

Casajus, André; Hüttner, Frank

Working Paper

Null players, solidarity, and the egalitarian Shapley values

Working Paper, No. 113

Provided in Cooperation with:

University of Leipzig, Faculty of Economics and Management Science

Suggested Citation: Casajus, André; Hüttner, Frank (2012) : Null players, solidarity, and the egalitarian Shapley values, Working Paper, No. 113, Universität Leipzig, Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät, Leipzig

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/62126>

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.

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät
Faculty of Economics and Management Science

Working Paper, No. 113

André Casajus / Frank Hüttner

**Null players, solidarity, and the
egalitarian Shapley values**

August 2012

ISSN 1437-9384

Null players, solidarity, and the egalitarian Shapley values

André Casajus^{†‡§} and Frank Huettner^{‡§}

(February 2012, August 16, 2012, 16:45)

Abstract

The Shapley value certainly is the most eminent single-point solution concept for TU-games. In its standard characterization, the null player property indicates the absence of solidarity among the players. First, we replace the null player property by a new axiom that guarantees null players non-negative payoffs whenever the grand coalition's worth is non-negative. Second, the equal treatment property is strengthened into desirability. This way, we obtain a new characterization of the class of egalitarian Shapley values, i.e., of convex combinations of the Shapley value and the equal division solution. We complement this result by characterizations of the class of generalized consensus values, i.e., of convex combinations of the Shapley value and the equal surplus division solution.

Key Words: Solidarity; egalitarian Shapley value; equal division value; desirability; generalized consensus value

JEL code: C71, D60

AMS subject classification: 91A12

[†]corresponding author, mail@casajus.de

[‡]LSI Leipziger Spieltheoretisches Institut, Leipzig, Germany

[§]Professur für Mikroökonomik, Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät, Universität Leipzig, Grimmaische Str. 12, 04009 Leipzig, Germany.

1. Introduction

A cooperative game with transferable utility (TU-game) consists of a non-empty and finite set of players, N , and a coalition function, $v \in \{f \mid f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(\emptyset) = 0\}$, which describes the worths $v(S)$ that can be generated by individuals that are willing to cooperate within coalitions $S \subseteq N$. Assuming that the grand coalition eventually forms, the question arises how to distribute the grand coalition's worth, $v(N)$. The most prominent single-point solution concept that answers this question certainly is the Shapley value (Shapley, 1953).

The Shapley value obeys marginality (Young, 1985), i.e., a player's payoff depends only on his *own* productivity measured by marginal contributions. Hence, the Shapley value does not allow for solidarity between the players. This can also be seen from the fact that unproductive players (null players) are assigned zero payoffs. Therefore, we depart from the standard characterization of the Shapley value by dropping the null player property¹ in order to create space for solidarity (as e.g. Nowak and Radzik (1994), van den Brink (2007), and van den Brink, Funaki and Ju (2011)).

Given that we no longer require the payoffs of null players to be zero, the nature of solidarity manifests itself in the way null players are treated. Since null players are completely unproductive, their "selfish" payoffs, i.e., their Shapley payoffs are zero. Consequently, any non-zero payoff must be due to solidarity among the players. Note that Nowak and Radzik (1994), van den Brink (2007), and Chameni-Nembua (2012) pursue another approach. Instead of dealing with the treatment of null players, they consider other notions of "null players". In fact, they identify certain types of players that are supposed to obtain a zero payoff.

We suggest the *null player in a productive environment property* that requires a null player to obtain a non-negative payoff whenever the worth generated by the grand coalition is non-negative. This property rules out that one could find oneself in a wealthy society that drains out the unproductive players in order to make other players better off. We feel that this would stretch our sense of solidarity too far. Obviously, this property is implied by the null player property and therefore it is satisfied by the Shapley value.

Our main result states that the null player in a productive environment property together with additivity, efficiency, and desirability already characterizes the class of egalitarian Shapley values introduced by Joosten (1996). Note that desirability

¹Ruiz, Valenciano and Zarzuelo (1998), Driessen and Radzik (2003), Hernandez-Lamonedada, Juarez and Sanchez-Sanchez (2008), Chameni-Nembua and Andjiga (2008), and Chameni-Nembua (2012) provide formulae for the class of efficient, linear, and symmetric values.

demands more productive players to obtain no lower payoffs than less productive ones (Maschler and Peleg, 1966). Other characterizations of this class have been given by Joosten (1996), Malawski (2004), and van den Brink et al. (2011). We complement this result by characterizations of the class of generalized consensus values (Ju, Borm and Ruys, 2007).

This paper is organized as follows.

Section 2 provides further definitions and notations.

Section 3 provides our characterization of the egalitarian Shapley values.

Section 4 provides our characterizations of the generalized consensus values.

The appendix provides all the proofs.

2. Basic definitions and notation

The set of all coalition functions on N is denoted by $\mathbb{V}(N)$. Since we work within a fixed player set, it is dropped as an argument. In particular, we address $v \in \mathbb{V}$ as a game. Subsets of N are called **coalitions**, and $v(S)$ is called the worth of coalition S . For $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the coalition functions $v + w \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\alpha \cdot v \in \mathbb{V}$ are given by $(v + w)(S) = v(S) + w(S)$ and $(\alpha \cdot v)(S) = \alpha \cdot v(S)$ for all $S \subseteq N$. For $T \subseteq N$, $T \neq \emptyset$, the game $u_T \in \mathbb{V}$, $u_T(S) = 1$ if $T \subseteq S$ and $u_T(S) = 0$ for $T \not\subseteq S$, is called a **unanimity game**. For $T \subseteq N$, $T \neq \emptyset$, the game $e_T \in \mathbb{V}$, $e_T(S) = 1$ if $T = S$ and $e_T(S) = 0$ for $T \neq S$, is called a **standard game**. Any $v \in \mathbb{V}$ can be uniquely represented by unanimity games,

$$v = \sum_{T \subseteq N: T \neq \emptyset} \lambda_T(v) \cdot u_T, \quad \lambda_T(v) := \sum_{S \subseteq T: S \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{|T|-|S|} \cdot v(S).$$

A game $v \in \mathbb{V}$ is called **zero-normalized** if $v(\{i\}) = 0$ for all $i \in N$; for $v \in \mathbb{V}$, the **associated zero-normalized game** $v^0 \in \mathbb{V}$ is given by

$$v^0 := v - \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{\{i\}} \cdot u_{\{i\}} \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq N. \quad (1)$$

Player $i \in N$ is called a **null player** in $v \in \mathbb{V}$ if $v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S) = 0$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{i\}$; players $i, j \in N$ are called **symmetric** in $v \in \mathbb{V}$ if $v(S \cup \{i\}) = v(S \cup \{j\})$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{i, j\}$.

