Expectation Formation Rules and the Core of Partition Function Games*

Francis Bloch[†] Anne van den Nouweland[‡]

May 22, 2014

Abstract

This paper proposes axiomatic foundations of expectation formation rules, by which deviating players anticipate the reaction of external players in a partition function game. The projection rule is the only rule satisfying subset consistency and responsiveness to the original partition of non-deviating players. It is also the only rule satisfying subset consistency, independence of the original partition of deviating players, and coherence of expectations. Exogenous rules are the only rules satisfying subset consistency and independence of the original partition, and the pessimistic rule is the only rule generating superadditive coalitional games.

`JEL Classification Numbers: C71, C70`

`Keywords: Partition Function Games, Core, Expectation Formation, Axiomatization`

---

*We are grateful to Faye Diamantoudi, David Wettstein, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments.

†Corresponding author. Department of Economics, Universite Paris I and Paris School of Economics, 106-112 Boulevard de l'Hopital, 75647 Paris CEDEX 13. Email francis.bloch@univ-paris1.fr.

‡Department of Economics 435 PLC, 1285 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1285, USA. Email annev@uoregon.edu.

1 Introduction

The objective of this paper is to provide axiomatic foundations for extensions of the core to games in partition function form. It is well known that, if one moves beyond the highly competitive, zero-sum game environment of van Neumann and Morgenstern (1944), the worth of a coalition cannot be defined independently of the coalition structure formed by other players. The natural description of a cooperative environment is then a game in partition function form (Thrall and Lucas (1963)) specifying for each coalition structure and each coalition embedded in that coalition structure, the worth that the coalition can achieve. Ray (2007) contains a thorough discussion of the difference between partition function games and coalitional games, and references to the early literature on partition functions.

Unfortunately, in games in partition function form, the dominance relation which supports the core cannot be defined unambiguously. When a coalition of players deviates, the payoff they expect to obtain depends on the way they expect external players to react to the deviation. This ambiguity has long been recognized – at least since Aumann (1967) – and various definitions of the core have been proposed corresponding to different specifications of the expectations of deviating players on the reaction of external players. For example, Hart and Kurz (1983) describe the α and β cores, based on pessimistic beliefs where players expect external players to organize in such a way that they minimize the payoffs of deviating players, and the γ and δ cores, where players anticipate that coalitions which have been left by some members of the deviating group either disintegrate into singletons, or stick together.[1] Chander and Tulkens (1997) and de Clippel and Serrano (2008) focus attention on a model where deviating coalitions expect all other players to remain singletons whereas Maskin (2003) and McQuillin (2009) suppose that they expect all other players to form the complement. Shenoy (1979) assumes that deviating players are optimistic and anticipate that external players organize in order to maximize the deviating players' payoffs. Hafalir (2007) compares different core notions based on different expectation formation rules and proves that for convex partition function form games and some expectation formation rules, the resulting cores are nonempty.

Definitions of the core of partition function games proposed in the literature are thus based on ad hoc assumptions on the reaction of external players to the deviation. By contrast, our objective in this paper is to ground the

[1]The γ model finds its roots in Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944) who discuss a game of coalition formation among three agents which requires unanimity and is equivalent to the γ game.

expectations of deviating players on axioms, and derive the core of a partition function game on the basis of properties satisfied by the expectation formation rule. We first propose a set of axioms that pertains to the relation between the current partition and the expectations formed by deviating players. An expectation formation rule is independent of the original partition or independent of the position of deviating players in the original partition if players do not tie their expectations to the current state. It is instead responsive if different partitions of external players always give rise to different expectations. The second set of axioms deals with the compatibility of expectations among groups of players. Compatibility is needed to guarantee that group expectations are well defined. Path independence guarantees that group expectations are independent of the order in which individual expectations are aggregated. Subset consistency prevents disagreement among players over the group expectations. Coherence of expectations introduces a compatibility condition between the expectations formed by S and its complement. It guarantees that groups hold rational expectations over the behavior of their complements. Finally, we define superadditivity as the property that the coalitional function generated by the expectation formation rule is always superadditive.

