliminary coalition structure $\tilde{C}$ (and not with respect to C which eventually forms) and may

thus be interpreted as unanimity of the Δ-type with respect to external coalitions. This suggests that in terms of external coalitions a stronger assumption of unanimity may be imposed. We turn to this issue in section 4 where we construct an exclusive membership I-game. Second, the preliminary coalition structure in step 1 comprises non-trivial coalitions, "voluntary" singletons that have proposed a singleton coalition and "involuntary" singletons whose proposals did not match. The assumption of step 2 can be relaxed without affecting results by requiring that only non-trivial coalitions and voluntary singletons (but not involuntary singletons) must be announced correctly by the members of a coalition C_i so that C_i forms. However, we discard this possibility for simplicity. Third, the two-step procedure determines for each set of messages a unique coalition structure. Fourth, each coalition structure can be generated if all players announce exactly this coalition structure. The last remark gives rise to the following lemma that demonstrates that the implicit punishments in the H-game and of α-β-core-stability are the same.

Lemma 2: Implicit Punishment in the H-Game

Suppose all players announce $\sigma_i = C^i = C$*, then a deviation by a group of players* I^C *(implying that they change their announcements) leads to a resolution of* $I \backslash I^C$ *if the deviation leads to a different coalition structure* $\tilde{C}$.

Proof: Consider two cases. Case 1: Suppose at least one player of I^C belongs to a non-trivial coalition C_i. Then C_i is not an element of $\tilde{C}$ anymore and all non-trivial coalitions to which players $I \backslash I^C$ belonged break up into singletons since C_i is not part of their message. Case 2: All players of I^C are singletons. a) A deviation does not lead in $\tilde{C}$ to a merger of singletons but only to at least one involuntary singleton. Hence, $\tilde{C}$ and also C do not change. (For instance, suppose four players announce $C^i=((1, 2), (3), (4))$ and hence $\tilde{C}=C=((1, 2), (3), (4))$. If player 4 deviates and proposes $C^4=((1, 2), (3, 4))$, then this has no affect on $\tilde{C}$ and also not on C.) b) A deviation leads in $\tilde{C}$ to a merger of singletons and possibly involuntary singletons. Then all players $I \backslash I^C$ break up into singletons since the "new coalition" is not part of their message. (For instance, suppose 5 players that all announce $C^i=((1, 2), (3), (4), (5))$ and hence $\tilde{C}=C=((1, 2), (3), (4), (5))$. If players 3 and 4 deviate and announce $C^3=C^4=((1, 2), (3, 4), (5))$, and player 5 $C^5=((1, 2), (3, 4, 5))$, then $\tilde{C}=((1, 2), (3, 4), (5))$ and $C=((1), (2), (3, 4), (5))$.) **(Q.E.D.)**

Using Lemma 2, we now can state our central result.

Proposition 1: Equivalence of Strong Nash Equilibrium Coalition Structures in the H-Game and α-β-Core Stable Coalition Structures

Let $X^{\alpha,\beta}$ be the set of α-β-core stable coalition structures and $X^{SNE}(H)$ the set of strong Nash equilibrium coalition structures in the H-game, then a) $X^{\alpha,\beta} \subset X^{SNE}(H)$ and b) $X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{\alpha,\beta}$.

