

Bandyopadhyay, Siddhartha; Oak, Mandar

**Working Paper**

## Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation

Nota di Lavoro, No. 98.2004

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

*Suggested Citation:* Bandyopadhyay, Siddhartha; Oak, Mandar (2004) : Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation, Nota di Lavoro, No. 98.2004, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/117968>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

**Party Formation and Coalitional  
Bargaining in a Model of  
Proportional Representation**

Siddhartha Bandyopadhyay and Mandar Oak

NOTA DI LAVORO 98.2004

**JUNE 2004**

CTN – Coalition Theory Network
--------------------------------

Siddhartha Bandyopadhyay, *Department of Economics, University of Birmingham*  
Mandar Oak, *Department of Economics, Williams College*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:  
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:  
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=XXXXXX>

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

# Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation

## Summary

We study a game theoretic model of a parliamentary democracy under proportional representation where 'citizen candidates' form parties, voting occurs and governments are formed. We study the coalition governments that emerge as functions of the parties' seat shares, the size of the rents from holding office and their ideologies. We show that governments may be minimal winning, minority or surplus. Moreover, coalitions may be 'disconnected'. We then look at how the coalition formation game affects the incentives for party formation. Our model explains the diverse electoral outcomes seen under proportional representation and integrates models of political entry with models of coalitional bargaining.

**Keywords:** Proportional representation, Party formation, Coalitions

**JEL Classification:** C72, D72, H19

*We thank Samrat Bhattacharya, Eric Bond, Stephen Coate, James Jordan, Vijay Krishna, Tamar London, Antonio Merlo, Neil Wallace, and participants at several conferences and seminars for comments and especially Kalyan Chatterjee and Tomas Sjöström for end- less discussions and suggestions. All remaining errors are ours.*

*Address for correspondence:*

Siddhartha Bandyopadhyay  
Department of Economics  
University of Birmingham  
Edgbaston  
Birmingham B15 2TT  
UK  
Phone: +44 121 414 6658  
Fax: +44 121 414 7377  
E-mail: s.bandyopadhyay@bham.ac.uk

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In democracies that use proportional representation (PR), it is unusual for a single party to control more than half the seats in parliament. In a study of 313 elections in 11 democracies in Europe (see Diermeier and Merlo (2001)) from 1945-1997, it was found that only 20 of the elections returned a single party with more than half the seats in parliament. Hence, in such democracies minority and coalition governments are more prevalent. Moreover, coalition governments differ in the number of participants as well as the ideological cohesion of their members. For example, in a study of fifteen European democracies in the post war period, Gallagher, Laver and Mair (1995) find that about 35% of coalitions were minimal winning, 36% were minority coalitions while the rest of the coalitions (29%) were surplus coalitions. Laver and Schofield (1990) and Indridason (2001) report instances of ideologically disconnected coalition governments being formed over the same time period in Europe.

The recent game theoretic models of PR, notably Diermeier and Merlo (2000) and Baron and Diermeier (2001), (collectively referred to as BDM) employ the efficient bargaining approach to coalition politics to provide an explanation for the size diversity of coalitions. According to this approach, the party in charge of putting together a coalition (called the *formateur*) can buy the support of other parties by adapting a compromise policy position or by making side payments in return for support. Using this they are able to generate equilibrium governments which can be minority, minimum winning or surplus. This is a major point of departure from the previous theoretical literature since Riker (1962) which had consistently predicted minimum winning coalitions in equilibrium. However, these recent papers do not consider the issue of disconnected coalitions<sup>1</sup>. They also do not look at whether their results are consistent with endogenous party entry.

---

<sup>1</sup>Brams et al (2001) is one of the few papers which explicitly addresses this issue.

In this paper we construct a game theoretic model of PR which endogenizes party formation, voting as well as coalitional politics. Our paper shares some features with the aforementioned literature in that we also use the formateur selection procedure<sup>2</sup> but precludes the possibility of efficient bargaining (in particular, of being able to make unlimited side transfers) or the ability to be able to commit to a policy at the government formation stage. Instead, we assume, that under a coalition government, the implemented policy is approximated by the seat-weighted average of the ideal policies of the coalition partners and each party in the coalition receives a share of power (to be interpreted as rents from office or directed transfers in the paper) in proportion to its seats. This approach allows us to formalize the issue of how party entry and government formation are affected by the relative importance of ideology to rents from office. In doing so, we generate a number of refutable predictions about the role of policy motivation vis-a-vis political power in the determination of government formation as well as political party formation.

The particular assumption about the bargaining outcome has strong empirical support. Empirical studies of power sharing among coalition partners (see Browne and Fendreis (1980) and Laver and Schofield, (1990)) have found substantial evidence that coalition partners share cabinet portfolios in proportion to their relative seat shares. Since a large bulk of political power is vested in various ministerial offices, the politician in charge of a particular ministry is entitled to that power as well as the right to make a policy in the relevant area.

Our second point of departure from the previous literature concerns our treatment of the status-quo in the event of the failure to form a government. We assume that in the event that the attempts at government formation fail, a consensus government comprised of all the parties is formed. Under such government, the implemented policy is the seat-weighted average of the ideal points all the members of the legislature

---

<sup>2</sup>Ansolabehere et al (2003) provide empirical support for the use of such models

and the political power is shared in proportion to the seats. Baron and Diermeier, on the other hand, assume an exogenously given status quo while Diermeier and Merlo assume it to be equal to the ideal point of one of the parties.

The basic structure of our model can be described as follows: there is a polity comprised of groups of citizens who share policy preferences. Each group decides whether or not to form a political party in order to gain representation in the legislature. Election takes place between the contesting parties and each party gets seats in the parliament equal to its vote share. This is followed by the process of government formation. If there exists a party that receives absolute majority, then it is selected as the formateur, otherwise each party is probabilistically chosen to be the formateur with the recognition probability equal to its seat share. The formateur invites any subset of parties in the legislature to form the government.<sup>3</sup> If all the invitees agree to join the government and if the prospective government wins the backing of a majority of legislators, then the government assumes office. Otherwise a caretaker government is instituted. The policy choice and the power sharing arrangement between the member parties of a government is as described in the earlier paragraph. To sum up, we model the system of PR by integrating the ‘citizen-candidate’ approach a la Besley and Coate (1997) and Osborne and Slivinski (1996) with a variant of the coalition formation literature.

We now summarize our main results. At the coalition formation stage, we show how the equilibrium nature of coalitions varies both with the choice of formateur as well as with changes in the value of ideology to rents from office. For a symmetric three party case, we completely characterize the equilibrium coalitions. In particular, we see that there is a non monotonic relation between rents from office and connected coalitions. The other cases of interest we discuss is where there is a large centrally located party with two smaller parties on either side and another where the two

---

<sup>3</sup>We do not preclude the possibility that the formateur may invite a subset of parties that does not include itself.

smaller parties are close to each other. We show how this can lead to disconnected coalitions, the two small parties by leaving the large party out can appropriate more rents for themselves. A general result that we get is that when the rents from office are large enough, equilibrium governments are minimal winning though not minimum size. At intermediate ranges (of the value of rents from office) we get the various kinds of coalitions seen in democracies under PR. We then do a two dimensional analogue with BDM and find that for their symmetric three party case we get minimum winning coalitions under the assumptions in our model. The difference stems from the fact that their results (on equilibrium coalition choice) are driven only by the position of the (exogenously given) status quo and choice of formateur while our results also depend on the ideological closeness of the parties as well as the trade-off between rents and ideology. We then examine what incentives the coalition formation procedure gives ideological group to form parties. We find that there exists an equilibrium of the political game which has the median group (when it is unique) being the only group to stand for elections and under some configurations, we show that this could in fact be the unique equilibrium. Hence, this is contrary to the Duvergerian prediction (see Duverger (1964)) <sup>4</sup>that PR promotes more party formation than does Plurality voting. We further show how political competition can increase with increases in the value placed to rents from office. In particular, beyond a certain value of the rents, we get a (non unique) political equilibrium where all the ideological groups contest for elections.

The next section discusses some more papers which are related to our work. This is followed by presenting the model, solving the legislative game and then solving the entire political game. A comparison is done with the BDM papers using a two dimensional policy space, followed by a robustness analysis by looking at how sensitive

---

<sup>4</sup>See Feddersen (1992), Fey (1997) and Palfrey (1989) for formalizations of the Duvergerian hypothesis that Plurality Rule leads to two party rule.

our results are to the way we model the coalition formation procedure. The final section discusses the empirical relevance of our model and concludes.

## 2. RELATED LITERATURE

Our work is related to several strands in the literature, particularly with several papers on coalitional bargaining, party positioning and endogenous party formation. It also draws on the insights provided by classic works on electoral systems, the activist literature on PR (see Barber (1999) for example ) and several case studies which throw light on actual coalitional structure.