We analyze which of the commonly used expectation formation rules satisfy these axioms, and characterize the *projection rule* (by which players anticipate that external players form a coalition structure which is the projection of the current coalition structure) – also known as the δ rule in Hart and Kurz (1983) – as the only expectation formation rule that satisfies the two properties responsiveness and subset consistency, or the three properties subset consistency, independence of position of deviating players in the original partition, and coherence of expectations. If instead of responsiveness to the current partition, we require independence of the current partition, the only rules that satisfy subset consistency are *exogenous rules* where deviating players anticipate external players to organize according to the projection of an exogenous partition $\mathcal{M}$. Notice in particular that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a partition of singletons, the $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous rule corresponds to the γ rule of Chander and Tulkens (1997) or the externality-free rule of de Clippel and Serrano (2008), whereas if $\mathcal{M}$ is the partition formed by the grand coalition, the $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous rule specifies that agents anticipate external players to form a single component as in Maskin (2003) and McQuillin (2009). We also note that the *pessimistic rule* (the α rule) is the only expectation formation rule which satisfies superadditivity. Our final result shows that the expectation formation rule under which balancedness of the coalitional game is equivalent to nonemptiness of the core is the *optimistic rule.*

To the best of our knowledge, our paper represents the first attempt to axiomatize the reaction of external players to a deviation in order to define the core of partition function games. However, the need to specify the partition of external players also appears in studies of extensions of the Shapley value to partition function games. Starting with Myerson (1977), several extensions of the Shapley value to partition function games have been proposed. Recently, Macho-Stadler, Perez-Castrillo and Wettstein (2007) have proposed an axiomatization based on the classical axioms of Shapley. De Clippel and Serrano (2008) base their value on axioms of marginality and monotonicity. McQuillin (2009) uses an approach based on the recursion axiom, which states that the solution applied to the game generated by the solution itself should return the same outcome. Grabisch and Funaki (2012) propose an extension of the Shapley value based on the process of coalition formation. Borm, Ju and Wettstein (2013) base their extension of the Shapley value on a noncooperative implementation mechanism. Dutta, Ehlers and Kar (2010) extend the axioms of consistency and the potential approach to partition function games. While the axioms we discuss in the current paper are applied to a different object than the axioms studied in the context of the Shapley value, there are clear similarities between our approaches. In order to use the potential approach, Dutta, Ehlers and Kar (2010) need to define restrictions of partition function games after one player leaves. They propose axioms on restriction operators, including a path independence axiom which guarantees that the restricted games do not depend on the order in which players leave. Implicitly, their axioms embody conditions on the partition formed after a player leaves. By contrast, our axioms apply directly to expectation formation rules. Hence, their axiomatizations and ours are complementary.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We present our model of partition function games and expectation formation rules in the next section. Section 3 is devoted to the description of axioms on expectation formation rules. Section 4 contains the axiomatizations of the projection and exogenous rules and a discussion of superadditivity. We discuss the construction of the core of partition function games generated by expectation formation rules in Section 5. Section 6 concludes and proposes directions for future research.

2 The Model

2.1 Partition function games

We consider a set N of players with cardinality $n \geq 3$. A partition on N is a collection of pairwise disjoint, nonempty subsets of N covering N. Let $\Pi(N)$ be the set of all partitions on N, with typical element $\mathcal{N}$. Similarly, for any subset S of N, we denote by $\Pi(S)$ the set of all partitions on S with typical element $\mathcal{S}$. The partition of S formed only of singletons is denoted $\underline{S} = \{\{i\} \mid i \in S\}$ and the partition of S formed only by the set S is denoted $\overline{S} = \{S\}$. For any set S, S^c denotes the complement of S in N. Given a set S and a partition $\mathcal{S}$ of S and a subset T of S, we let $\mathcal{S}|_T$ denote the projection of $\mathcal{S}$ onto T, i.e. the partition $\mathcal{T}$ of T such that i and j belong to the same block in $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if they belong to the same block in $\mathcal{S}$.