Proof: a) $C \in X^{\alpha,\beta} \Rightarrow C \in X^{SNE}(H)$: First, $C \in X^{\alpha,\beta}$ implies by Lemma 1 that a deviation by a group of players I^C leading to coalition structure $C' = (C^{I^C}, 1, ..., 1)$ is not beneficial where C^{I^C} is a partition of players I^C. Second, in the H-game, C forms if all players announce exactly C. Then, a deviation either does not change the coalition structure at all (Lemma 2: case 2a) or does lead to the complete resolution of all coalitions of players belonging to $I \backslash I^C$ (Lemma 2: case 1 and 2b). b) $C \notin X^{\alpha,\beta} \Rightarrow C \notin X^{SNE}(H)$: First, $C \notin X^{\alpha,\beta}$ implies that there is a group of players $I^C \subset I$ and a partition C^{I^C} of I^C such that $w_i(C') \geq w_i(C) \; \forall i \in I^C$ and $\exists i \in I^C : w_i(C') > w_i(C)$ holds where $C' = (C^{I^C}, 1, ..., 1)$. Second, players I^C can also induce coalition structure C' in the H-game by proposing C^{I^C} for themselves and for $I \backslash I^C$ those coalition structures that will form in $\tilde{C}'$. Then in step 1 of the output function, $\tilde{C}' = (\tilde{C}^{I^C}, \tilde{C}^{I/I^C})$ where $\tilde{C}^{I/I^C}$ is the partition of players $I \backslash I^C$ and $\tilde{C}^{I^C} = C^{I^C}$. $\tilde{C}^{I/I^C}$ comprises players that have no deviating players in their coalition and which are in the same coalition in $\tilde{C}'$ than in $\tilde{C}$ and players belonging to coalitions of deviators who are now singletons. In step 2 of the output function ($\tilde{C}' \rightarrow C'$), $\tilde{C}^{I^C}$ ($= C^{I^C}$) remains the same in C' than in $\tilde{C}'$ and all other coalitions break apart since they did not announce $\tilde{C}^{I^C}$ correctly. Hence, $C' = (C^{I^C}, 1, ..., 1)$. (**Q.E.D.**)

In order to characterize equilibrium coalition structures in the H-game and in the I-game (see section 4), we need two more definitions.

Definition 3: Pareto-optimal Coalition Structures

A coalition structure C is Pareto-optimal if there is no other coalition structure C' where at least one player is better off and no player is worse off, i.e., there is no C' such that $w_i(C_i', C') \geq w_i(C_i, C) \; \forall i \in I \wedge \exists j \in I: \; w_j(C_j', C') > w_j(C_j, C)$.

Definition 4: Individual Rational Coalition Structures

A coalition structure C is called individual rational if each player receives at least his payoff in the singleton coalition structure, i.e., $\forall i \in I: \; w_i(C_i, C) \geq w_i(\{i\}, 1, ..., 1)$.

Definition 3 is the classical definition of Pareto-optima applied to coalition structures in the context of valuations as proposed by Finus/Rundshagen (2003). Definition 4 uses the singleton coalition structure as a benchmark for individual rationality. Given the assumption of the valuation function (see Introduction), the singleton coalition structure represents the classical Nash equilibrium in terms of economic strategies. With these definitions we can now state the following.

Proposition 2: Nash Equilibrium and Strong Nash Equilibrium Coalition Structures in the H-Game

Let the set of individually rational coalition structures be denoted by X^{IR}*, the set of Pareto-optimal coalition structures by* X^{PO}*, the set of Nash (strong Nash) equilibrium coalition structures by* $X^{NE}(H)$ *(*$X^{SNE}(H)$*) in the H-game, then a)* $X^{NE}(H) = X^{IR}$*, b)* $X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{IR} \cap X^{PO}$*.*

Proof: a) Consider coalition structure C and suppose that all players announce exactly C. i) Suppose a singleton in C changes its announcement. Then this player remains a (involuntary) singleton in $\tilde{C}'$. Since $\tilde{C}' = \tilde{C}$, this will trigger no reaction by others and hence this deviation cannot be profitable because $C' = C$. ii) Suppose a player belonging to a non-trivial coalition in C changes his announcement. Then, his coalition breaks apart in $\tilde{C}'$ and that of all other players in C'. Hence, a deviation is not profitable since $w_i(C_i, C) \geq w_i(\{i\}, C')$, $C' = (1, ..., 1)$, holds by individual rationality. b) $X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{IR}$ follows from the fact that $X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{NE}$ and $X^{NE}(H) = X^{IR}$ as stated above. $X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{PO}$ immediately follows from the definition of strong Nash equilibrium (see Introduction) and Definition 3 of Pareto-optimal coalition structures. (**Q.E.D.**)