A **value** on N is an operator φ that assigns a payoff vector $\varphi(v) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to any $v \in \mathbb{V}$. The **equal division value**, ED, is given by

$$\text{ED}_i(v) := \frac{v(N)}{|N|}, \quad \text{for all } i \in N.$$

The **equal surplus division value** (Driessen and Funaki, 1991), ES, is given by

$$\text{ES}_i(v) := v(\{i\}) + \frac{v(N) - \sum_{j \in N} v(\{j\})}{|N|}, \quad \text{for all } i \in N.$$

The **Shapley value** (Shapley, 1953), Sh , given by

$$\text{Sh}_i(v) := \sum_{T \subseteq N: i \in T} \frac{\lambda_T(v)}{|T|}, \quad \text{for all } i \in N,$$

is characterized by the axioms **E**, **N**, [**A** or **L**], and [**ET** or **S**] below.

Efficiency, E. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$, $\sum_{i \in N} \varphi_i(v) = v(N)$.

Null player, N. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and every $i \in N$, who is a null player in v , $\varphi_i(v) = 0$.

Additivity, A. For all $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$, $\varphi(v + w) = \varphi(v) + \varphi(w)$.

Linearity, L. For all $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi(v + w) = \varphi(v) + \varphi(w)$ and $\varphi(\lambda \cdot v) = \lambda \cdot \varphi(v)$.

Equal treatment, ET. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and $i, j \in N$, who are symmetric in $v \in \mathbb{V}$, $\varphi_i(v) = \varphi_j(v)$.

Symmetry, S. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$, $i \in N$, and all bijections $\pi : N \rightarrow N$, $\varphi_{\pi(i)}(v \circ \pi^{-1}) = \varphi_i(v)$.

3. Treatment of null players in a productive environment

The ‘‘mixture’’ of the Shapley value and the equal division value, Sh^α , $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$\text{Sh}_i^\alpha(v) = \alpha \cdot \text{Sh}_i(v) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \text{ED}_i(v), \quad \text{for all } i \in N \text{ and all } v \in \mathbb{V}. \quad (2)$$

For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, the value Sh^α is said to be an egalitarian Shapley value (Joosten, 1996). The egalitarian Shapley values obey efficiency, symmetry, and additivity. For $\alpha \neq 1$, they do not satisfy the null player property.² But, they satisfy the following weaker one.

Null player in a productive environment, NPE. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and $i \in N$ such that i is a null player in v and $v(N) \geq 0$, we have $\varphi_i(v) \geq 0$.

This property guarantees null players to obtain a non-negative payoff whenever the worth generated by the grand coalition is non-negative. This is quite plausible. For we consider deviations from the Shapley payoffs as an expression of a certain degree of solidarity among players. When the whole society is productive, $v(N) \geq 0$, then it is not *necessary* that any player ends up with a negative payoff. In particular, null players need not receive a negative payoff. Since they do not do any harm to society, they actually should not obtain negative payoffs. It turns out that this

²Instead, each Sh^α , $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the α -egalitarian null player property, stating that $\varphi_i(v) = (1 - \alpha) \cdot v(N) / |N|$ for all null players i in v (Joosten, 1996). In a sense, the parameter α determines the extent of solidarity among the players.

axiom has strong implication on the nature of solidarity among the players within the class of efficient, linear, and symmetric values; one is almost down to the class of egalitarian Shapley values.

Proposition 1. *A TU-value φ satisfies efficiency, linearity, the equal treatment property, and the null player in a productive environment property if and only if there is an $\alpha \leq 1$ such that $\varphi = \text{Sh}^\alpha$.*

The null player in a productive environment property in combination with standard axioms does not rule out that a higher productivity translates into lower payoffs. For example, the TU-value $\text{Sh}^{-1} = 2 \cdot \text{ED} - \text{Sh}$ satisfies this weak requirement on null players as well as additivity, efficiency and the equal treatment property. Yet, for $1, 2 \in N$, we have $\text{Sh}_1^{-1}(u_{\{1\}}) = \frac{2}{|N|} - 1 < \frac{2}{|N|} = \text{Sh}_2^{-1}(u_{\{1\}})$ even though player 1 is more productive than player 2 in $u_{\{1\}}$. In a sense, the transfers from the productive player, 1, to the unproductive one, 2, are too high. We feel that this is also not in line with sound solidarity considerations. In order to rule out such awkward transfers, we invoke the following axiom.

Desirability³, D. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and all $i, j \in N$, if $v(S \cup \{i\}) \geq v(S \cup \{j\})$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{i, j\}$, then $\varphi_i(v) \geq \varphi_j(v)$.

Desirability compares two players in a game and ensures that their payoffs are not opposite to their productivities measured by marginal contributions. Replacing the equal treatment property by desirability does not only rule out adverse incentives, but also allows to weaken linearity into additivity.⁴ Next, we state the main result of this paper, a characterization of the class of egalitarian Shapley values.

Theorem 2. *A TU-value φ satisfies additivity, efficiency, desirability, and the null player in a productive environment property if and only if there exists an $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi = \text{Sh}^\alpha$.*

Our characterization is non-redundant. The solution φ^{A} , given by $\varphi^{\text{A}}(v) = \text{Sh}(v)$ if $v(N) < 1$ and $\varphi^{\text{A}}(v) = \text{ED}(v)$ if $v(N) \geq 1$, satisfies all axioms but additivity. The solution given by $\varphi_i^{\text{E}}(v) = 0$ for all $i \in N$ and $v \in \mathbb{V}$ satisfies all axioms but efficiency. The solution given by $\varphi^{\text{D}} = \text{Sh}^{-1}$ satisfies all axioms but desirability. The solution given by $\varphi^{\text{NPE}} = \text{Sh}^2$ satisfies all axioms but the null player in a productive environment property.