We suppose that the strategic situation faced by the agents is captured by a *TU game in partition function form.* Partition function games, introduced by Thrall and Lucas (1963), generalize coalitional games by allowing for externalities across coalitions. They arise naturally in environments where players can form binding agreements, and cooperate inside coalitions but compete across coalitions (see Ray (2007)). Formally, a partition function v associates to each partition $\mathcal{N}$ and each block $S \in \mathcal{N}$ a positive number $v(S, \mathcal{N})$ specifying the *worth of coalition S in partition $\mathcal{N}$*. Notice that a partition function only assigns worths to those subsets which are blocks in $\mathcal{N}$. If S does not belong to $\mathcal{N}$, then $v(S, \mathcal{N})$ is not defined.

2.2 Coalitional games

A *TU game in coalitional function form* associates a real number to any nonempty subset of N. Formally, for any $S \subseteq N$, $S \neq \emptyset$, $w(S) \in \Re_+$ denotes the *worth of coalition S.* A coalitional game is superadditive if the worth of the union of two disjoint coalitions is greater than the sum of the worths. This property is justified by the fact that members of the two merging coalitions can always reproduce the behavior they adopted when the coalitions where separate, and can in addition benefit from cooperating after merging the two coalitions. A coalitional function w is *superadditive* if for all S, T such that $S \cap T = \emptyset$,

$$w(S \cup T) \geq w(S) + w(T).$$

2.3 Expectation formation rules

Consider a coalition S of players contemplating a deviation. Players in S may contemplate deviating as a block – we call this a block deviation. Alternatively, they may consider deviating together but breaking into separate coalitions, re-arranging into a partition $\mathcal{S}$ of S – we call this a general deviation. In order to assess the value of the deviation, players in S need to form an expectation about the reaction of external players to their deviation. We define *expectation formation rules* assigning to every deviating coalition S an expectation over the coalition structure formed by the players in S^c. We assume that coalitions have *deterministic expectations*, and that expectations may depend on the deviating coalition S and the partition $\mathcal{S}$ formed by these deviating players, on the current partition $\mathcal{N}$, and on the partition function v.

Definition 2.1 *An* expectation formation rule *is a mapping f associating a partition $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ of S^c with each coalition S, partition $\mathcal{S}$ of S, partition $\mathcal{N}$ of N, and partition function v.*[2]

2.4 Generating coalitional functions from partition functions

For any expectation formation rule f and partition $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$, we generate a coalitional function $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ from the partition function v by assuming that external players react to a deviation according to f. When coalition S deviates, reorganizes itself into a partition $\mathcal{S}$, and expects external players to react according to f, it obtains an expected worth of

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)).$$

We assume that players in S can choose to re-arrange themselves in such a way that they maximize the total worth of the coalition. Hence, the coalitional function is defined by using a superadditive cover and we have

$$w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(S) = \max_{\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)). \tag{1}$$

Notice that, in general, the coalitional function $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ is indexed by the current partition $\mathcal{N}$. However, $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ is *not* a partition function, as it assigns worths to *all* subsets S of N, including subsets which are not blocks in $\mathcal{N}$.

[2]The expectation formation rule is not defined for $S = N$ and $S = \emptyset$.

2.5 Some rules of expectation formation

In this subsection, we provide a list of the different expectation formation rules that have been proposed in the literature. We have named these rules in a manner that is descriptive of their nature.

The disintegration rule: This rule was introduced by Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944). They propose that coalitions be formed by unanimous agreement of their members, resulting in an expectation formation rule where deviating players expect the coalitions they leave to disintegrate into singletons. In this model (also labeled the γ rule by Hart and Kurz (1983)), for any $T \in \mathcal{N}$, such that $T \cap S \neq \emptyset$, $T \setminus S$ disintegrates into $\underline{T \setminus S}$ in $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ and for any $T \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $T \cap S = \emptyset$, T remains in $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$.

The projection rule: Hart and Kurz (1983) introduce the δ model of coalition formation, where coalitions are formed by all players announcing the same coalition. This results in an expectation rule where players expect the coalitions that they leave to remain together. Hence, the expectation rule is given by $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$.