The study of what type of coalitions will form in equilibrium dates back to Riker (earlier cit.). However, the concern in Riker's work is with the division of a fixed 'pie' which members of the winning coalition are entitled to. Hence, he predicts a *minimum winning coalition* i.e. the minimal winning coalition made of the smallest number of members.<sup>5</sup> When ideology is considered there are no longer compelling reasons to predict a minimal winning coalition. Instead, following Axelrod (1970), the natural thing to predict would be a 'minimum winning connected' coalition – i.e. a coalition that does not leave out a partner who is in between two coalition partners on the ideological dimension. As pointed out, until the papers by BDM, most of the theoretical papers did make such predictions (see Austen Smith and Banks (1988), Baron (1989, 1991, 1998) and Lupia and Strom (1995) for instance).

There are also a fair number of models of party formation/strategic entry, starting from the 'citizen candidate' models of endogenous candidate entry to more recent papers by Riviere (2000), Morelli (2001) and Osborne and Tourky (2002) (in the recent papers a distinction is made between a candidate and a party).<sup>6</sup> These papers either

---

<sup>5</sup>For some of the theoretical papers on coalition formation both with a constant pie as well as a non constant sum pie see Ray and Vohra (1997) and the references in the survey by Bloch (1997)

<sup>6</sup>In recent papers by Levy (2002) and Jackson and Moselle (2002) the role of a party when the space is multidimensional rather than unidimensional is analyzed. For a recent survey on coalitions



assume that the winner is selected by plurality rule or they model the post election policy outcome as a majority rule game, thus missing one of the most important aspects of PR which is coalition formation. There are also papers dealing with strategic entry under more general outcome functions most notably Dutta, Jackson and LeBreton (2000) but the generality of the paper does not allow them to generate any sharp predictions except that under complete information at least one player (candidate) will behave strategically.

The fact that PR promotes diversity has been made by Ortuno Ortin (1997). The paper assumes that the policy is a weighted average of the two parties policy with the weights being proportional to seat shares. The main aim is to provide an explanation of why policies pursued might deviate from the median voter's position. Hamlin and Hjortland (2000) integrate this approach with the citizen candidate literature and De Sinopoli and Iannantuoni (2001) consider model with non strategic parties but strategic voters. Both papers predict two parties under proportional representation contrary to empirical evidence. Moreover, the assumption of vote weighted average does not capture the institutional details of coalition formation and government policy making which is an important aspect of democracies under PR.

A more complete analysis of the electoral process has been made by Austen Smith and Banks (earlier cit.), Baron (1993) Roemer (2001) and Baron and Diermeier (earlier cit.). Baron and Diermeier also note that with 'strategic voting' minority parliaments may form in equilibrium and voters do not always vote for the party closest to their ideal point. The first result is of interest as it provides a justification for dealing with the coalition formation stage under a minority parliament. These papers do not deal with party formation and their parties are only endogenous in the sense that they choose positions.

---

and party formation, see Dhillon (2003) which also discusses some other recent work on political parties and coalitions.

In summary, we differ from these papers in two major ways. First, we make different assumptions about coalitional bargaining (in particular, by assuming no commitment and non transferable utility). Second, we integrate the ‘institution free’ citizen-candidate approach to politics with the rich institutional details of parliamentary democracy under PR.

### 3. THE MODEL

In this section we formalize the political process under PR. We denote by  $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  the set of groups of citizens in the polity where  $1 \leq N < \infty$ . Let  $N_i$  denote the measure of citizen belonging to group  $i$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  denote the policy space. The payoff of a (representative) citizen belonging to group  $i$  is denoted by

$$-u(|x_i - x|) + T$$

where  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is the policy implemented,  $x_i$  is the ideal policy of party  $i$  and  $T$  is the transfer of money received by the citizen. The interpretation of  $T$  is the amount of directed transfer made to that group as opposed to the policy which has a public good interpretation. We shall throughout assume that a group which is a part of the government receives a transfer  $\lambda P$  where  $\lambda$  is the relative size (seat share) of the group in terms of the number of parties in the government. This is the main distinction from being in government and out of government. Only members of a government are able to hold ministries and hence make directed transfers to their own groups. This is the particular way we interpret the rents from office and following the strong empirical evidence (as discussed in the Introduction) we assume the ministries (which we assume is vested with the ability to make these transfers) to be split according to

party size.<sup>7</sup> We assume that  $u(0) = 0, u' > 0, u'' \geq 0$ . The political process can be described by the following four stages.

- (1) **Candidate Entry** Each group simultaneously decides whether or not to contest the elections. There is a cost  $\delta > 0$  of contesting the elections. Let  $e_i = 1(0)$  indicate that group  $i$  contests (does not contest) the elections. Hence, given an entry profile  $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N)$ , the set of parties contesting an election can be denoted by  $\mathcal{C}(e) = \{i \in \mathcal{N} : e_i = 1\}$ .
- (2) **Elections** Citizens simultaneously vote over the set of contesting parties  $\mathcal{C}(\neq \emptyset)$ . We assume throughout this model that voting is costless and each citizen votes for the party that is closest to his ideal policy. Upon elections, each party receives seats in the parliament in proportion to its relative vote share. In reality there are minimum floor requirements and the integer constraints that must be taken into account. In our model we abstract from these considerations.
- (3) **Government Formation** Let  $(C, S_i, \{x_i\})$  denote a parliament comprised of  $C(> 0)$  parties where  $S_i$  denotes party  $i$ 's seat share and  $x_i$  its ideal point. The process of government formation is comprised of three stages: formateur selection, proto-coalition formation and the vote of confidence.
  - (a) *Formateur Selection* If there is a party  $k$  such that  $S_k > \frac{1}{2}$ , then party  $k$  is asked to be the formateur. If there is a hung parliament, i.e., if  $S_i \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ , then each party is asked to become the formateur with probability  $S_i$ . The formateur selection process described here (variously

---

<sup>7</sup>Note that we could alternately have assumed that people care for policy and rents (or directed transfers) in the ratio  $\alpha$  and  $1 - \alpha$ . Hence, payoff for a citizen of group  $i$  can be written as  $-\alpha u(|x_i - x|) + (1 - \alpha)T$ . The comparative statics that we do would have been in terms of the marginal rate of substitution between policy benefits and rents. This makes no qualitative change, so we keep the simpler formulation.

called proportional selection or random recognition) seems to fit the data well (see Diermeier and Merlo (2001)).

- (b) *Proto-Coalition Selection* The formateur asks any subset of parties in the legislature,  $D$ , to form a government.  $D$  is called the proto-coalition. All the members of the proto-coalition must simultaneously decide whether or not to accept the offer. If the offer is unanimously accepted, then  $D$  goes on to seek the vote of confidence, otherwise a caretaker government is instituted.
- (c) *Vote of Confidence* If a proto-coalition decides to accept the formateur's offer, it must seek the vote of confidence from the legislature. Each member of the legislature simultaneously votes to approve or to disapprove the proto-coalition. If the proto-coalition wins more than 50% of the votes, then it goes on to form a government, otherwise a caretaker government is instituted.
- (4) **Policy Selection** Let  $D$  denote the government in office. Depending upon the outcome of the government formation stage, there could either be a single party government, coalition government or a caretaker government in power. There are two cases to consider.

- *Single Party or Coalition Government*: Let  $\pi_i$  denote the relative seat share of party  $i$  in the government. We assume that the policy chosen by such a government is given by  $\sum_{k \in D} \pi_k x_k$  and each member of each party in power gets a transfer equal to  $\frac{1}{\sum_{i \in D} \pi_i} P$ .
- *Consensus Government*: In case of a caretaker government, the policy implemented is given by  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} S_i x_i$  and each member of the legislature gets a transfer  $P$ . In other words, a caretaker government is the same as a consensus government formed by all parties in the legislature.

We assume that if no group decides to form a party, then each citizen receives a payoff  $u_0$ .

## 4. SOLVING THE LEGISLATIVE MODEL

We will solve the game backwards. Thus, we will first solve for the coalition formation and policy making stage for a given legislature. In the next section we shall look at party formation and study the incentives generated by the parliamentary game for party formation. Thus, in this section we start with a given seat share for each party. There are two stages in the legislative game viz. government formation and policy making.

**4.1. The Government Formation and Policy Making game.** We assume that each party in the legislature acts as a cohesive decision making unit which tries to maximize the payoff of its representative member. Once the coalition wins the confidence (investiture) vote, policy making and division of the spoils of office is decided by the bargaining among members. The bargaining procedure is of course complicated by the fact that we have a non constant sum game. Thus, we do not explicitly model this but simply assume that each members strength is the weight it has in the government and thus they will share the rents from office in that ratio and the implemented policy will be a seat weighted outcome of the members ideal points.