It may be worthwhile pointing out that not every Pareto-optimal coalition structure is individual rational. For instance, the grand coalition is always a Pareto-optimal coalition structure but may not be individually rational for some players in the case of heterogeneous payoff functions. A strong Nash equilibrium coalition structure must be a Pareto-optimal coalition structure (otherwise all players would have an incentive to jointly deviate to some other coalition structure), but the opposite is not true since a subgroup of players may have an incentive to move to another coalition structure, though other players will be negatively affected by such a move.

4. Exclusive Membership I-game

As pointed out in the discussion of the H-game, it is possible to invoke an even stronger degree of unanimity for coalitions to form. Thus, the description of strategies is the same as in the H-game and only the output function changes that requires only one step.

Definition 5: Exclusive Membership I-game

Let the strategy set of player i be given by $\Sigma_i = \{C^i \in X / i \in C_1^i\}$ *with* X *the set of coalition structures. A particular strategy* $\sigma_i = C^i = (C_1^i; C_2^i, ..., C_{M_i}^i)$ *of player i is composed of a list of countries with whom he wants to form a coalition,* C_1^i*, and his preferred residual coalition structure,* $C_2^i, ..., C_{M_i}^i$*. Then the resulting coalition structure C is derived from output function* $\psi^I : C = C^i$ *if and only if* $\sigma_i = \sigma_j \ \forall i \in I$*, otherwise* $C = (1, ..., 1)$*.*

A coalition structure only forms if all players have announced exactly this coalition structure. That is, not only the internal list of all members of coalition C_i (list of members in C_i) must match but also the external list of players outside of coalition C_i (list of partitions of players outside C_i). In other words, not only the degree of unanimity with respect to the internal list must be of the Γ-type but also with respect to the external list. For these stronger assumptions it is easy to derive the following result.

Proposition 3: Nash Equilibrium and Strong Nash Equilibrium Coalition Structures in the I-Game

Let the set of Nash (strong Nash) equilibrium coalition structures in the I-game be denoted by $X^{NE}(I)$ *(*$X^{SNE}(I)$*), then a)* $X^{NE}(I) = X^{IR}$*, b)* $X^{SNE}(I) = X^{IR} \cap X^{PO}$*.*

Proof: a) Any deviation leads to the singleton coalition structure that is not profitable if a coalition structure is individually rational. b) Any deviation by a subgroup of players $I^C \subsetneq I$ leads to the singleton coalition structure, which is not beneficial if the coalition structure is individually rational, and a deviation by all players I is not profitable if a coalition structure is Pareto-optimal. (**Q.E.D.**)

5. Comparison of Equilibrium Coalition Structures and Final Remarks

In this section we briefly relate the exclusive membership H- and I-game to the Δ- and Γ-game of Hart and Kurz (1983). In contrast to these authors, who showed $X^{SNE}(\Delta) \cup X^{SNE}(\Gamma) \subset X^{\beta} \subset X^{\alpha}$, we can add now three more aspects to a comparison of

equilibrium coalition structures. First, we can be more specific in characterizing relations between equilibrium sets due to the assumption of positive externalities (Assumption 1). That is, $X^{\beta} = X^{\alpha} = X^{\alpha,\beta}$ from Lemma 1 and - as will be shown below - $X^{SNE}(\Delta) \subset X^{SNE}(\Gamma)$. Second, a comparison can be related to the rules of the coalition game since we have established $X^{SNE}(H) = X^{\alpha,\beta}$ in Proposition 1. Third, we can add a new comparison since we defined the I-game in Definition 5 and derived equilibrium coalition structures in Proposition 3. Fourth, we cannot only compare equilibrium coalition structures in terms of strong Nash equilibrium but also in terms of Nash equilibrium since we conceptually detangled stability from the rules of coalition formation. Taken together, we can state the following.