$\mathcal{M}$-Exogenous rules: An exogenous rule is indexed by a partition $\mathcal{M}$ of N. Players in S expect that external players organize according to the projection of $\mathcal{M}$ onto S^c: $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \mathcal{M}|_{S^c}$. Two special exogenous rules are the $\underline{N}$-exogenous rule, where players anticipate that all external players will form singletons (Chander and Tulkens (1997), Hafalir (2007) and de Clippel and Serrano (2008)), and the $\overline{N}$-exogenous rule, where players anticipate that all external players join in a single coalition S^c (Maskin (2003), Hafalir (2007), and McQuillin (2009)).

The optimistic rule: According to the optimistic rule, proposed by Shenoy (1979), players expect external members to select the[3] partition which maximizes the payoff of the players in S:[4]

$$f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \text{argmax}_{\mathcal{S}^c \in \Pi(S^c)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c).$$

[3]We are aware that the argmax partition in this definition may not be unique and the same holds for the argmin in the pessimistic rule or the argmax in the max rule. Some tie-breaking rule can be used to choose a partition, but in order to avoid unnecessary notation, throughout the rest of the analysis we assume that the partition is unique up to symmetry considerations for the optimistic, pessimistic, and max rules.

[4]Following our method of denoting a partition of a set with the calligraphic letter, we use the notation $\mathcal{S}^c$ for a partition of S^c. Since we use the notation $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$ for the projection of a coalition structure $\mathcal{N}$ onto S^c, our notation should not cause any confusion.

The pessimistic rule: The pessimistic rule is most in line with the idea that a coalition should consider the worth that it can *guarantee* itself independent of the behavior of players that are not in the coalition - an idea that underlies the very definition of coalitional games. In the pessimistic rule, inspired by Aumann's (1967)'s definition of the α-core, and discussed by Hart and Kurz (1983), players expect external players to select the partition which minimizes the payoff of the players in S:

$$f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \text{argmin}_{\mathcal{S}^c \in \Pi(S^c)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c).$$

The max rule: In the max rule, discussed by Hafalir (2007) and singled out by Borm, Ju and Wettstein (2013), players expect external players to select a partition which maximizes the payoff of the players in S^c:

$$f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \text{argmax}_{\mathcal{S}^c \in \Pi(S^c)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}^c} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c).$$

3 Axioms on expectation formation rules

In this section, we define axioms for expectation formation rules, and show how these axioms can be used to discriminate among different rules. We first introduce axioms on the dependence of $f(\cdot)$ with respect to the initial partition $\mathcal{N}$. We then present axioms relating expectations formed by players in a coalition and the expectations formed by players in smaller coalitions. We also introduce an axiom on the coherence of expectations formed by S and S^c. Finally, we discuss conditions under which an expectation formation rule generates superadditive coalitional functions.

3.1 Independence and responsiveness to $\mathcal{N}$

When external players react to the formation of $\mathcal{S}$ by coalition S, they can either be tied by the current partition, $\mathcal{N}$, or can freely reorganize independently of the original partition. In a more subtle way, the reaction of external players may or may not depend on the position in $\mathcal{N}$ of players perpetrating the deviation. The following axioms capture these different notions of independence.

Definition 3.1 *An expectation formation rule f is* independent of the original partition *(IOP) if $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}', v)$ for all $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}' \in \Pi(N)$.*

Definition 3.2 *An expectation formation rule f is* independent of the position of deviating players in the original partition *(IPDOP) if $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}', v)$ for all $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}' \in \Pi(N)$ such that $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}'|_{S^c}$.*

Definition 3.3 *An expectation formation rule f is* responsive to the position of external players in the original partition *(RPEOP) if $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) \neq f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}', v)$ for all $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}' \in \Pi(N)$ such that $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \neq \mathcal{N}'|_{S^c}$.*

Notice that all usual rules but the disintegration rule and the projection rule are independent of the original partition. The disintegration rule does not satisfy IPDOP nor RPEOP, whereas the projection rule satisfies both axioms.