Let  $v_i(D)$  denote the average payoff of a member of party  $i$  when  $D$  is the ruling coalition. If  $i \notin D$ , then  $v_i(D) = -u(|x_i - x_D|)$  and if  $i \in D$ , then  $v_i(D) = -u(|x_i - x_D|) + \frac{1}{s_D}P$  where  $s_D$  is the ‘size’ i.e. the seat shares of coalition  $D$ .<sup>8</sup> Let  $v_i(\mathcal{C})$  denote the payoff of a member of party  $i$  when there is a consensus government. At the vote of confidence stage, the members of party  $i$  will vote for the proposed government  $D$  if  $v_i(D) \geq v_i(\emptyset)$  (we assume that when indifferent, a party member votes for the proposed government). Let  $A(D)$  denote the set of parties that would vote for the proposed government  $D$  and let  $s_{A(D)}$  denote its size. If  $s_{A(D)} > \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $D$  forms the government. Let  $W$  denote the set of proto coalitions that will win the

---

<sup>8</sup>Note that party  $i$  receives  $\pi_i P$  part of the power. Hence, the per party member share of power is  $\frac{\pi_i P}{s_i}$ . Since  $\pi_i = \frac{s_i}{s_D}$ , we have the per capita share to be  $\frac{1}{s_D}P$ .

vote of confidence. Formally,  $W \equiv \{D \in 2^C \text{ s.t. } s_{A(D)} > \frac{1}{2}\}$ . Now we come to the proto coalition selection stage. At this stage the formateur  $k$  must choose the proto coalition. Let  $Y$  denote the set of proto coalitions that are unanimously preferred by its constituents over the status quo. Formally,  $Y \equiv \{D \in 2^C \text{ s.t. } v_i(D) \geq v_i(\phi)\}$ . Thus, every coalition member has a veto power in that it can decide not to be in the coalition. Hence, unanimity is required among the selected members for a coalition to be formed. Let  $D_k$  denote the proto coalition most preferred by a member of party  $k$ , i.e.  $D_k = \operatorname{argmax}_{D \in W \cap Y} v_k(D)$ . For simplicity, we assume that  $D_k$  is unique for each  $k$  (otherwise choose with equal probability). Thus, associated with each formateur  $k$  we have an equilibrium government  $D_k$ . Formally, a legislative equilibrium can be defined as follows:

**Definition 1.** A legislative equilibrium is a collection of proto coalition  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_N$  such that  $\forall k \in C, D_k = \operatorname{argmax}_{D \in W \cap Y} v_k(D)$

Note that existence is not a problem as the sets  $W$  and  $Y$  are well defined. Hence,  $D_k$  is well defined.

**4.2. Defining different coalitions.** Before stating our main results on the parliamentary stage it is useful to make precise the types of coalitions we had described in the introduction. Let  $(C, S_i, \{x_i\})$  denote a parliament comprised of  $C (> 0)$  parties where  $S_i$  denotes party  $i$ 's seat share and  $x_i$  its ideal point. Let  $D \subseteq N$  denote the coalition in power with  $\pi_i$  denoting the relative seat share of party  $i \in D$ . Naturally, for  $i \in D, \pi_i = \frac{S_i}{\sum_{k \in D} S_k}$ . Some special cases of interest are

- $|D| = 1$  - a single party is in power.
- $\sum_{k \in D} S_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$  -  $D$  is a minority government.
- $\sum_{k \in D} S_k > \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\exists i \in D$  such that  $\sum_{k \in D \setminus i} S_k > \frac{1}{2}$  -  $D$  is a super-majority government.
- $\sum_{k \in D} S_k > \frac{1}{2}$  and for any  $i \in D, \sum_{k \in D \setminus i} S_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$  -  $D$  is a minimal winning coalition government.

- $D = \mathcal{C}$  - a consensus government.
- $\mathcal{C}(\{x_i\}_{i \in D})$  denote the convex hull of the ideal points of the coalition partners.  
If  $\exists j \notin D$  such that  $x_j \in \mathcal{C}(\{x_i\}_{i \in D})$  then  $D$  is a disconnected coalition.  
Otherwise  $D$  is a connected coalition.

The following section characterizes the types of equilibrium coalitions as a function of policy and power.

## 5. A SYMMETRIC THREE PARTY CHARACTERIZATION AND A ‘LIMITING RESULT’

Consider a legislature comprised of 3 parties, 1, 2 and 3, with  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = x \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $x_3 = 1$ . We shall further assume that  $S_1 = S_2 = S_3 = \frac{1}{3}$ . Each party has well defined preferences denoted by a weak ordering  $\succ_i$  over the set of possible coalitions. If two or more parties prefer a coalition  $D$  over the status quo  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , then the  $D$  succeeds in forming a government. We will completely characterize the set of equilibrium coalitions.

**5.1. Party 2 as the formateur.** First suppose that party 2 is chosen as the formateur. It obviously prefers  $\{2\}$  over any other  $D$  and will succeed in forming the government if  $\{2\} \succ_1 \{1, 2, 3\}$ . 1’s payoff from  $\{2\}$  in power is  $-x$  while his payoff from  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  is  $-\frac{1+x}{3} + P$ . Hence, 1 will support the coalition if

$$-x \geq -\frac{1+x}{3} + P$$

which simplifies to  $x \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}P$ . Hence, if the above condition holds, 2 will successfully propose a minority government comprised only of itself. If this condition does not hold, the 2’s other alternatives are  $\{1, 2\}$  or  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  or  $\{1, 3\}$ . Since  $\{1, 2\} \succ_2 \{2, 3\}$ , 2 will propose  $\{1, 2\}$  if  $\{1, 2\} \succ_2 \{1, 2, 3\}$  which is equivalent to

$$-\frac{x}{2} + 2P \geq x - \frac{1+x}{3} + P$$

which simplifies to  $x \leq \frac{2}{7} + \frac{6}{7}P$ . Note that 1 will always support  $\{1, 2\}$  over  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  and hence 2 is assured of winning the vote of confidence. If  $x > \frac{2}{7} + \frac{6}{7}P$ , then 2’s next

best alternative would be either  $\{2, 3\}$  or  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ . In either case the government is assured of party 3's support hence support. 2 will propose  $\{2, 3\}$  if

$$x - \frac{1+x}{2} + 2P \geq x - \frac{1+x}{3} + P$$

which simplifies to  $x \leq -1 + 6P$ . Otherwise 2 will prefer the status quo  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ .

The following diagram summarizes the various possible coalitions in the  $(P, x)$  space.




FIGURE 1. Coalitions with 2 as Formateur

**5.2. Party 1 as the formateur.** Let party 1 be the formateur. Its most preferred government is  $\{1\}$ , which it will succeed in forming if  $\{1\} \succ_2 \{1, 2, 3\}$ , which is same as

$$-x \geq x - \frac{1+x}{3} + P$$

which simplifies to  $x \leq \frac{1}{5} - \frac{3}{5}P$ . If the above condition fails to hold, the next best feasible alternative for party 1 is  $\{1, 2\}$ . Party 2 will accept 1's proposal to form  $\{1, 2\}$



if

$$-\frac{x}{2} + 2P \geq x - \frac{1+x}{3} + P$$

which boils down to  $x \leq \frac{2}{7} + \frac{6}{7}P$ . If neither  $\{2\}$  nor  $\{1, 2\}$  are feasible, then 1 could propose either  $\{2\}$ ,  $\{1, 3\}$  or  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Note that  $\{2\}$  will always get party 2's support. Hence, 1 would propose  $\{2\}$  if  $\{2\} \succ_1 \{1, 3\}$  and  $\{2\} \succ_1 \{1, 2, 3\}$ . The former condition is equivalent to  $x \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2P$  and latter is equivalent to  $x \leq \frac{1}{2} - 3P$ . Similar conditions can be obtained for the range over which  $\{1, 3\}$  is the best feasible combination. The following diagram shows the various equilibrium coalitions when party 1 is the formateur.




FIGURE 2. Coalitions with 1 as Formateur

**5.3. Party 3 as the formateur.** To study the possible coalitions when party 3 is the formateur, we do a similar exercise of deriving 3's best feasible coalitions. The following diagram shows the various equilibrium coalitions when party 3 is the formateur.




FIGURE 3. Coalitions with 3 as Formateur

5.4. **Connected vs. disconnected coalitions.** An important insight that the recent empirical work on coalitions has revealed (see Indridason, earlier cit.) is that disconnected coalitions may be more frequently seen where ideology is less important as compared to rents (or what we also interpret as special transfers as opposed to policies which affect all groups). To see when this may be true more clearly, consider two particular cases, one where there is a large party which is centrally located and two smaller parties on either side and another where there are two ideologically similar parties with a large party further away from them. We can to fix ideas, assume, as in the symmetric case, that we have parties 1, 2, 3 with ideal points  $(0, x, 1)$ .  $S_2 \geq \max(S_1, S_3)$ . Thus, essentially we now introduce asymmetry in party size to see how that affects coalition formation. The closer  $x$  is to  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the lower the value of  $P$  needed to get a disconnected coalition. Again, as  $S_2$  gets bigger the chance of a disconnected coalition increases (until  $S_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ ). This captures the intuitive phenomenon that the centrist party is left out as it is asking for too much (in terms of share of

$P$ ). However, this is a special case of a more general result, namely as the value of  $P$  gets larger, the equilibrium coalitions are minimum winning (subject to the formateur being in the coalition). Hence, in this case the two smallest parties form a coalition and, being on either side, the coalition is disconnected. On the other hand, when they are on the same side, we can get again get disconnected coalitions when  $P$  is very high as the far extreme party will call on the smallest partner which may be farthest from it. In both cases, what is of further interest is to check for consistency with the entry game which we do in the next section.