³Desirability is also known as local monotonicity (e.g. van den Brink et al., 2011).

⁴Employing that fact that there are functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ but $f(x \cdot y) \neq x \cdot f(y)$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ (Macho-Stadler, Pérez-Castrillo and Wettstein, 2007), it is easy to show that there are solutions that obey additivity, efficiency, and symmetry but not linearity.

Recently, van den Brink et al. (2011) characterize the class of egalitarian Shapley values employing efficiency, linearity, symmetry, and weak monotonicity below.

Weak monotonicity, M^- . For all $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$ and all $i \in N$ such that $v(N) \geq w(N)$ and $v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S) \geq w(S \cup \{i\}) - w(S)$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{i\}$, we have $\varphi_i(v) \geq \varphi_i(w)$.

This axiom is a relaxation of the well-known strong monotonicity axiom (Young, 1985) in the sense that its implication only is supposed to hold if $v(N) \geq w(N)$. Their characterization and ours are related as follows: van den Brink et al. (2011, Lemma 4.2) show that symmetry and weak monotonicity imply desirability. Moreover, since linearity determines the payoffs in a null game to be zero, it is immediate that linearity and weak monotonicity entail the null player in a productive environment property. Hence, we also provide an alternative proof of their characterization (van den Brink et al., 2011, Theorem 4.3).

4. Equal surplus value and the generalized consensus value

The “mixture” of the Shapley value and the equal surplus division value, Con^α , $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$\text{Con}_i^\alpha(v) = \alpha \cdot \text{Sh}_i(v) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \text{ES}_i(v), \quad \text{for all } i \in N \text{ and all } v \in \mathbb{V}.$$

For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, the values Con^α are called **generalized consensus values** (Ju et al., 2007).

Inspired by the previous section and Casajus and Huettner (2012), we provide a new characterization of the class of generalized consensus values. To this end, we suggest two new axioms, weak surplus monotonicity and null player in a surplus environment property.

Weak surplus monotonicity, SM^- . For all $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$ and all $i \in N$ such that $v^0(N) \geq w^0(N)$ and $v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S) \geq w(S \cup \{i\}) - w(S)$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{i\}$, we have $\varphi_i(v) \geq \varphi_i(w)$.

This axiom is a cousin of weak monotonicity and a relaxation of the well-known strong monotonicity axiom (Young, 1985). While weak monotonicity restricts strong monotonicity to situations where the overall worth generated does not decrease, weak surplus monotonicity refers to situations where the overall surplus does not decrease. Note that the equal division value violates weak surplus monotonicity for $|N| > 1$. For $1, 2 \in N$, $\text{ED}_1(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ but $\text{ED}_1(-u_{\{2\}}) = -1/|N|$ although $\mathbf{0}^0(N) = -u_{\{2\}}^0(N)$ and 1 is a null player in both in $\mathbf{0}$ and $-u_{\{2\}}$. This counterexample ($-u_{\{2\}}$) also shows that the equal division value fails the next property, which guarantees null

players a non-negative payoff whenever the surplus generated by the grand coalition is non-negative.

Null player in a surplus environment, NSE. For all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and $i \in N$ such that i is a null player in v and $v^0(N) \geq 0$, we have $\varphi_i(v) \geq 0$.

Replacing null player in a productive environment property with the null player in a surplus environment property or with weak surplus monotonicity in Theorem 2 yields a characterization of the class of generalized consensus values.

Theorem 3. *A TU-value φ satisfies additivity, efficiency, desirability, and either (i) the null player in a surplus environment property or (ii) weak surplus monotonicity if and only if there exists an $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi = \text{Con}^\alpha$.*

5. Appendix

We prepare the proof of Proposition 1 by a lemma which states that every efficient, linear, and symmetric value can be interpreted as follows: First, the Shapley payoffs for unanimity games u_T are taxed at a rate $\tau_{|T|}$ depending on the cardinality of T . Second, the tax revenue is distributed equally among all players.

Lemma 4. *A TU-value φ on N satisfies efficiency, linearity, and symmetry if and only if there exists an $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{|N|-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|-1}$ such that $\varphi = \zeta^\tau$ where*

$$\zeta_i^\tau(v) := \sum_{T \subseteq N, T \ni i} \left(\frac{1 - \tau_{|T|}}{|T|} \right) \cdot \lambda_T(v) + \sum_{T \subseteq N, T \neq \emptyset} \frac{\tau_{|T|}}{|N|} \cdot \lambda_T(v) + \frac{\lambda_N(v)}{|N|} \quad (3)$$

for all $i \in N$ and $v \in \mathbb{V}$.

Proof. It is clear that ζ^τ satisfies **E**, **L**, and **S** for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|-1}$. Now, let the TU-value φ satisfy **E**, **L**, and **S**. By **L**,

$$\varphi(v) = \sum_{T \subseteq N, T \neq \emptyset} \lambda_T \cdot \varphi(u_T), \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V}. \quad (4)$$

Note that by **E** and **S** we have $\varphi_i(u_N) = 1/|N|$ for all $i \in N$.

For $t \in \{1, \dots, |N| - 1\}$, set $\tau_t := |N| \cdot \varphi_i(u_T)$ for some $T \subseteq N$ such that $|T| = t$ and $i \in N \setminus T$. By **S**, $\varphi_i(u_T) = \varphi_j(u_S)$ for all $S, T \subseteq N$ such that $|S| = |T| > 0$ and $i \in N \setminus T$ and $j \in N \setminus S$. Therefore, τ_t do neither depend on the choice of $T \subseteq N$ nor on the choice of $i \in N \setminus T$.

Given $\varphi_j(u_T) = \tau_{|T|}/|N|$ for all $j \in N \setminus T$ and all $T \neq N$, we may infer from **E** and **S** that

$$\varphi_i(u_T) = \frac{1 - \sum_{j \in N \setminus T} \varphi_j(u_T)}{|T|} = \frac{\tau_{|T|}}{|N|} + \frac{1 - \tau_{|T|}}{|T|} \quad \text{for all } i \in T.$$

In view of (4), we have $\varphi = \zeta^\tau$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. It is clear that Sh^α , $\alpha \leq 1$, inherits **L**, **E**, **ET**, and **NPE** from Sh and **ED**. Now, let the TU-value φ satisfy **L**, **E**, **ET**, and **NPE**. By Malawski (2008, Theorem 2), φ meets **S**. By Lemma 4, there is some $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|-1}$ such that $\varphi = \zeta^\tau$ given by (3).