Proposition 4: Comparison Equilibrium Coalition Structures in the Exclusive Membership Δ-, Γ-, H- and I-Game

In positive externality games as defined in Assumption 1:

a) $X^{NE}(\Delta) \subset X^{NE}(\Gamma) \subset X^{NE}(H) = X^{NE}(I)$ *and*

b) $X^{SNE}(\Delta) \subset X^{SNE}(\Gamma) \subset X^{SNE}(H) \subset X^{SNE}(I)$.

Proof: To show the first two relations in a) and b) let $C^{\Delta'} = (C^{I^C}, C^{I/I^C}(\Delta))$, $C^{\Gamma'} = (C^{I^C}, C^{I/I^C}(\Gamma))$ and $C^{H'} = (C^{I^C}, C^{I/I^C}(H))$ be the resulting coalition structure if a player $I^C = \{i\}$ or group of players $I^C \subset I$ change their strategies where C^{I^C} is the partition of players I^C and C^{I/I^C} the partition of all other players. From the rules in these games it follows that $C^{I/I^C}(\Gamma)$ can be derived by merging coalitions in $C^{I/I^C}(H)$ and that $C^{I/I^C}(\Delta)$ can be derived from merging coalitions in $C^{I/I^C}(\Gamma)$. Hence from Assumption 1, $w_i(C^{I^C}, C^{\Delta'}) \geq w_i(C^{I^C}, C^{\Gamma'}) \geq w_i(C^{I^C}, C^{H'})$ $\forall$ $i \in I^C$. Thus, if a deviation is not profitable in the Δ-game, it will also not be profitable in the Γ-game and if a deviation is not profitable in the Γ-game, it will not be beneficial in the H-game. The last relation in a) and b) follows directly from Proposition 2 and 3. (**Q.E.D.**)

Proposition 4 clearly shows that the higher the degree of unanimity required to form coalitions, the easier it is to sustain stable coalition structures. Of course from an economic perspective it would be interesting to know what "more stability" means in welfare terms and for the level of economic strategies. This, however, requires being more specific about the underlying economic strategies of a model (see the example in the Introduction) and is therefore beyond the scope of this paper. We intend to take this issue up in future research.

We would like to finish with three remarks about future research. First, it seems obvious to construct a coalition game that captures the notion of α- and β-stability in the context of negative externality games. Second, we observe that in positive externality games the reaction of external players after a deviation of a group of players implied by the H-game (and α- and β-core stability) has a close resemblance to Chander/Tulkens´ γ-core in the context of the characteristic function approach. Chander/Tulkens (1997) assume that after a deviation of a group of players, the remaining players split up into singletons, playing a Nash equilibrium in terms of economic strategies. However, their definition of the characteristic function assumes transferable utility and they consider only that deviating players form one coalition.[4] Nevertheless, it would be interesting to relate the γ-core to strong Nash equilibrium coalition structures in our H-game if the underlying assumptions are matched. Third, it would be interesting to relate the cooperative game theoretical concept of the core to a non-cooperative coalition game if transfers between agents are possible. No doubt, this will be a difficult issue and requires deriving transfers between agents endogenously as Ray/Vohra (1999) proposed.

[4] This seems to be a restriction since in their global emission game superadditivity may fail to hold.

References

Chander, P. and H. Tulkens (1997), The Core of an Economy with Multilateral Environmental Externalities. "International Journal of Game Theory", vol. 26, pp. 379-401.

Bloch, F. (1997), Non-Cooperative Models of Coalition Formation in Games with Spillovers. In: Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco (eds.), New Directions in the Economic Theory of the Environment. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, ch. 10, pp. 311-352.