In this context we note that the general result when the value of rents become very high is that every formateur can form a coalition and that will be minimal winning. We state this formally as follows.

**Proposition 1.** *There exist a value of  $P$  beyond which every formateur  $i \in N$  can form a coalition and that will be a minimum winning coalition, in particular it will be the smallest minimum winning coalition subject to inclusion of the formateur*

*Proof.* Consider party  $i \in N$  and let  $M$  denote the smallest minimum winning coalition subject to inclusion of  $i$  and denote by  $S \geq \frac{1}{2}$  the relative size of the coalition. Denote an alternative larger coalition by  $M'$  and its relative size by  $S'$ . Note that there exists  $P$  for which  $u_M + \frac{P}{S} > u_{M'} + \frac{P}{S'}$ . Hence, a larger coalition is ruled out. Now we need to show that a smaller coalition will be voted down by a majority. Denote the smaller coalition by  $M''$  and its relative size by  $S'' < \frac{1}{2}$ . It will be voted against by all members not included in  $S''$  as long as  $u_\phi + P > u_{M''}$ . The value of  $P$  which satisfies both inequalities is the one beyond which all equilibrium coalitions are minimal winning. ■

## 6. PARTY FORMATION

We are now able to define the political equilibrium. We first define the entry stage equilibrium and then the political equilibrium.

**Definition 2.** Entry-stage Equilibrium: A profile  $e$  of entry decisions constitutes an equilibrium if, for all  $i \in C$ ,  $V_i(C) - \delta > V_i(C')$ , where  $V_i(C)$  (respectively  $V_i(C')$ ) is the expected utility of party  $i$  from contesting (respectively not contesting) and the set of entrants is denoted by  $C$  and  $C' = C - i$ .

**Definition 3.** Political Equilibrium: A political equilibrium is a collection  $\{D^*, e^*\}$  where  $D^* = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_N)$  is a collection of equilibrium proto coalitions of the government formation game and  $e^*$  is an entry-profile such that,

- (1)  $\forall k \in C, D_k = \text{argmax}_{D \in W \cap Y} v_k(D)$  and
- (2)  $e^*$  is an equilibrium of the entry game given the proto-coalition decision functions.

6.1. **Results.** Given these definitions we can now easily show existence.

**Proposition 2.** *A Political equilibrium exists.*

*Proof.* The number of players ( $1 \leq N < \infty$ ) and the strategy set is finite. Hence, the conditions for existence of a Nash equilibrium holds. In particular, the government formation subgame associated with each formateur also has an equilibrium as  $D_k$  is well defined. ■

Now since the entry decision of each party is dependent on the decisions by other parties it is not very difficult to see that we get multiple equilibria. We shall demonstrate this by giving examples of such multiplicity. However, as our next proposition shows, if the median is unique, then the median group being the only group to form a party is always an equilibrium.

**Proposition 3.** *If the median group is unique, there exists a political equilibrium in which the median group stands uncontested and implements its ideal policy in parliament.*

*Proof.* If the median group forms a party no group can get more than half the votes by standing on its own.

As the median party retains its absolute majority it still becomes the formateur and implements its ideal point. Thus any group  $i$  by launching a party incurs a net cost since its change of utility from standing is  $U(x_m) - U(x_m) - \delta = -\delta < 0$ . Hence, no unilateral deviation is profitable. Any group by forming a party only undergoes a cost.<sup>9</sup> ■

It is natural at this stage to ask what (if anything) can be said about Duverger's law. Non-Duvergerian predictions for PR have been made (see the papers cited in section 2), in particular showing that only two parties can form under PR. The assumptions are open to question but clearly it is worth investigating if strategic entry in our particular framework can give rise to non Duvergerian predictions. An interesting point in this context made by Morelli (earlier cit.) is that in a multi-district model if the population distribution across districts is sufficiently dissimilar Duverger's predictions are reversed. We demonstrate that even in a one district scenario we can get more parties under plurality voting than under PR.

There are three groups with ideal points  $0, x < \frac{1}{2}, 1$ . We further assume that  $N_i = \frac{1}{3} \forall i$ . We wish to look at conditions under which the median group forming the party is the unique equilibrium. In other words, contra Duvergerian prediction we have only one party under PR. We also examine under what conditions we have another equilibrium in which all the groups will stand. To understand why the unique equilibrium could be party with ideal point  $x$  standing, note that the group further away from  $x$  (i.e. the party with ideal point 1) may wish to withdraw in order to prevent the minimum winning coalition of  $0, x$  which will be worse for the group than if the ideal policy of the middle group  $x$  is implemented. The conditions that need

---

<sup>9</sup>This is not robust in the sense that it depends on the simultaneity of the game. Note that this non robustness is true for the citizen candidate model as well.

to be satisfied for this is that the equiprobable chance of the three coalitions that occur when all three groups form parties must be less than the utility from  $x$  being implemented with certainty. In this, we have different cases to consider. The first is when there a coalition between the parties with ideal point 0 and 1 when the party with ideal point 0 is the formateur and a minority government when the party with ideal point  $x$  is the formateur and a caretaker government when the party with ideal point 1 is the formateur.

**Proposition 4.** *Let there be three equal sized groups, 1,2 and 3 with the ideal points given by  $0, x < \frac{1}{2}, 1$ , respectively. Further assume that  $|\frac{x}{2}| < |\frac{x+1}{3} - x| < |x|$ . There exists a unique political equilibrium where the party with ideal point  $x$  contests when the following conditions hold (1)  $-\frac{1}{3}|\frac{x+1}{3} - 1| - \frac{1}{3}|\frac{x}{2} - 1| - \frac{1}{3}|x - 1| + \frac{P}{3} - \delta < -|x - 1|$  (2)  $3P - 3\delta \geq \max\{u_\emptyset, -x, -(1-x)\}$  where  $u_\emptyset$  denotes the payoff when no party runs for elections.*

*Proof.* The assumption  $|\frac{x}{2}| < |\frac{x+1}{3} - x| < |x|$  implies that if all three groups have contested (and by sincere voting gained equal seat shares in the legislature) the party with ideal point 0 as formateur will form a minimum winning coalition with the party with ideal point  $x$ , while the party with ideal point  $x$  will form a minority coalition at low values of  $P$  and the status quo will be implemented when the party with ideal point 1 is the formateur. Clearly, this is not restrictive in that in the event that the party with ideal point 0 can form a minority government, the incentive for the party with ideal point 1 to drop out is even greater. Given that, we see by condition (1) that the group with ideal point 1 prefers to drop out which leads to the policy  $x$  being implemented with certainty. Condition (2) makes sure that group 2 would always like to form a party and contest the elections. ■

The intuition for this is that the further extreme party (with ideal point 1) prefers  $x$  as the policy than a coalition which would lead to  $\frac{x}{2}$  being the policy and hence drops out to give the middle party a majority. Thus, while several formalizations of

Duverger's law relied on voters behaving strategically (see references earlier cit.), we have shown that even with sincere voting the intuition is not very different if there is strategic behavior on the part of parties. In particular, notice that the condition for uniqueness under PR is weaker than that under plurality voting (PV) in the sense that under PV  $-\frac{1}{3} \left| \frac{x+1}{3} - 1 \right| - \frac{1}{3} \left| \frac{x}{2} - 1 \right| - \frac{1}{3} |x - 1| + P - \delta < -|x - 1|$  would need to hold as in the event of a tie there is a on third probability of the party with ideal point 1 being the winner and hence appropriating all the  $P$ .

We now look at entry-proofness for the two asymmetric cases described in the discussion on connected vs. disconnected coalitions. Recall that we had three parties 1,2,3 with ideal points  $(0, x, 1)$ .  $s_2 \geq \max(s_1, s_3)$  The closer  $x$  is to  $\frac{1}{2}$  the lower the value of  $P$  to get disconnected coalitions. Again ;as  $s_x$  gets bigger chances of a disconnected coalition increases (until  $s_2 = 1$ ). We can see why at low  $P$  and reasonably moderate  $\delta$  an extreme party may want to drop out.