Note that we have $\zeta^\tau = \text{Sh}$ for $\tau = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\zeta^\tau = \text{ED}$ for $\tau = (1, \dots, 1)$. Since ζ^τ is linear in τ , we have $\text{Sh}^\alpha = \zeta^\tau$ for $\tau = (1 - \alpha, \dots, 1 - \alpha)$. Therefore, we have to show that $\tau = (c, \dots, c)$ for some $c \geq 0$. For $|N| = 1$, nothing is to show.

Suppose, $\tau_t < 0$ for some $t \in \{1, \dots, |N| - 1\}$. Consider $T \subsetneq N$, $|T| = t$. Then, $i \in N \setminus T$ is a null player in u_T and $u_T(N) = 1 \geq 0$. Yet, $\zeta_i^\tau(u_T) = \frac{\tau_t}{|N|} < 0$. Hence, $\tau_t \geq 0$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, |N| - 1\}$.

Suppose now, $\tau_t > \tau_{t-1}$ for some $t \in \{2, \dots, |N| - 1\}$. Consider $T \subsetneq N$, $|T| = t$ and

$$v = -u_T + \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{j \in T} u_{T \setminus \{j\}}.$$

Then, $i \in N \setminus T$ is a null player in v and $v(N) = 0$. Yet,

$$\zeta_i^\tau(v) = \frac{-\tau_t + \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{j \in T} \tau_{t-1}}{|N|} = \frac{\tau_{t-1} - \tau_t}{|N|} < 0,$$

a contradiction to **NPE**. Hence, $\tau_t \leq \tau_{t-1}$ for all $t = 2, \dots, |N| - 1$. Analogously, one shows $\tau_t \geq \tau_{t-1}$. This concludes the proof. \square

We prepare the proof of Theorem 2 by a lemma showing that **E**, **A**, and **D** imply **L**.

Lemma 5. *Every TU-value φ that satisfies efficiency, additivity, and desirability is linear.*

Proof. Let φ meet **E**, **A**, and **D**. It suffices to show $\varphi(\lambda \cdot v) = \lambda \cdot \varphi(v)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $v \in \mathbb{V}$. First, we establish that for all $v, w \in \mathbb{V}$ and $i, j \in N$ such that

$$v(K \cup \{i\}) - v(K \cup \{j\}) \geq w(K \cup \{i\}) - w(K \cup \{j\}) \quad \text{for all } K \subseteq N \setminus \{i, j\}, \quad (5)$$

we have $\varphi_i(v) - \varphi_j(v) \geq \varphi_i(w) - \varphi_j(w)$.

By (5), we have $(v - w)(K \cup \{i\}) \geq (v - w)(K \cup \{j\})$ for all $K \subseteq N \setminus \{i, j\}$, i.e., $v - w$, i , and j meet the hypothesis of **D**. This entails

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i(v) - \varphi_j(v) &= \varphi_i(w + (v - w)) - \varphi_j(w + (v - w)) \\ &\stackrel{\mathbf{A}}{=} \varphi_i(w) - \varphi_j(w) + \varphi_i(v - w) - \varphi_j(v - w) \stackrel{\mathbf{D}}{\geq} \varphi_i(w) - \varphi_j(w) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed above.

It is well known that **A** implies homogeneity for rational scalars, i.e., $\varphi(\varrho \cdot v) = \varrho \cdot \varphi(v)$ for all $\varrho \in \mathbb{Q}$. By **A**, it suffices to consider coalition functions of the form $\lambda \cdot u_T$, $T \subseteq N$, $T \neq \emptyset$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

Let $\lambda > 0$ and $T \subseteq N$, $T \neq \emptyset$. Since the rational numbers are dense in the reals, there are rational sequences $(\lambda_k^-)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda_k^+)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $0 < \lambda_k^- \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_k^+$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k^- = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k^+ = \lambda$. For all $i \in T$, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k^- \cdot (u_T(K \cup \{i\}) - u_T(K \cup \{j\})) &\leq \lambda \cdot (u_T(K \cup \{i\}) - u_T(K \cup \{j\})) \\ &\leq \lambda_k^+ \cdot (u_T(K \cup \{i\}) - u_T(K \cup \{j\})) \end{aligned}$$

for all $K \subseteq N \setminus \{i, j\}$ and $j \in N$. Hence, $i, j, \lambda_k^- \cdot u_T$, and $\lambda \cdot u_T$ (or $\lambda \cdot u_T$ and $\lambda_k^+ \cdot u_T$) satisfy the condition stated in (5). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_i(\lambda_k^- \cdot u_T) - \varphi_j(\lambda_k^- \cdot u_T)) &\leq \varphi_i(\lambda \cdot u_T) - \varphi_j(\lambda \cdot u_T) \\ &\leq (\varphi_i(\lambda_k^+ \cdot u_T) - \varphi_j(\lambda_k^+ \cdot u_T)). \end{aligned}$$

Since **A** implies homogeneity for rational scalars, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k^- \cdot (\varphi_i(u_T) - \varphi_j(u_T)) &\leq \varphi_i(\lambda \cdot u_T) - \varphi_j(\lambda \cdot u_T) \\ &\leq \lambda_k^+ \cdot (\varphi_i(u_T) - \varphi_j(u_T)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit and by assumption, we thus have

$$\varphi_i(\lambda \cdot u_T) - \varphi_j(\lambda \cdot u_T) = \lambda \cdot (\varphi_i(u_T) - \varphi_j(u_T)).$$

Summing up over $j \in N$ gives

$$|N| \cdot \varphi_i(\lambda \cdot u_T) - \sum_{\ell \in N} \varphi_\ell(\lambda \cdot u_T) = |N| \cdot \lambda \cdot \varphi_i(u_T) - \lambda \cdot \sum_{\ell \in N} \varphi_\ell(u_T).$$