Finus, M. and B. Rundshagen (2003), Endogenous Coalition Formation in Global Pollution Control. A Partition Function Approach. Forthcoming in Carraro, C. (ed.), Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Hart, S. and M. Kurz (1983), Endogenous Formation of Coalitions. "Econometrica", vol. 51, pp. 1047-1064.

Ray, D. and R. Vohra (1999), A Theory of Endogenous Coalition Structures. "Games and Economic Behavior", vol. 26, pp. 286-336.

von Neumann, J. and Morgenstern, O. (1944), The Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. Wiley, New York.

Yi, S.-S. (1997), Stable Coalition Structures with Externalities. "Games and Economic Behavior", vol. 20, pp. 201-237.

Yi, S.-S. (1999), Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions: A Survey on the Partition Function Approach. Preliminary Draft, Sogang University, Seoul. Revised version forthcoming in Carraro, C. (ed.), Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series
Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:
http://www.feem.it/web/activ/_wp.html
http://papers.ssrn.com

SUST	1.2002	*K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW*: Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa
ETA	2.2002	*Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO*: What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?
WAT	3.2002	*Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER*: The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea
CLIM	4.2002	*Andreas LÖSCHEL*: Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey
VOL	5.2002	*Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI*: Stable Coalitions
CLIM	6.2002	*Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA*: Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets
ETA	7.2002	*Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Eftichios S. SARTZETAKIS*: Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach
KNOW	8.2002	*Alain DESDOIGTS*: Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus
NRM	9.2002	*Giuseppe DI VITA:* Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling
KNOW	10.2002	*Giorgio BRUNELLO*: Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries
ETA	11.2002	*Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE*: Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy
KNOW	12.2002	*Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES:* Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?
NRM	13.2002	*Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO*: The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model
CLIM	14.2002	*Philippe QUIRION*: Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector
CLIM	15.2002	*Roberto ROSON*: Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy
CLIM	16.2002	*Francesco RICCI* (l): Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity
ETA	17.2002	*Alberto PETRUCCI*: Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy
Coalition Theory Network	18.2002	*László Á. KÓCZY* (liv)*:* The Core in the Presence of Externalities
Coalition Theory Network	19.2002	*Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR* (liv): Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions
Coalition Theory Network	20.2002	*Guillaume HAERINGER* (liv): On the Stability of Cooperation Structures
NRM	21.2002	*Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAOLO:* Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems
CLIM	22.2002	*Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI*: Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&D and Climate Cooperation
CLIM	23.2002	*Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG:* The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech
ETA	24.2002	*Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI*: Inventories, Employment and Hours
CLIM	25.2002	*Hannes EGLI:* Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany
ETA	26.2002	*Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS*: Environmental Policy and Technological Change
SUST	27.2002	*Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO*: Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans
SUST	28.2002	*The ANSEA Network*: Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment
KNOW	29.2002	*Paolo SURICO*: Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence
ETA	30.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS:* Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies

NRM	31.2002	*Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO:* Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon
NRM	32.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS*: National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years
KNOW	33.2002	*A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN* : Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?
KNOW	34.2002	*G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA:* Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect
CLIM	35.2002	*C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION* (lv): Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences
CLIM	36.2002	*T.TIETENBERG* (lv): The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?
CLIM	37.2002	*K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL* (lv): On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits
CLIM	38.2002	*C. FISCHER* (lv): Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading
SUST	39.2002	*G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO:* Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000
NRM	40.2002	*S .M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS:* Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices
NRM	41.2002	*A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS:* The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices
CLIM	42.2002	*C. OHL* (lvi): Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits
CLIM	43.2002	*J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE* (lvi): Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM
CLIM	44.2002	*A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI* (lvi): Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model
ETA	45.2002	*P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET* (lvi): Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments
ETA	46.2002	*Z. YU* (lvi): A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect
SUST	47.2002	*Y. H. FARZIN*: Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?
SUST	48.2002	*Y. H. FARZIN*: Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value
KNOW	49.2002	*C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI*: Cooperation in R&D and Sample Selection
Coalition Theory Network	50.2002	*M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO* (liv): Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets
Coalition Theory Network	51.2002	*Sergio CURRARINI* (liv): Stable Organizations with Externalities
ETA	52.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS*: Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments
ETA	53.2002	*C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN* (liii): Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation
CLIM	54.2002	*Scott BARRETT* (liii)*:* Towards a Better Climate Treaty
ETA	55.2002	*Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS*: Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies
SUST	56.2002	*Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO*: Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs
SUST	57.2002	*Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA* (lvii): Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests
SUST	58.2002	*Vladimir KOTOV* (lvii): Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy
SUST	59.2002	*Fanny MISSFELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO* (lvii): How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?
VOL	60.2002	*Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE:* Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union
ETA	61.2002	*Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F.WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER*: Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity
PRIV	62.2002	*Carlo CAPUANO*: Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability
PRIV	63.2002	*Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI*: Privatization and R&D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q
PRIV	64.2002	*Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO*: The Effects of Privatization on R&D Investments and Patent Productivity
SUST	65.2002	*Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE*: Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life
ETA	66.2002	*Paolo SURICO:* US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences
PRIV	67.2002	*Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO*: Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.
CLIM	68.2002	*Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON*: Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations
CLIM	69.2002	*Philippe QUIRION*: Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?
SUST	70.2002	*Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO*: Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents
SUST	71.2002	*Marco PERCOCO:* Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal

NRM	72.2002	*Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD*: Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation
PRIV	73.2002	*Mohammed OMRAN:* The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt
PRIV	74.2002	*Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER:* Family Firms
PRIV	75.2002	*Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD:* Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint
PRIV	76.2002	*Nichole M. CASTATER***:** Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union
PRIV	77.2002	*Christoph LÜLSFESMANN*: Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization
PRIV	78.2002	*Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ*: Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms
PRIV	79.2002	*Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ*: How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies
PRIV	80.2002	*Alberto R. PETRUCCI*: Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy
CLIM	81.2002	*Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON* (lvi): The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol
PRIV	82.2002	*George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU:* Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities
PRIV	83.2002	*Massimo FLORIO and Katiuscia MANZONI*: The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance
NRM	84.2002	*Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luís RODRIGUES*: An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)
CLIM	85.2002	*Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO* (lv): Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions
CLIM	86.2002	*Pierre COURTOIS*: Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds
ETA	87.2002	*Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA* (lviii): Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance
ETA	88.2002	*Laurent FRANCKX* (lviii): Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring
ETA	89.2002	*Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON* (lviii): Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.
ETA	90.2002	*Hans KEIDING* (lviii): Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing
ETA	91.2002	*Wietze LISE* (lviii): A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India
CLIM	92.2002	*Jens HORBACH*: Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves
ETA	93.2002	*Martin P. GROSSKOPF:* Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units
VOL	94.2002	*Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS*: Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements
CLIM	95.2002	*Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE:* Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality
CLIM	96.2002	*Matthieu GLACHANT*: The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy
KNOW	97.2002	*Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO*: Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand
ETA	98.2002	*Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA*: Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models
ETA	99.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL*: Bundling Biodiversity
ETA	100.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRLICH, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT*: Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture
ETA	101.2002	*Geoffrey HEAL:* Biodiversity and Globalization
VOL	102.2002	*Andreas LANGE*: Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter
ETA	103.2002	*Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI*: Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externality
ETA	104.2002	*Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI*: Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy
PRIV	105.2002	*Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE*: Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity
ETA	106.2002	*Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE* (lviii): Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game
PRIV	107.2002	*Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER*: Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries
PRIV	108.2002	*Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD*: Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification
PRIV	109.2002	*Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES*: Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World
PRIV	110.2002	*Nandini GUPTA*: Partial Privatization and Firm Performance
PRIV	111.2002	*François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO*: Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience

PRIV	112.2002	*Isaac OTCHERE*: Intra-Industry Effects of Privatization Announcements: Evidence from Developed and Developing Countries
PRIV	113.2002	*Yannis KATSOULAKOS and Elissavet LIKOYANNI*: Fiscal and Other Macroeconomic Effects of Privatization
PRIV	114.2002	*Guillaume GIRMENS:* Privatization, International Asset Trade and Financial Markets
PRIV	115.2002	*D. Teja FLOTHO:* A Note on Consumption Correlations and European Financial Integration
PRIV	116.2002	*Ibolya SCHINDELE and Enrico C. PEROTTI*: Pricing Initial Public Offerings in Premature Capital Markets: The Case of Hungary
PRIV	1.2003	*Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO*: Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues
PRIV	2.2003	*Ibolya SCHINDELE*: Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review
PRIV	3.2003	*Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL*: Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market
CLIM	4.2003	*Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM*: Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment
KNOW	5.2003	*Reyer GERLAGH*: Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition
ETA	6.2003	*Efrem CASTELNUOVO*: Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model
SIEV	7.2003	*Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI:* The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers
NRM	8.2003	*Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH*: Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?
CLIM	9.2003	*A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT*: North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information
KNOW	10.2003	*Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI*: School Quality and Family Background in Italy
CLIM	11.2003	*Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI*: Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis
KNOW	12.2003	*Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)*: Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art
KNOW	13.2003	*Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI* (lvix): Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures
KNOW	14.2003	*Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT* (lvix): Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories
KNOW	15.2003	*Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP* (lvix): Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life
KNOW	16.2003	*Alexandra BITUSIKOVA* (lvix): Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia
KNOW	17.2003	*Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV* (lvix): A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community
KNOW	18.2003	*Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER* (lvix): Managing Diversity in a Glocalizing World
Coalition Theory Network	19.2003	*Sergio CURRARINI:* On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities
PRIV	20.2003	*Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN* (lvx): Monopoly with Resale
PRIV	21.2003	*Claudio MEZZETTI* (lvx): Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition
PRIV	22.2003	*Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN* (lvx): Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions
PRIV	23.2003	*David ETTINGER* (lvx): Bidding among Friends and Enemies
PRIV	24.2003	*Hannu VARTIAINEN* (lvx): Auction Design without Commitment
PRIV	25.2003	*Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST* (lvx): Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions
PRIV	26.2003	*Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN* (lvx): Rationing in IPOs
PRIV	27.2003	*Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV* (lvx): Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes
PRIV	28.2003	*Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON* (lvx): Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts
PRIV	29.2003	*TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF* (lvx): Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment
PRIV	30.2003	*Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL* (lvx): Auctions with Financial Externalities
ETA	31.2003	*Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN:* A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games

(l) This paper was presented at the Workshop "Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001
(li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on "Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001
(lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on "Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001
(liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on "Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?", jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001
(liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002
(lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001
(lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy "The International Dimension of Environmental Policy", organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei , Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001
(lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of "CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum fur Europaische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001
(lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on "Game Practice and the Environment", jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002
(lvix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Mapping Diversity", Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
(lvx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002

2002 SERIES

CLIM *Climate Change Modelling and Policy* (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)

VOL *Voluntary and International Agreements* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

SUST *Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

NRM *Natural Resources Management* (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)

KNOW *Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital* (Editor: Dino Pinelli)

MGMT *Corporate Sustainable Management* (Editor: Andrea Marsanich)

PRIV *Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust* (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)

ETA *Economic Theory and Applications* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

2003 SERIES

CLIM *Climate Change Modelling and Policy* (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)

GG *Global Governance* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

SIEV *Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation* (Editor: Anna Alberini)

NRM *Natural Resources Management* (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)

KNOW *Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital* (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)

IEM *International Energy Markets* (Editor: Anil Markandya)

CSRM *Corporate Social Responsibility and Management* (Editor: Sabina Ratti)

PRIV *Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust* (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)

ETA *Economic Theory and Applications* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

CTN *Coalition Theory Network*