Now consider the three parties 1,2,3 with ideal points  $(0, x, 1)$  with  $s_3 \geq \max(s_1, s_2)$ . It is easy to see that with low  $P$  the status quo is implemented. As an example of entry (non proofness) consider  $x = \epsilon$  close to 0. It is easy to see that there exists  $P$  such that

$$-|s_2x + s_3 - x| + \frac{P}{3} > -\left| \frac{1-x}{2} - x \right| + \frac{P}{2}$$

But notice that this is not entry proof. This is because  $-|x| > -\frac{1}{3}|s_2x + s_3 - x| + \frac{P}{3} - \frac{1}{3}|x| + \frac{1}{3}P - \delta$  for  $x$  close to 0.

Note of course that as  $P$  gets very large there exist a political equilibrium in which all groups contest. The following proposition formalizes this.

**Proposition 5.** *There exist a value of  $P$  such that all  $N$  groups contesting the elections is a political equilibrium as long as there does not exist a group  $j$  such that  $N_j > \sum_{i \setminus j} N_i$ .*

*Proof.* We know that there exist a value of  $P$  at which any formateur  $i$  can form a minimal winning coalition including itself. We need to show that there exist a value

at which in an equilibrium with all  $N$  groups forming parties, no one will deviate. The minimum loss (assuming party  $i$  is in government only if selected to be a formateur) to a party  $i$  by withdrawing is  $\frac{P}{N} - \delta + Eu_N - Eu_{N-i}$  ( $Eu_N - Eu_{N-i}$  denotes difference in expected utility in terms of ideology implemented if party  $i$  withdraws) which is  $> 0$  for large  $P$ . ■

## 7. MULTIDIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH THE BARON DIERMEIER MERLO'S EFFICIENT BARGAINING

So far we have done a one dimensional analysis. The models of BDM (earlier cit.) consider scenarios where there are two policy dimensions and characterize a 'symmetric case' with three parties which are equidistant from each other. While the two dimensional model they use can be analyzed in our framework as well, the one dimensional analysis allows us to look at the issue of 'connectedness'<sup>10</sup> of coalitions and develop comparative static results with regard to how equilibrium coalitions could change (from connected to disconnected or vice versa) as a function of seat share, ideological closeness and the value of the rents from office. In this section we provide a two dimensional characterization for a symmetric 3 party case which would also facilitate comparison with BDM. We also comment on the differences in the results that they obtain with our results for the same set of ideal points. Following BDM let the ideal points of party 1,2 and 3 be located on the vertices of an equilateral triangle with the coordinates being respectively  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$  and  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ . To make things comparable we assume that  $s_i = \frac{1}{3}$  for all  $i$ . We divide the regions by drawing lines from the party's ideal points which cross at the centroid of the triangle.

Following our choice of status quo, we have  $x_\phi = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6})$ . We will show that regardless of the identity of the formateur and the value of  $P$  minimal winning coalitions emerge. Further, the formateur is indifferent to the choice of a coalition partner. The intuition is simple enough. Any formateur is unable to form a minority government

---

<sup>10</sup>In multidimensional space, defining 'connectedness' itself is difficult.






FIGURE 4. 2 Dimensional Case

as the other partners prefer the status quo policy to the formateur's ideal point. However, any party asked by the formateur is willing to join as the compromised policy (which is midway between them) is preferred by both to the status quo. This goes through for any value of  $P$  as the seat shares are the same and there is thus no effect coming from wanting to take a smaller party. We formalize this in the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.** *Let there be three parties 1, 2, 3 of equal size and two policy dimensions  $x$  and  $z$ . Further, let the parties have policy positions given by  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$  and  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$  respectively. Let the utility function for party  $i$  be given by  $-\frac{1}{2}(y_1 - x_i)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(y_2 - z_i)^2 + \lambda P$ , where  $y = (y_1, y_2)$  is the implemented policy. Then, for any formateur  $i \in 1, 2, 3$  the equilibrium government will be minimum winning. Further,  $i$  will be indifferent to the choice of a coalition partner.*

*Proof.* As the parties are located symmetrically, we can consider the case where 1 is the formateur without loss of generality. In that case 1 can propose to either 2 or 3 and in each case the utility both to the formateur and the other party will be  $-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{P}{2}$ . Now the utility from the status quo which is  $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}\right)$  (to both parties) will be  $-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{P}{3} < -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{P}{2}$ . Hence this proposal will be accepted by whoever the formateur invites. Clearly, this also rules out supermajoritarian governments as the policy (in this three party case) is the same as the status quo policy. Now, we only need to check that a formateur cannot propose a minority government. This is also easy to see as the minority government yields a utility of  $-1$  for the two excluded parties which is less than  $-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{P}{3}$ . Hence, the minority government will be voted against by the two excluded parties. Notice, that the results are the same whoever is chosen by the formateur in the minimum winning coalition as the three parties are equidistant from each other. Hence, the formateur is indifferent to a choice of coalition partner. ■

This result contrasts with both the papers. In the static version of Diermeier and Merlo, only minority and surplus (supermajoritarian) coalitions occur. That is because of the particular status quo they take. Diermeier and Merlo constrain the status quo  $x_\phi$  to lie in the set  $((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3))$ . Baron and Diermeier (2001) have an arbitrary status quo, in general their status quo can lie in one of the six partitions of the triangle or even outside it. They get minimum winning coalitions except when the status quo is very outlying. The reason is that with an outlying status quo, coalition partners (in their framework) are willing to make large transfers to be in the government.

An important distinction in our approach as compared to BDM is worth mentioning. For large enough  $P$  we necessarily get minimal winning coalitions subject to the inclusion of the formateur. In other words when the value that parties place on rents (or directed transfers to their own groups) as compared to ideology, we converge to the prediction of Riker subject to inclusion of the formateur. On the other hand, the

choice of coalition in BDM is driven by the status quo and is independent of the value of  $P$  increasing. Hence, even when  $P$  is very large they do not converge to Riker's prediction. Both approaches have merit, however because of 'efficient bargaining' BDM are unable to analyze how coalition structure varies as the relative importance of ideology to 'rents from office' change. It is also worth noting that they also ignore any endowment constraints. They analyze  $P$  as perks which can be freely transferred but they do not analyze what happens when the value is small so that the transfers required for the efficient outcome cannot be made. In other words, their results would vary when the constraint becomes binding (i.e.  $P$  is low).

The arbitrary status quo chosen by BDM can be generated as the status quo in our model for different seat shares as long as it lies inside the triangle. However, all points inside are not really admissible for coalition formation as  $s_i > \frac{1}{3}$  for those points to be a status quo in our model. A comparison can of course be carried out for an arbitrary status quo in the BDM framework and compare it to what happens if we replace their assumption of full commitment and perfect transferability with the 'no commitment' assumption that we use in our model. To rule out issues of how  $P$  would be divided we set it to 0. We find that even when we consider the status quo chosen by BDM in the two papers we get different results if we assume no commitment. We first analyze the case. where the status quo is the policy of any one of the parties.. In that scenario, there are two cases to consider, one where the policy of the formateur  $i$  is the status quo and another where  $j \neq i$  is the formateur. In the first case it is easy to see that  $i$  proposes a minority government including only itself and all parties support it as they are indifferent to the government's policy and the status quo  $x_\phi$  which are the same. In the second case the proposer  $j$  also proposes a minority government and is supported by the party which is different to  $j$ 's policy and the status quo as they are equidistant. Hence, the results in the static version of their paper gives only minority governments under our assumptions.

Now, consider the more general case which It is easy to show that only minority or minimal winning governments can form. In each of these six regions (and assuming  $x_\phi \neq x_i$ ) if the party closest to the status quo is the proposer a minimal winning coalition forms and the proposer is indifferent to the identity of the other coalition partner.

## 8. ROBUSTNESS: HOW CRITICAL ARE THE ASSUMPTIONS?

In this section we study the robustness of the equilibrium to the assumptions we made about parliamentary rules (formateur selection procedure/ bargaining outcomes), voting behavior and inability of parties to commit to positions other than their ideal points. We will not deal with the last two issues except make brief remarks about each. However, we shall talk in some detail about two alternate ways to model legislative behavior which are common in the literature.

**8.1. Majority Rule game.** Instead of the formateur selection and coalition formation procedure suppose Parliament operated by voting on each issue by majority rule. In a single dimensional policy space this would lead to the Condorcet winner. If a single issue is what matters to the groups we get fairly sharp results for the whole political process. Consider the arbitrary  $N$  groups and assume a unique median exists. In that case we get the following results immediately.

**Proposition 7.** *If after elections the median of the candidates (representing different party positions) is implemented, at most two groups put up candidates in equilibrium.*

*Proof.* First, note that more than two candidates standing cannot be an equilibrium. To see this note that if three (or more) candidates contest in the second stage there will be at least one candidate who will be non pivotal i.e. whose dropping out will not affect the implemented policy. hence, it is not optimal for that candidate to contest.