Using **E**, one obtains $\varphi_i(\lambda \cdot u_T) = \lambda \cdot \varphi_i(u_T)$. Analogously, this can be seen for $i \in N \setminus T$ or $\lambda < 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. It is clear that Sh^α , $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ inherits **A**, **E**, **D**, and **NPE** from Sh . Let the TU-value φ satisfy **A**, **E**, **D**, and **NPE**. By Lemma 5, φ meets **L**. Since **D** implies **ET**, Proposition 1 already entails $\varphi = \text{Sh}^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \leq 1$. Suppose $0 > \alpha$. This entails

$$\varphi_i^\alpha(u_{N \setminus \{i\}}) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{n} > \frac{1 - \alpha}{n} + \frac{\alpha}{n - 1} = \varphi_j^\alpha(u_{N \setminus \{i\}}) \quad \text{for } i \in N, j \in N \setminus \{i\}.$$

Yet, the marginal contributions of i are not greater than those of j in $u_{N \setminus \{i\}}$, contradicting **D**. Hence $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. It is clear that Con^α , $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ inherits **A**, **E**, **D**, **NSE** and **SM**⁻ from Sh and Con . Let the TU-value φ satisfy **A**, **E**, **D**, and **NSE**. By Lemma 5, φ meets **L**. Moreover, **D** implies **ET**. Thus, Malawski (2008, Theorem 2) implies that φ meets **S**.

For all $i \in N$ we have $(u_{\{i\}})^0 = \mathbf{0} = (-u_{\{i\}})^0$. Since $\mathbf{0}(N) = 0$, **NSE** implies $\varphi_j(u_{\{i\}}) \geq 0$ and $\varphi_j(-u_{\{i\}}) \geq 0$ for all $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$. By **L**, $\varphi_j(-u_{\{i\}}) = -\varphi_j(u_{\{i\}})$. Hence, $\varphi_j(u_{\{i\}}) = 0$. By **E**, $\varphi_i(u_{\{i\}}) = 1$. Therefore, $\varphi(u_{\{i\}}) = \text{Sh}(u_{\{i\}}) = \text{ED}(u_{\{i\}}) = \text{Con}^\alpha(u_{\{i\}})$ for all $i \in N$ and all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, from (1) and **L** follows

$$\varphi_i(v) = \varphi_i(v^0) + v(\{i\}) \quad \text{for } i \in N \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{V}. \quad (6)$$

Note that on the class of zero-normalized games **NSE** becomes **NPE**. Further, one easily checks that the proof of Proposition 1 runs through smoothly within the class of zero-normalized games. Hence, $\varphi(v^0) = \text{Sh}^\alpha(v^0)$ for some $\alpha \leq 1$ and all $v \in \mathbb{V}$. Using (6), one infers $\varphi_i(v) = \text{Sh}_i^\alpha(v^0) + v(\{i\}) = \text{Con}^\alpha(v)$ for some $\alpha \leq 1$.

For $|N| \leq 2$, $\text{Sh} = \text{ED} = \text{Con}^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $0 > \alpha$ contradicts **D** for $|N| \geq 3$. Suppose $0 > \alpha$. Then,

$$\varphi_i^\alpha(u_{N \setminus \{i\}}) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{n} > \frac{1 - \alpha}{n} + \frac{\alpha}{n - 1} = \varphi_j^\alpha(u_{N \setminus \{i\}}) \quad \text{for } i \in N, j \in N \setminus \{i\}.$$

Yet, the marginal contributions of i are not greater than those of j in $u_{N \setminus \{i\}}$, contradicting **D**. Hence $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. This proves the first part of the theorem.

Concerning (ii), it suffices to show that **L** and **SM**⁻ imply **NSE**. Consider $v \in \mathbb{V}$ and $i \in N$ such that i is a null player in v and $v^0(N) \geq 0$. This entails $v^0(N) \geq \mathbf{0}^0(N)$ and $v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S) \geq \mathbf{0}(S \cup \{i\}) - \mathbf{0}(S)$. By **SM**⁻, we have $\varphi_i(v) \geq \varphi_i(\mathbf{0})$. Finally, **L** implies $\varphi_i(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and we are done. \square

References

- van den Brink, R. (2007). Null or nullifying players: The difference between the Shapley value and equal division solutions, *Journal of Economic Theory* **136**: 767–775.
- van den Brink, R., Funaki, Y. and Ju, Y. (2011). Reconciling marginalism with egalitarianism-consistency, monotonicity, and implementation of egalitarian Shapley value, *Social Choice and Welfare* (forthcoming). doi: 10.1007/s00355-011-0634-2.
- Casajus, A. and Huettner, F. (2012). Null players, solidarity, and the egalitarian Shapley values, *working paper*, Universität Leipzig, Germany.
- Chameni-Nembua, C. (2012). Linear efficient and symmetric values for TU-games: Sharing the joint gain of cooperation, *Games and Economic Behavior* **74**: 431–433.
- Chameni-Nembua, C. and Andjiga, N. G. (2008). Linear, efficient and symmetric values for TU-games, *Economics Bulletin* **3**(71): 1–10.
- Driessen, T. and Funaki, Y. (1991). Coincidence of and collinearity between game theoretic solutions, *OR Spectrum* **13**(1): 15–30.
- Driessen, T. and Radzik, T. (2003). Extensions of Hart and Mas-Colell’s consistency to efficient, linear, and symmetric values for TU-games, in L. A. Petrosjan and D. W. K. Yeung (eds), *ICM Millenium lectures on Games*, Springer, Heidelberg, Germany, pp. 147–166. Volume dedicated to the International Congress of Mathematicians, Game Theory and Applications Satellite Conference, August 14–17, 2002, Qingdao, China.