3.2 Path independence and subset consistency

The axioms of path dependence and subset consistency establish a connection between the expectations formed by different coalitions. Path independence states that, when a subset $S \cup T$ forms expectations, the expectations can either be formed first by S and then by T or first by T and then by S. In other words, the expectation formation rule must be independent of the order in which deviating agents form expectations. Subset consistency relates the expectations formed by a set S and any subset T of S and requires that these expectations be compatible, so that the projection of the expectations of members of T on S^c must be equal to the expectations of the members of S.

To understand the motivation underlying the two axioms, consider a coalition S contemplating a deviation. In order to assess whether the deviation is profitable, each member of S must hold an expectation over the reaction of external players. The difficulty is to construct a *group* expectation for the coalition S. Path independence guarantees that this group expectation is well defined. If path independence did not hold, the group expectation would depend on the order in which individual expectations are aggregated, so that different orders would result in different values of the group expectation. Subset consistency guarantees that all players agree on the behavior of external players. If subset consistency failed, disagreement among players would prevent the construction of a single group expectation for coalition S.

Definition 3.4 *An expectation formation rule f satisfies* path independence *(PI) if, for any $S, T \subset N$ with $S, T \neq \emptyset$ and $S \cap T = \emptyset$, and for all $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$,*

$\mathcal{T} \in \Pi(T)$, $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$,

$$f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v), v) = f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T} \cup f(T, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v), v) \tag{2}$$

Definition 3.5 *An expectation formation rule f satisfies* subset consistency *(SC) if, for all $S \subseteq N, T \subset S$, $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$, $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$,*

$$f(T, \mathcal{S}|_T, \mathcal{N}, v)|_{S^c} = f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v). \tag{3}$$

A direct– but not trivial – consequence of subset consistency is that the expectation formation rule is independent of the coalition structure $\mathcal{S}$ formed by members of S.[5] Note that if we restrict attention to block deviations – as is often done in the literature – the fact that expectations are independent of $\mathcal{S}$ is irrelevant. In addition, subset consistency and independence of $\mathcal{S}$ are not equivalent – there exist expectation formation rules that are independent of $\mathcal{S}$ but not subset consistent.[6] Thus, subset consistency tells us something very subtle about the manner in which group expectations are formed by nested coalitions.

For an expectation formation rule that is subset consistent, RPEOP implies IPDOP, as we demonstrate in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6 *If the expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency and is responsive to the position of external players in the original partition, then it is independent of the position of deviating players in the original partition.*

Proof: Because the expectation formation rule satisfies subset consistency, the partition $\mathcal{S}$ does not influence $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ and we omit $\mathcal{S}$ as an argument of the expectation formation rule f.
By RPEOP of f, we know that $f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) \neq f(S, \mathcal{N}', v)$ for all $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}' \in \Pi(N)$ such that $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \neq \mathcal{N}'|_{S^c}$. From this we derive that

$$|\{f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}| \geq |\{\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}|.$$

Suppose that in addition to f satisfying RPEOP, there exist $\mathcal{N}', \mathcal{N}'' \in \Pi(N)$ with $\mathcal{N}'|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}''|_{S^c}$ and $f(S, \mathcal{N}', v) \neq f(S, \mathcal{N}'', v)$. Then it follows that

$$|\{f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}| > |\{\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}|.$$

[5] To see this, let $S \subset N$, $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \Pi(S)$, and $i \in S$. Note that $\mathcal{S}|_{\{i\}} = \{i\} = \mathcal{S}'|_{\{i\}}$. Thus, it follows from subset consistency that $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = f(i, \{i\}, \mathcal{N}, v)|_{S^c} = f(S, \mathcal{S}', \mathcal{N}, v)$.

[6] This is evidenced in Example 3.8.

This, however, leads to a contradiction because

$$\{f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\} \subseteq \Pi(S^c) = \{\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \mid \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}.$$

We conclude that for all $\mathcal{N}', \mathcal{N}'' \in \Pi(N)$ with $\mathcal{N}'|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}''|_{S^c}$ it must be the case that $f(S, \mathcal{N}', v) = f(S, \mathcal{N}'', v)$. Thus, f satisfies IPDOP. $\square$

Path independence and subset consistency impose restrictions on cross-variations of the expectation formation rule on different variables: path independence considers variations in the original partition, whereas subset consistency focuses on variations in the set of deviating players. In spite of these differences, subset consistency implies path independence for expectation formation rules that are IPDOP.