We now show that there can be zero, one or two candidate equilibria.

If cost are very high it is easy to see that no candidate will stand.

To get one candidate equilibria first note that there exists a  $c$  for which if the candidate with ideal point 0 stands, for all  $\epsilon$ ,  $1-\epsilon$  will not find it worthwhile to contest and win. This implies that  $u(-1 + \epsilon) > P - c$ . This implies a continuum of one candidate equilibria where any candidate can stand in equilibrium. However, as  $c$  decreases the range decreases i.e. the marginal candidate who can stand uncontested moves towards the median. Further, as  $c$  decreases we can get two candidate equilibria symmetrically around the median.<sup>11</sup> ■

Notice, that this contrasts with Duverger's hypothesis that PR leads to a multiparty (more than two) system. Moreover, this range around which symmetric 2 candidate equilibria can occur also keeps shrinking.

**Proposition 8.** *As costs go to zero (and the median is unique) the unique equilibrium is for the median citizen to form a party.*

*Proof.* We need to consider only one candidate or two candidate equilibria.

Consider a 1 candidate equilibrium with a group  $x_i \neq x_m$  where  $x_m$  is the ideal point of the median candidate. WLOG, let  $x_i < x_m$ . Clearly, any  $j$  such that  $x_i < x_j \leq x_m$  can form a party and get more than half the votes. The net gain to group  $j$  is  $U(x_j) - U(x_i) + P - \delta > 0$  when  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ .

Now consider 2 candidate equilibria. We already know that they must be symmetric around the median. Let us denote the utility to the median group in these symmetric equilibria by  $U(x_s)$ . Since, the post election policy gets selected by majority rule, if the median group deviated and formed a party it will get its ideal point in stage 2. Hence, by deviating the median group gets  $U(x_m) - U(x_s) + P - \delta > 0$  when  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ .

---

<sup>11</sup>We have assumed that the group sizes are the same for convenience and they are at the same distance from their neighbors, hence 2 candidate equilibria are possible. Otherwise, as we have shown before we need to introduce voter uncertainty to get 2 candidate equilibria.

We already know that the median group being the only group to form a party is an equilibria. We have shown no other equilibria exists. Hence, as cost go to zero this is the unique equilibrium. ■

A comparison with plurality voting is quite interesting. For different cost levels we get one or two candidate equilibria as in the citizen candidate model with plurality voting. As cost decrease our prediction is extremely sharp under PR unlike plurality voting and it predicts a unique outcome. However, this seems hardly representative of how Parliament works. In particular, even if this were taken to be a way to make decisions we run into problems if the policy space is multidimensional. Different results obtain depending on how voting on different issues take place.

**8.2. Selection in order.** Another rule which is sometimes seen in formateur selection (and mandated by law in Greece) is selection in order analyzed by Austen Smith and Banks (earlier cit.). We now look at ex post coalitions under the ‘Selection in order’ rule (Austen Smith and Banks Protocol). Briefly, this involves a fixed order of asking parties to be the formateur-starting with the largest (in terms of vote shares) and then if the largest fails to form a government the second largest and so on. If all parties fail a national government is formed and the policy implemented is a status quo policy which is implemented by a caretaker government which enjoys no power.

We now present some results which contrast with random selection.

**Proposition 9.** *If power and entry costs are low the unique equilibrium of the political game is for the median group to be the unique party to form.*

*Proof.* We first show that if power is ‘low’ in the parliamentary game only the median party will be able to command a majority support. This is because any coalition will have an implemented policy  $x_j \neq x_m$  where  $x_m$  is the median party’s ideal point. Hence, a majority of members prefer  $x_m$  to  $x_j$ . Hence, the optimal coalition when the median party proposes is for it to propose a coalition consisting only of itself which

will be accepted. Therefore, the unique equilibrium of the parliamentary game is for  $x_m$  to get implemented.

Clearly, if this is the outcome in the legislature no other group will launch a party in the party formation stage. ■

**Proposition 10.** *If the status quo policy  $x_\phi$  is implemented by a caretaker government which enjoys no power, that government will not form in equilibrium.*

*Proof.* We are required to show that at least 1 party can form a successful coalition when it is the formateur. Notice that as  $x_\phi$  lies between  $x_1$  and  $x_n$  a coalition of the median party is preferred by a majority to the status quo. So there exists a feasible coalition which dominates the status quo. ■

We notice that this result contrasts with that under proportional selection. In fact, while caretaker governments are not unheard of it is usually the case that even though governments may not form at the first attempt it is almost always the case that some coalition comes to power. The one shot version of the random recognition protocol by cutting off the game in one stage does not allow for any other party to get a chance to propose leading to this ‘extreme’ situation. A further insight that we get is the following.

**Corollary 1.** *An extreme party cannot form a minority government.*

*Proof.* To see this notice that the middle party’s minority government is preferred by a majority of members. Thus there exists at least one coalition which Hence, parties commanding a majority of seats will not accept the proposal of a minority government by an extreme party. ■

A couple of remarks at this point are in order.

*Remark 1.* Minimal winning ,minority and surplus governments are possible in equilibrium. Moreover, the coalitions may be connected or disconnected.

The trade-offs involved are similar to the proportional selection model.

*Remark 2.* The first party may not be able to form a coalition. Hence, delays may occur in equilibrium. However, it is worth noting that for every equilibrium involving delay there is an equilibrium without delay which leads to the same government.

Notice that the formateur may not be able to form a government including itself and hence the offer it makes to other parties to join a coalition with it will be turned down. However, an equivalent outcome can be achieved by the formateur proposing a coalition excluding itself which lies in  $W \cap Y$ .

Some points of difference are worth noting.

First, in the random recognition protocol we may get caretaker governments as well as minority governments. Selection in order never leads to a caretaker government in equilibrium. Moreover, only a median party can form a minority government and that too only when power is very low. At the empirical level, while selection in order is not borne out, it is worth investigating if the predictions of the one period random recognition model used in recent papers by BDM which we have adopted here as well captures important features of the data. Clearly, finite periods of these protocols change the results but it is still not clear what institutional details correspond to this random recognition protocol. Thus, when the largest party is not selected we need to see if this is because a party other than the largest has indicated that it has the support of other parties which would enable it to form a government. Another important thing to look at is how well the ‘random recognition’ model fits the data after accounting for an incumbency bias i.e. where the last party in power is first asked to form the government. The ‘selection in order’ protocol is something that can be observed and legislated on (as in Greece). However, there is certainly a lot to be said for this ‘random selection’ procedure in terms of capturing the inherent uncertainty that is associated with the political environment in government formation



in most countries. Moreover, this random selection model of BDM we have analyzed under modified assumptions leads to fairly interesting results.

Clearly, there are issues which are important in the political process which we have left out. For instance, we do not consider the issue of strategic voting. As long as representation per se is important, there are less reasons for voters to behave strategically under PR than under plurality. There is enough evidence in the recent runoff in the French Presidential elections to believe that voters behaved sincerely.<sup>12</sup> Further work is certainly needed in this area. We have embedded a citizen candidate model in the institutional framework of coalition government formation. Thus, we do not allow parties to credibly commit to positions other than their own. Given that parties may have access to a credible commitment device (often repeated play ensures that, see Alesina (earlier cit.)). it would be interesting to see if this would lead to more divergence or more convergence of party policies. This remains a fascinating area of future research.

## 9. EMPIRICAL RELEVANCE AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have presented a model of parliamentary democracy under PR which predicts political coalition formation as a function of party size and the relative importance of power to ideology. Moreover, by endogenizing the political entry stage we have shown how our legislature is consistent with a party formation game under the assumption of sincere voting. Our coalition and policy making stages in particular give rise to certain predictions which contrast with those existing in the literature. In particular, two limiting cases arise, one when parties care only for ideology and another where the rents of office become very large. We find that in the limit Riker's size principle does apply subject to inclusion of the formateur and coalitions are minimal winning

---

<sup>12</sup>Candidates to the left of Jospin received enough votes which, if combined, could have ensured Chirac's defeat.

(though not minimum size) when the value of rents from office become very big. However, because we explicitly consider party size, ‘disconnected coalitions’ can occur even with parties which are purely driven by ideology. Thus, when parties care only for ideology they may leave out an ideologically close partner because a large party can tilt the policy too close towards its ideal point because of its increased bargaining strength.