- Hernandez-Lamonedá, L., Juárez, R. and Sánchez-Sánchez, F. (2008). Solutions without dummy axiom for TU cooperative games, *Economics Bulletin* **3**(1): 1–9.
- Joosten, R. (1996). *Dynamics, equilibria and values*, PhD thesis, Maastricht University, The Netherlands.
- Ju, Y., Borm, P. and Ruys, P. (2007). The consensus value: a new solution concept for cooperative games, *Social Choice and Welfare* **28**: 685–703.
- Macho-Stadler, I., Pérez-Castrillo, D. and Wettstein, D. (2007). Sharing the surplus: An extension of the shapley value for environments with externalities, *Journal of Economic Theory* **135**(1): 339–356.
- Malawski, M. (2004). Procedural values for cooperative games, *working paper*, Institute of Computer Science PAS, Warsaw, Poland.
- Malawski, M. (2008). A note on equal treatment and symmetry of values, *working paper*, Institute of Computer Science PAS, Warsaw, Poland.
- Maschler, M. and Peleg, B. (1966). A characterization, existence proof and dimension bounds for the kernel of a game, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **18**(2): 289–328.
- Nowak, A. S. and Radzik, T. (1994). A solidarity value for n -person transferable utility games, *International Journal of Game Theory* **23**: 43–48.
- Ruiz, L. M., Valenciano, F. and Zarzuelo, J. M. (1998). The family of least square values for transferable utility games, *Games and Economic Behavior* **24**: 109–130.
- Shapley, L. S. (1953). A value for n -person games, in H. Kuhn and A. Tucker (eds), *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, Vol. II, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 307–317.
- Young, H. P. (1985). Monotonic solutions of cooperative games, *International Journal of Game Theory* **14**: 65–72.

Universität Leipzig

Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät

Nr. 1	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Stock Options wegen oder gegen Shareholder Value? Vergütungsmodelle für Vorstände und Führungskräfte 04/1998
Nr. 2	Thomas Lenk / Volkmar Teichmann	Bei der Reform der Finanzverfassung die neuen Bundesländer nicht vergessen! 10/1998
Nr. 3	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Gedanken über Führen – Dienen – Verantworten 11/1998
Nr. 4	Kristin Wellner	Möglichkeiten und Grenzen kooperativer Standortgestaltung zur Revitalisierung von Innenstädten 12/1998
Nr. 5	Gerhardt Wolff	Brauchen wir eine weitere Internationalisierung der Betriebswirtschaftslehre? 01/1999
Nr. 6	Thomas Lenk / Friedrich Schneider	Zurück zu mehr Föderalismus: Ein Vorschlag zur Neugestaltung des Finanzausgleichs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Bundesländer 12/1998
Nr. 7	Thomas Lenk	Kooperativer Föderalismus – Wettbewerbsorientierter Föderalismus 03/1999
Nr. 8	Thomas Lenk / Andreas Mathes	EU – Osterweiterung – Finanzierbar? 03/1999
Nr. 9	Thomas Lenk / Volkmar Teichmann	Die fiskalischen Wirkungen verschiedener Forderungen zur Neugestaltung des Länderfinanzausgleichs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Eine empirische Analyse unter Einbeziehung der Normenkontrollanträge der Länder Baden-Württemberg, Bayern und Hessen sowie der Stellungnahmen verschiedener Bundesländer 09/1999
Nr. 10	Kai-Uwe Graw	Gedanken zur Entwicklung der Strukturen im Bereich der Wasserversorgung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung kleiner und mittlerer Unternehmen 10/1999
Nr. 11	Adolf Wagner	Materialien zur Konjunkturforschung 12/1999
Nr. 12	Anja Birke	Die Übertragung westdeutscher Institutionen auf die ostdeutsche Wirklichkeit – ein erfolg-versprechendes Zusammenspiel oder Aufdeckung systematischer Mängel? Ein empirischer Bericht für den kommunalen Finanzausgleich am Beispiel Sachsen 02/2000
Nr. 13	Rolf H. Hasse	Internationaler Kapitalverkehr in den letzten 40 Jahren – Wohlstandsmotor oder Krisenursache? 03/2000
Nr. 14	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Unternehmensführung (Corporate Governance) und Hauptversammlung 04/2000
Nr. 15	Adolf Wagner	Materialien zur Wachstumsforschung 03/2000
Nr. 16	Thomas Lenk / Anja Birke	Determinanten des kommunalen Gebührenaufkommens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Bundesländer 04/2000
Nr. 17	Thomas Lenk	Finanzwirtschaftliche Auswirkungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichtsurteils zum Länderfinanzausgleich vom 11.11.1999 04/2000
Nr. 18	Dirk Büttel	Continuous linear utility for preferences on convex sets in normal real vector spaces 05/2000
Nr. 19	Stefan Dierkes / Stephanie Hanrath	Steuerung dezentraler Investitionsentscheidungen bei nutzungsabhängigem und nutzungsunabhängigem Verschleiß des Anlagenvermögens 06/2000
Nr. 20	Thomas Lenk / Andreas Mathes / Olaf Hirschfeld	Zur Trennung von Bundes- und Landeskompetenzen in der Finanzverfassung Deutschlands 07/2000
Nr. 21	Stefan Dierkes	Marktwerte, Kapitalkosten und Betafaktoren bei wertabhängiger Finanzierung 10/2000
Nr. 22	Thomas Lenk	Intergovernmental Fiscal Relationships in Germany: Requirement for New Regulations? 03/2001
Nr. 23	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Stock Options – Aktuelle Fragen Besteuerung, Bewertung, Offenlegung 03/2001