Proposition 3.7 *If the expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency and independence of the position of deviating players in the original partition, then it satisfies path independence.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$. Consider two coalitions S, T such that $S \cap T = \emptyset$, and partitions $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$, $\mathcal{T} \in \Pi(T)$.
Applying subset consistency to coalitions S and $S \cup T$, we obtain

$$f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)|_{(S \cup T)^c} = f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v).$$

Because $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$, $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) \in \Pi(S^c)$, and $(S \cup T)^c \subseteq S^c$, adding $\mathcal{S}$ to $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ does not modify the projection onto $(S \cup T)^c$ so that

$$(\mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v))|_{(S \cup T)^c} = f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v))|_{(S \cup T)^c}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$(\mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v))|_{(S \cup T)^c} = f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v). \tag{4}$$

Similarly, we derive

$$(\mathcal{T} \cup f(T, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v))|_{(S \cup T)^c} = f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v). \tag{5}$$

Given (4) and (5), we can apply IPDOP to obtain

$$f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v), v) = f(S \cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T} \cup f(T, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v), v),$$

which demonstrates path independence. $\square$

The following examples show that the two axioms of path independence and subset consistency are not equivalent.

Example 3.8 *(The expectation formation rule f satisfies path independence (and IOP) but not subset consistency)*
Let $N = \{1,2,3,4\}$. We define an expectation formation rule that only depends on the deviating coalitions S and let $f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v) = \underline{S^c}$ if $|S| = 1$, and $f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v) = \overline{S^c}$ for all S such that $|S| \geq 2$.

This expectation formation rule obviously satisfies IOP (and thus also the weaker property IPDOP). The rule also satisfies path independence, because for all disjoint $S,T \subset N$ we have $|S \cup T| \geq 2$ so that $f(S\cup T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \overline{(S \cup T)^c}$, independently of the partitions $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{T}$, or $\mathcal{N}$.

The expectation formation rule does not satisfy subset consistency. To see this, let $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$, $S = \{1,2\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{12\}$,[7] and $T = \{1\}$. Then $f(T, \mathcal{S}|_T, \mathcal{N}, v)|_{S^c} = \{2|3|4\}|_{\{3,4\}} = \{3|4\}$, whereas $f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v) = \{34\}$.

The intuition for the discrepancy between path independence and subset consistency underlying Example 3.8 is that path independence does not impose any restrictions on the expectations of singletons, whereas subset consistency imposes a condition on the link between the expectations of singletons and those of larger coalitions. The following example illustrates that the requirement that f satisfies IPDOP cannot be omitted from the statement of Proposition 3.7.

Example 3.9 *(The expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency but not path independence)*
Suppose that $N = \{1,2,3,4\}$. We define an expectation rule that only depends on the deviating coalitions S and the partitions $\mathcal{N}$ and so we suppress $\mathcal{S}$ and v in the notation. Let $f(S,\mathcal{N}) = \underline{S^c}$ if $\mathcal{N} = \overline{N}$ or $\mathcal{N} = \{i|j|kl\}$,[8] and $f(S,\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$ otherwise.

This expectation formation rule satisfies subset consistency, because if $\mathcal{N} = \overline{N}$ or $\mathcal{N} = \{i|j|kl\}$, then $f(T,\mathcal{N})|_{S^c} = (\underline{T^c})\,|_{S^c} = \underline{S^c} = f(S,\mathcal{N})$, and for all other $\mathcal{N}$ it holds that $f(T,\mathcal{N})|_{S^c} = (\mathcal{N}|_{T^c})\,|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = f(S,\mathcal{N})$. However, f violates path independence: Let $S = \{1\}$, $T = \{2\}$, and $\mathcal{N} =$

[7] In examples, we use the less cluttered and commonly used notation of denoting a partition by separating the players in various blocks with the symbol | . Hence, we write $\{12\}$ instead of $\{\{1,2\}\}$, $\{1|2\}$ instead of $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$, and so on.