We can usefully compare our paper to the papers by BDM which use efficient bargaining and perfect commitment within the coalition. Given any coalition, our model predicts a policy orientation that is skewed towards larger parties while BDM predicts that party size will be irrelevant. This stems from the bargaining procedure in BDM giving equal weights to all parties. With different weights in proportion to size, our results in this regard will match. The more fundamental difference comes from the assumption of no commitment which leads to substantive differences in predictions for coalitions for a given a composition of the legislature. Empirically, we do not believe that perfect commitment or the converse are observed. However, our results are robust to some degree of commitment. We believe that apart from the usefulness of analyzing the polar opposite of BDM, no commitment at the coalition formation stage is often a good approximation-this implies that the proposer cannot make a take it or leave it offer such that anything in the status quo’s majority win set would be accepted. This seems consistent with the observed phenomenon of power sharing that is seen in coalitions around the world. As we had pointed out earlier Laver and Schofield (earlier cit.) state that cabinet seats being allotted roughly in proportion to seat shares is one of the most observed empirical regularities of coalition governments. They also provide a discussion for why at the coalition formation stage the manifestos written are not binding and that actual policies are a result of intricate bargaining inside the coalition.<sup>13</sup> Hence, both as an approximation to what happens

---

<sup>13</sup>See also Laver and Shepsle (1995).

in the real world and in terms of predictive power we argue that no commitment is not a bad assumption.

Another issue that we address, but which BDM cannot (because of their assumption of efficient bargaining) is the ideological connectedness of coalitions as functions of power. We are not aware of too many studies which look at this systematically. A paper by Indridason (2001) examines the nature of disconnected coalitions in the context of a few northern European countries and tentatively concludes that this is related to whether the office seeking model is more appropriate or whether the coalition is governed by ideological considerations. Our model makes a set of predictions which are more precise and can provide a useful basis for further case studies along these lines. In fact, another recent paper by Indridason (2003)<sup>14</sup> presents some empirical tests on ‘clientelism’ and coalition structure. While his ‘clientelism’ may not be the only way to think about we call political power, it provides an interesting set of hypothesis about how coalition structure depends on the degree of ‘office seeking’ motives of politicians. It is certainly worth looking at some of our predictions using the same dataset.

An extremely important issue is the formateur selection procedure. Diermeier and Merlo (2001) provide the first systematic empirical study but they study only the first stage i.e. they look at whether it is the case that the first party is always asked to form the government against the alternate that this is roughly in proportion to seat shares and find empirical support for the latter. However, some things are worth further investigation-when the party elected to be the formateur is not the largest it is worth looking at whether they have informally waived the right to form the government. Moreover, whether it is the case that the party selected to be the formateur has an informal pre electoral understanding with a set of parties which together can win a majority in parliament. Also, given an incumbency bias in selection we need to check

---

<sup>14</sup>Kalandrakis (2002) also does an empirical analysis of coalitions though his empirical analysis is restricted to minority governments.

how well the two alternatives perform after controlling for that. Another issue worth pursuing is to see how well proportional selection fits the data after controlling for the number of parties. These issues together with a more specific procedure incorporating institutional details of bargaining among parties inside a coalition will lead the way to a more complete understanding of formateur selection considerations as well as why delays in bargaining over government formation occur.

**References:**

**AMY, D. (2000)**, 'Real Choices/New Voices: The Case for Proportional Representation Elections in the United States', Columbia University Press.

**ANSOLABEHERE S., J. SNYDER, A. STRAUSS and M. TING (2003)**, 'Voting Weights and Formateur Advantages in the Formation of Coalitional Governments' (mimeo)

**AUSTEN-SMITH, D. and J. BANKS (1988)**, 'Elections, Coalitions, and Legislative Outcomes', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, No. 2, June, pp. 405-422.

**AXELROD, R., (1970)**, 'The conflict of interest', Chicago, Marham.

**BARBER, K. (1999)**, 'A Right to Representation :Proportional Election Systems for the Twenty-first Century' Ohio State University Press.

**BARON, D. and J. FERREJOHN (1989)**, 'Bargaining in Legislatures', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 4, December, pp.1181-1206.

**BARON, D. (1989)**, 'A non cooperative theory of legislative coalitions', *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol.33, No.4 pp. 1048-84.

————— **(1991)**, 'A Spatial Bargaining Theory of Government Formation in Parliamentary Systems', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, No. 1, March, pp. 137-164.

—————**(1993)**, 'Government Formation and Endogenous Parties', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 1, March, pp. 34-47.

—————**(1998)**, 'Comparative Dynamics of parliamentary Governments' *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.92, No.3, September, pp. 553-609.

————— **and D. DIERMEIER (2001)**, 'Elections, Governments, and Parliaments under Proportional Representation', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 116 Issue 3 August, pp. 933-967

**BESLEY, T. and S. COATE (1997)**, 'An Economic Model of Representative Democracy', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 112, No. 1, pp. 85-106

**BRAMS, S., M. JONES and D. KILGOUR (2001)** ‘Single peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions’ , Journal of Theoretical Politics (forthcoming)

**BROWNE, E. and J. FRENDEIS (1980)**, ‘Allocating Coalition Payoffs by Conventional Norm: An Assessment of the Evidence from Cabinet Coalition Situations’ American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 24, No. 4. November, pp. 753-768.

**BLOCH, F. (1997)** ‘Noncooperative Models of Coalition Formation in Games with Spillovers, Chapter 10 in New Directions in the Economic Theory of the Environment (C. Carraro and D. Siniscalco eds.), Cambridge University Press.

**DHILLON, A. (2003)** ‘Political Parties and Coalition Formation’ mimeo (forthcoming in ”Group Formation in Economics: Networks, Clubs and Coalitions”, edited by G Demange and M. Wooders, forthcoming, Cambridge University Press.

**DIERMEIER, D., M. KEANE and A. MERLO (2002)** ‘A Political Economy Model of Congressional Careers’, UPenn Working Paper.

**DIERMEIER, D. and A. MERLO (2000)**, ‘Government Turnover in Parliamentary Democracies’, Journal of Economic Theory, Vol. 94, September, pp. 46-79.

————— (2001), ‘An Empirical Investigation of Coalitional Bargaining Procedures’, UPenn Working Paper.

**DOWNS A. (1957)** ‘An Economic Theory of Democracy’ New York: Harper Collins.

**DUTTA, B., M. JACKSON and M. LE BRETON (2001)**, ‘Strategic candidacy’, Econometrica, Vol.69, No.4, pp.1013-1037

**DUVERGER, M. (1964)**, ‘Political parties: their organization and activity in the modern state’, 3rd edition, Methuen Press, London.

**FEDDERSEN, T. (1992)**, ‘A Voting Model implying Duverger’s Law and Positive Turnout’, American Journal of Political Science, Vol.36, No.4, pp. 938-962.

**FEY, M. (1997)**, ‘Stability and Coordination in Duverger’s Law: A Formal Model of Preelection Polls and Strategic Voting’, American Political Science Review, Vol.91, pp. 135-147.

**GALLAGHER K., K. LAVER and P. MAIR (1995)**, 'Representative Government in Modern Europe', New York Mc Graw Hill.

**HAMLIN A. and M. HJORTLUND (2000)**, 'Proportional Representation with Citizen Candidates', *Public Choice*, Vol. 103, No.3, pp. 205-230.

**INDRIDASON, I. (2001)**, 'A Theory of Coalitions and Clientelism: Coalition Politics in Iceland 1945-2000.', Working Paper, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University.

-----**(2003)**. 'Coalitions and Clientelism: A Comparative study', mimeo

**JACKSON M. and A. MOSELLE (2002)** 'Coalition and Party Formation in a Legislative Voting Game', *Journal of Economic Theory*, Volume 103, No.1, pp.49-87

**KALANDRAKIS, T. (2002)** 'Minority Governments: Ideology and Office', mimeo

**KONISHI H. and D. Ray (2003)** 'Coalition formation as a dynamic process' *Journal of Economic Theory*, 110, 1-41

**LAVER, K. and N. SCHOFIELD (1990)**, 'Multiparty Governments: The Politics of Coalitions in Europe', Oxford University Press.

**LAVER, K. and K.SHEPSLE (1996)** 'Making and Breaking Governments: Cabinets and Legislatures in Parliamentary Democracies. New York: Cambridge UP.

**LEVY, G. (2002)** 'A Model of Political Parties' *Journal of Economic Theory* (forthcoming)

**LUPIA, A. and KAARE S. (1995)** 'Coalition termination and the strategic timing of parliamentary elections', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.89, pp. 648-665.

**MORELLI, M. (2001)**, 'Party Formation and Policy Outcomes Under Different Electoral Systems', Working paper.

**ORTUÑO-ORTÍN, I. (1997)**, 'A spatial model of political competition and proportional representation', *Social Choice and Welfare*, Vol.14, No. 3, pp. 427-438.

**OSBORNE, M. and A. SLIVINSKI (1996)**, 'A Model of Political Competition with Citizen-Candidates', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 111, No. 1, February, pp. 65-96.

**OSBORNE, M. and R. TOURKY (2002)**, 'Party formation in collective decision-making', Working paper.

**PALFREY, T. (1989)**, 'A Mathematical Proof of Duverger's Law' in P.C. Ordeshook (ed.) *Models of Strategic Choice in Politics*, University of Michigan Press.