Nr. 24	Thomas Lenk	Die „kleine Reform“ des Länderfinanzausgleichs als Nukleus für die „große Finanzverfassungs-reform“? 10/2001
Nr. 25	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Biotechnologie im Spannungsfeld von Menschenwürde, Forschung, Markt und Moral Wirtschaftsethik zwischen Beredsamkeit und Schweigen 11/2001
Nr. 26	Thomas Lenk	Finanzwirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Neuregelung des bundestaatlichen Finanzausgleichs – Eine allokoative und distributive Wirkungsanalyse für das Jahr 2005 11/2001
Nr. 27	Sören Bär	Grundzüge eines Tourismusmarketing, untersucht für den Südraum Leipzig 05/2002
Nr. 28	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Der Deutsche Corporate Governance Kodex: Zuwahl (comply) oder Abwahl (explain)? 06/2002
Nr. 29	Adolf Wagner	Konjunkturtheorie, Globalisierung und Evolutionsökonomik 08/2002
Nr. 30	Adolf Wagner	Zur Profilbildung der Universitäten 08/2002
Nr. 31	Sabine Klinger / Jens Ulrich / Hans-Joachim Rudolph	Konjunktur als Determinante des Erdgasverbrauchs in der ostdeutschen Industrie? 10/2002
Nr. 32	Thomas Lenk / Anja Birke	The Measurement of Expenditure Needs in the Fiscal Equalization at the Local Level Empirical Evidence from German Municipalities 10/2002
Nr. 33	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Die Lust am Fliegen Eine Parabel auf viel Corporate Governance und wenig Unternehmensführung 11/2002
Nr. 34	Udo Hielscher	Wie reich waren die reichsten Amerikaner wirklich? (US-Vermögensbewertungsindex 1800 – 2000) 12/2002
Nr. 35	Uwe Haubold / Michael Nowak	Risikoanalyse für Langfrist-Investments Eine simulationsbasierte Studie 12/2002
Nr. 36	Thomas Lenk	Die Neuregelung des bundesstaatlichen Finanzausgleichs auf Basis der Steuerschätzung Mai 2002 und einer aktualisierten Bevölkerungsstatistik 12/2002
Nr. 37	Uwe Haubold / Michael Nowak	Auswirkungen der Renditeverteilungsannahme auf Anlageentscheidungen Eine simulationsbasierte Studie 02/2003
Nr. 38	Wolfgang Bernhard	Corporate Governance Kodex für den Mittel-Stand? 06/2003
Nr. 39	Hermut Kormann	Familienunternehmen: Grundfragen mit finanzwirtschaftlichen Bezug 10/2003
Nr. 40	Matthias Folk	Launhardtsche Trichter 11/2003
Nr. 41	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Corporate Governance statt Unternehmensführung 11/2003
Nr. 42	Thomas Lenk / Karolina Kaiser	Das Prämienmodell im Länderfinanzausgleich – Anreiz- und Verteilungsmittlungen 11/2003
Nr. 43	Sabine Klinger	Die Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnung des Haushaltsektors in einer Matrix 03/2004
Nr. 44	Thomas Lenk / Heide Köpping	Strategien zur Armutsbekämpfung und –vermeidung in Ostdeutschland: 05/2004
Nr. 45	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Sommernachtsfantasien Corporate Governance im Land der Träume. 07/2004
Nr. 46	Thomas Lenk / Karolina Kaiser	The Premium Model in the German Fiscal Equalization System 12/2004
Nr. 47	Thomas Lenk / Christine Falken	Komparative Analyse ausgewählter Indikatoren des Kommunalwirtschaftlichen Gesamt-ergebnisses 05/2005
Nr. 48	Michael Nowak / Stephan Barth	Immobilienanlagen im Portfolio institutioneller Investoren am Beispiel von Versicherungsunternehmen Auswirkungen auf die Risikosituation 08/2005

Nr. 49	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Familiengesellschaften – Quo Vadis? Vorsicht vor zu viel „Professionalisierung“ und Ver-Fremdung 11/2005
Nr. 50	Christian Milow	Der Griff des Staates nach dem Währungsgold 12/2005
Nr. 51	Anja Eichhorst / Karolina Kaiser	The Institutional Design of Bailouts and Its Role in Hardening Budget Constraints in Federations 03/2006
Nr. 52	Ullrich Heilemann / Nancy Beck	Die Mühen der Ebene – Regionale Wirtschaftsförderung in Leipzig 1991 bis 2004 08/2006
Nr. 53	Gunther Schnabl	Die Grenzen der monetären Integration in Europa 08/2006
Nr. 54	Hermut Kormann	Gibt es so etwas wie typisch mittelständige Strategien? 11/2006
Nr. 55	Wolfgang Bernhardt	(Miss-)Stimmung, Bestimmung und Mitbestimmung Zwischen Juristentag und Biedenkopf-Kommission 11/2006
Nr. 56	Ullrich Heilemann / Annika Blaschzik	Indicators and the German Business Cycle A Multivariate Perspective on Indicators of Ifo, OECD, and ZEW 01/2007
Nr. 57	Ullrich Heilemann	“The Soul of a new Machine” zu den Anfängen des RWI-Konjunkturmodells 12/2006
Nr. 58	Ullrich Heilemann / Roland Schuhr / Annika Blaschzik	Zur Evolution des deutschen Konjunkturzyklus 1958 bis 2004 Ergebnisse einer dynamischen Diskriminanzanalyse 01/2007
Nr. 59	Christine Falken / Mario Schmidt	Kameralistik versus Doppik Zur Informationsfunktion des alten und neuen Rechnungswesens der Kommunen Teil I: Einführende und Erläuternde Betrachtungen zum Systemwechsel im kommunalen Rechnungswesen 01/2007
Nr. 60	Christine Falken / Mario Schmidt	Kameralistik versus Doppik Zur Informationsfunktion des alten und neuen Rechnungswesens der Kommunen Teil II Bewertung der Informationsfunktion im Vergleich 01/2007
Nr. 61	Udo Hielscher	Monti della città di firenze Innovative Finanzierungen im Zeitalter Der Medici. Wurzeln der modernen Finanzmärkte 03/2007
Nr. 62	Ullrich Heilemann / Stefan Wappler	Sachsen wächst anders Konjunkturelle, sektorale und regionale Bestimmungsgründe der Entwicklung der Bruttowertschöpfung 1992 bis 2006 07/2007
Nr. 63	Adolf Wagner	Regionalökonomik: Konvergierende oder divergierende Regionalentwicklungen 08/2007
Nr. 64	Ullrich Heilemann / Jens Ulrich	Good bye, Professir Phillips? Zum Wandel der Tariflohndeterminanten in der Bundesrepublik 1952 – 2004 08/2007
Nr. 65	Gunther Schnabl / Franziska Schobert	Monetary Policy Operations of Debtor Central Banks in MENA Countries 10/2007
Nr. 66	Andreas Schäfer / Simone Valente	Habit Formation, Dynastic Altruism, and Population Dynamics 11/2007
Nr. 67	Wolfgang Bernhardt	5 Jahre Deutscher Corporate Governance Kodex Eine Erfolgsgeschichte? 01/2008
Nr. 68	Ullrich Heilemann / Jens Ulrich	Viel Lärm um wenig? Zur Empirie von Lohnformeln in der Bundesrepublik 01/2008
Nr. 69	Christian Groth / Karl-Josef Koch / Thomas M. Steger	When economic growth is less than exponential 02/2008
Nr. 70	Andreas Bohne / Linda Kochmann	Ökonomische Umweltbewertung und endogene Entwicklung peripherer Regionen Synthese einer Methodik und einer Theorie 02/2008
Nr. 71	Andreas Bohne / Linda Kochmann / Jan Slavik / Lenka Slaviková	Deutsch-tschechische Bibliographie Studien der kontingenten Bewertung in Mittel- und Osteuropa 06/2008

Nr. 72	Paul Lehmann / Christoph Schröter-Schlaack	Regulating Land Development with Tradable Permits: What Can We Learn from Air Pollution Control? 08/2008
Nr. 73	Ronald McKinnon / Gunther Schnabl	China's Exchange Rate Impasse and the Weak U.S. Dollar 10/2008
Nr. 74	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Managervergütungen in der Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise Rückkehr zu (guter) Ordnung, (klugem) Maß und (vernünftigem) Ziel? 12/2008
Nr. 75	Moritz Schularick / Thomas M. Steger	Financial Integration, Investment, and Economic Growth: Evidence From Two Eras of Financial Globalization 12/2008
Nr. 76	Gunther Schnabl / Stephan Freitag	An Asymmetry Matrix in Global Current Accounts 01/2009
Nr. 77	Christina Ziegler	Testing Predictive Ability of Business Cycle Indicators for the Euro Area 01/2009
Nr. 78	Thomas Lenk / Oliver Rottmann / Florian F. Woitek	Public Corporate Governance in Public Enterprises Transparency in the Face of Divergent Positions of Interest 02/2009
Nr. 79	Thomas Steger / Lucas Bretschger	Globalization, the Volatility of Intermediate Goods Prices, and Economic Growth 02/2009
Nr. 80	Marcela Munoz Escobar / Robert Holländer	Institutional Sustainability of Payment for Watershed Ecosystem Services. Enabling conditions of institutional arrangement in watersheds 04/2009
Nr. 81	Robert Holländer / WU Chunyou / DUAN Ning	Sustainable Development of Industrial Parks 07/2009
Nr. 82	Georg Quaas	Realgrößen und Preisindizes im alten und im neuen VGR-System 10/2009
Nr. 83	Ulrich Heilemann / Hagen Findeis	Empirical Determination of Aggregate Demand and Supply Curves: The Example of the RWI Business Cycle Model 12/2009
Nr. 84	Gunther Schnabl / Andreas Hoffmann	The Theory of Optimum Currency Areas and Growth in Emerging Markets 03/2010
Nr. 85	Georg Quaas	Does the macroeconomic policy of the global economy's leader cause the worldwide asymmetry in current accounts? 03/2010
Nr. 86	Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger / Timo Trimborn	Quantifying Optimal Growth Policy 06/2010
Nr. 87	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Corporate Governance Kodex für Familienunternehmen? Eine Widerrede 06/2010
Nr. 88	Philipp Mandel / Bernd Süßmuth	A Re-Examination of the Role of Gender in Determining Digital Piracy Behavior 07/2010
Nr. 89	Philipp Mandel / Bernd Süßmuth	Size Matters. The Relevance and Hicksian Surplus of Agreeable College Class Size 07/2010
Nr. 90	Thomas Kohstall / Bernd Süßmuth	Cyclic Dynamics of Prevention Spending and Occupational Injuries in Germany: 1886-2009 07/2010
Nr. 91	Martina Padmanabhan	Gender and Institutional Analysis. A Feminist Approach to Economic and Social Norms 08/2010
Nr. 92	Gunther Schnabl / Ansgar Belke	Finanzkrise, globale Liquidität und makroökonomischer Exit 09/2010
Nr. 93	Ulrich Heilemann / Roland Schuhr / Heinz Josef Münch	A "perfect storm"? The present crisis and German crisis patterns 12/2010
Nr. 94	Gunther Schnabl / Holger Zemanek	Die Deutsche Wiedervereinigung und die europäische Schuldenkrise im Lichte der Theorie optimaler Währungsräume 06/2011
Nr. 95	Andreas Hoffmann / Gunther Schnabl	Symmetrische Regeln und asymmetrisches Handeln in der Geld- und Finanzpolitik 07/2011
Nr. 96	Andreas Schäfer / Maik T. Schneider	Endogenous Enforcement of Intellectual Property, North-South Trade, and Growth 08/2011
Nr. 97	Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger / Timo Trimborn	Dynamically Optimal R&D Subsidization 08/2011

Nr. 98	Erik Gawel	Political drivers of and barriers to Public-Private Partnerships: The role of political involvement 09/2011
Nr. 99	André Casajus	Collusion, symmetry, and the Banzhaf value 09/2011
Nr. 100	Frank Hüttner / Marco Sunder	Decomposing R^2 with the Owen value 10/2011
Nr. 101	Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger / Timo Trimborn	The Macroeconomics of TANSTAAFL 11/2011
Nr. 102	Andreas Hoffmann	Determinants of Carry Trades in Central and Eastern Europe 11/2011
Nr. 103	Andreas Hoffmann	Did the Fed and ECB react asymmetrically with respect to asset market developments? 01/2012
Nr. 104	Christina Ziegler	Monetary Policy under Alternative Exchange Rate Regimes in Central and Eastern Europe 02/2012
Nr. 105	José Abad / Axel Löffler / Gunther Schnabl / Holger Zemanek	Fiscal Divergence, Current Account and TARGET2 Imbalances in the EMU 03/2012
Nr. 106	Georg Quaas / Robert Köster	Ein Modell für die Wirtschaftszweige der deutschen Volkswirtschaft: Das "MOGBOT" (Model of Germany's Branches of Trade)
Nr. 107	Andreas Schäfer / Thomas Steger	Journey into the Unknown? Economic Consequences of Factor Market Integration under Increasing Returns to Scale 04/2012
Nr. 108	Andreas Hoffmann / Björn Urbansky	Order, Displacements and Recurring Financial Crises 06/2012
Nr. 109	Finn Marten Körner / Holger Zemanek	On the Brink? Intra-euro area imbalances and the sustainability of foreign debt 07/2012
Nr. 110	André Casajus / Frank Hüttner	Nullifying vs. dummifying players or nullified vs. dummified players: The difference between the equal division value and the equal surplus division value 07/2012
Nr. 111	André Casajus	Solidarity and fair taxation in TU games 07/2012
Nr. 112	Georg Quaas	Ein Nelson-Winter-Modell der deutschen Volkswirtschaft 08/2012
Nr. 113	André Casajus / Frank Hüttner	Null players, solidarity, and the egalitarian Shapley values 08/2012