**RAY, D. and R. VOHRA (1997)** 'Equilibrium Binding Agreements' *Journal of Economic Theory* 73, 30-78

-----**(1999)** 'A Theory of Endogenous Coalition Structures', *Games and Economic Behavior*, 26, 286-336

**RIKER, W. (1962)** 'The Theory of Political Coalitions' New Haven, Yale University.

**RIVIERE, A. (2000)**, 'Citizen Candidacy, Party Formation and Duverger's Law', Discussion Paper, Royal Holloway, University of London

**ROEMER, J. (2001)**, 'Political competition: Theory and Applications' (Harvard University Press)



## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2003

PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</i> : <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM</i> : <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO</i> : <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI</i> : <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI</i> : <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)</i> : <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix)</i> : <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix)</i> : <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u>
Coalition		
Theory	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
Network		
PRIV	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u>
PRIV	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTIAINEN (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx)</i> : <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAIEV (lx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx)</i> : <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx)</i> : <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL</i> : <u>On the Relationship between R&amp;D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAMI</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&amp;D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS</i> (Ixi): <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (Ixi): <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH</i> (Ixi): <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (Ixi): <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF</i> (Ixi): <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Tajji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI</i> (Ixi): <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ</i> (Ixi): <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH</i> (Ixi): <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ</i> (Iix): <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI</i> (Iix): <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC</i> (Ixi): <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA</i> (Ixi): <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE</i> (Ixi): <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA</i> (Ixi): <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA</i> (Ixi): <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN</i> (Ixi): <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>
KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE</i> (Ixi): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixi): <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>

IEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u></i>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO: <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u></i>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u></i>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE: <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u></i>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u></i>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI: <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u></i>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCGHER and Sjak SMULDERS: <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&amp;D investments</u></i>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u></i>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u></i>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u></i>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u></i>
IEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA: <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u></i>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI: <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u></i>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER: <u>The <math>\gamma</math>-Core and Coalition Formation</u></i>
IEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO: <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u></i>
IEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u></i>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR: <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u></i>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES (Ixxiii): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u></i>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD (Ixxiii): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u></i>
KNOW	100.2003	<i>Alaknanda PATEL (Ixxiii): <u>Cultural Diversity and Conflict in Multicultural Cities</u></i>
KNOW	101.2003	<i>David MAY (Ixxiii): <u>The Struggle of Becoming Established in a Deprived Inner-City Neighbourhood</u></i>
KNOW	102.2003	<i>Sébastien ARCAND, Danielle JUTEAU, Sirma BILGE, and Francine LEMIRE (Ixxiii) : <u>Municipal Reform on the Island of Montreal: Tensions Between Two Majority Groups in a Multicultural City</u></i>
CLIM	103.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>China and the Evolution of the Present Climate Regime</u></i>
CLIM	104.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Emissions Trading Regimes and Incentives to Participate in International Climate Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	105.2003	<i>Anil MARKANDYA and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE: <u>Ancillary Benefits of Climate Policy</u></i>
NRM	106.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Management Challenges for Multiple-Species Boreal Forests</u></i>
NRM	107.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Threshold Effects in Coral Reef Fisheries</u></i>
SIEV	108.2003	<i>Sara ANIYAR (Ixiv): <u>Estimating the Value of Oil Capital in a Small Open Economy: The Venezuela's Example</u></i>
SIEV	109.2003	<i>Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA and Karl-Göran MÄLER(Ixiv): <u>Evaluating Projects and Assessing Sustainable Development in Imperfect Economies</u></i>
NRM	110.2003	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Catarina ROSETA-PALMA(Ixiv): <u>Instabilities and Robust Control in Fisheries</u></i>
NRM	111.2003	<i>Charles PERRINGS and Brian WALKER (Ixiv): <u>Conservation and Optimal Use of Rangelands</u></i>
ETA	112.2003	<i>Jack GOODY (Ixiv): <u>Globalisation, Population and Ecology</u></i>
CTN	113.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties</u></i>
CTN	114.2003	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Decentralized Job Matching</u></i>
CTN	115.2003	<i>Hideo KONISHI and M. Utku UNVER: <u>Credible Group Stability in Multi-Partner Matching Problems</u></i>
CTN	116.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for the Room-Mates Problem</u></i>
CTN	117.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for a Generalized Marriage Problem</u></i>
CTN	118.2003	<i>Marita LAUKKANEN: <u>Transboundary Fisheries Management under Implementation Uncertainty</u></i>
CTN	119.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Social Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Arbitrary Games with Incomplete Information: Some First Results</u></i>
CTN	120.2003	<i>Gianluigi VERNASCA: <u>Dynamic Price Competition with Price Adjustment Costs and Product Differentiation</u></i>
CTN	121.2003	<i>Myrna WOODERS, Edward CARTWRIGHT and Reinhard SELTEN: <u>Social Conformity in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	122.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>On Equilibrium in Pure Strategies in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	123.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Games with Many Players</u></i>
	<b>1000</b>	<b>Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u></b>

## NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u></i>
ETA	2.2004	<i>Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u></i>
PRA	3.2004	<i>Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u></i>
ETA	4.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u></i>
ETA	5.2004	<i>Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u></i>
CCMP	6.2004	<i>Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u></i>
PRA	7.2004	<i>Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u></i>
PRA	8.2004	<i>Wolfgang AUSSENEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u></i>
PRA	9.2004	<i>Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u></i>
PRA	10.2004	<i>Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u></i>
PRA	11.2004	<i>Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u></i>
PRA	12.2004	<i>Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u></i>
PRA	13.2004	<i>Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u></i>
PRA	14.2004	<i>Gadi FIBICH, Arieh GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u></i>
PRA	15.2004	<i>Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u></i>
PRA	16.2004	<i>Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	17.2004	<i>Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&amp;D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u></i>
NRM	18.2004	<i>Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u></i>
SIEV	19.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u></i>
NRM	20.2004	<i>Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u></i>
NRM	21.2004	<i>Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u></i>
NRM	22.2004	<i>Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u></i>
NRM	23.2004	<i>Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u></i>
NRM	24.2004	<i>Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u></i>
NRM	25.2004	<i>Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u></i>
NRM	26.2004	<i>Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u></i>
NRM	27.2004	<i>Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u></i>
CSRM	28.2004	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u></i>
NRM	29.2004	<i>Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u></i>
NRM	30.2004	<i>Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u></i>
CCMP	31.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u></i>
CCMP	32.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u></i>
CTN	33.2004	<i>Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u></i>
KTHC	34.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u></i>
KTHC	35.2004	<i>Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u></i>
KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u></i>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u></i>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u></i>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE: <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u></i>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST: <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u></i>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u></i>

KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI</i> : <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>
CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRHUELA-VILLAR</i> : <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL</i> (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLESMARK THORSEN</i> (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU</i> (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE</i> (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transitional Economy</u>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG</i> : <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI</i> : <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF</i> (lxvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN</i> (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE</i> (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON</i> : <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN</i> : <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI</i> (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO</i> : <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, Györgyi PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ</i> (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN</i> (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK</i> (lxvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> : <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA</i> : <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO</i> : <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER</i> : <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA</i> : <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u>
CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERA and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Álex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (lxx): <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES</i> (lxx): <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u>

CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE</i> (lxx): <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO</i> (lxx): <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u>
CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT</i> (lxx): <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN</i> (lxx): <u>Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement</u>
CTN	84.2004	<i>Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ</i> (lxx): <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT</i> (lxx): <u>Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players</u>
IEM	86.2004	<i>Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power</u>
KTHC	87.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income</u>
CCMP	88.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT</i> : <u>Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey</u>
IEM	89.2004	<i>A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE</i> : <u>Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?</u>
GG	90.2004	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Agreements and Technology Policy</u>
PRA	91.2004	<i>Sergei IZMALKOV</i> (lxx): <u>Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction</u>
KTHC	92.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI</i> : <u>Cities and Cultures</u>
KTHC	93.2004	<i>Massimo DEL GATTO</i> : <u>Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution</u>
CCMP	94.2004	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON</i> : <u>Equilibrium with a Market of Permits</u>
CCMP	95.2004	<i>Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply</u>
CCMP	96.2004	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise</u>
CTN	97.2004	<i>Gustavo BERGANTIÑOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA</i> : <u>Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form</u>
CTN	98.2004	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK</i> : <u>Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation</u>

- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) 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
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- (lxiv) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Theoretical Topics in Ecological Economics”, organised by the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics - ICTP, the Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei – FEEM Trieste, February 10-21, 2003
- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003
- (lxx) This paper was presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

**2003 SERIES**

<b>CLIM</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>GG</b>	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SIEV</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KNOW</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
<b>IEM</b>	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
<b>CSR</b>	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
<b>PRIV</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>CTN</b>	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

**2004 SERIES**

<b>CCMP</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>GG</b>	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SIEV</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KTHC</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
<b>IEM</b>	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
<b>CSR</b>	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
<b>PRA</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>CTN</b>	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>