[8] In order to keep the examples as uncluttered as possible, we will omit quantifiers like "$i \in N$" and "$i,j \in N$, $i \neq j$" whenever this can be done without causing confusion. Thus, $S = \{i\}$ means that S is a singleton coalition, and $\mathcal{N} = \{i|j|kl\}$ means that $\mathcal{N}$ is a partition that consists of two singleton blocks and one two-player block, and so on.

$\{1|234\}$. *When* 1 *forms expectations first, we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} f(S\cup T,\{S\}\cup f(S,\mathcal{N})) &= f(\{1,2\},\{1\}\cup\{1|234\}|_{\{2,3,4\}}) \\ &= f(\{1,2\},\{1|234\}) \\ &= \{1|234\}|_{\{3,4\}} = \{34\}. \end{aligned}$$

However, when 2 *forms expectations first, we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} f(S\cup T,\{T\}\cup f(T,\mathcal{N})) &= f(\{1,2\},\{2\}\cup\{1|234\}|_{\{1,3,4\}}) \\ &= f(\{1,2\},\{1|2|34\}) \\ &= \underline{\{3,4\}} = \{3|4\}. \end{aligned}$$

3.3 Coherence of expectations

The next axiom imposes consistency between the formation of expectations of a coalition S and those of its complement S^c. Suppose that a coalition S contemplates reorganizing itself and forming a partition $\mathcal{S}$, expecting that the complement S^c reacts by forming $f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v)$. The axiom of coherence of expectations states that if indeed S^c forms this partition after S reorganizes and forms $\mathcal{S}$, members of S^c expect that the members of S will not subsequently reorganize again and form a partition different from $\mathcal{S}$.

Coherence of expectations is a basic requirement that guarantees that expectations are "rational" in the following sense. Whenever a group contemplates a deviation based on the belief that external players react in a given way, these external players believe that if they behave in that given way, the original group conforms to the contemplated deviation. Expectation formation is an eductive reasoning, where coalitions anticipate the reactions to their moves. If coherence of expectations were violated, this eductive reasoning would not converge: the partition on N would continue to evolve.

Definition 3.10 *The expectation formation rule f satisfies* coherence of expectations *(COH) if, for all S, $\mathcal{S}\in\Pi(S)$ and $\mathcal{N}\in\Pi(N)$,*

$$f(S^c, f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v), \mathcal{S}\cup f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v), v) = \mathcal{S}. \tag{6}$$

Coherence of expectations puts restrictions only on expectations held by a coalition and its complement, whereas subset consistency puts restrictions on expectations held by nested coalitions. Thus, the two axioms are independent, as demonstrated in the following two examples.

Example 3.11 *(An $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous rule satisfies subset consistency and violates coherence of expectations.)*
Let $N = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \{12|3|4\}$ *and let* f *be the* $\mathcal{M}$*-exogenous rule.* f *satisfies subset consistency because* $f(T,\mathcal{T},\mathcal{N},v)|_{S^c} = (\{12|3|4\}|_{T^c})\,|_{S^c} = \{12|3|4\}|_{S^c} = f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v)$ *for all* $T \subset S \subset N$*. The expectation rule* f *does not satisfy coherence of expectations because, for example, for* $S = \{1,2\}$ *and* $\mathcal{S} = \{1|2\}$*, it holds that* $f(S^c, f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v), \mathcal{S}\cup f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N},v), v) = \{12|3|4\}|_S = \{12\} \neq \{1|2\} = \mathcal{S}$*.*

Example 3.12 *(A rule that satisfies coherence of expectations but is not subset consistent.)*
Suppose that $N = \{1,2,3,4\}$*. Define the expectation rule* f *that does not depend on* v *as follows. If* $|S| = 1$ *or* $|S| = 3$*, then* $f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$*. If* $S = \{i,j\}$*, then* $f(S,\{i|j\},\mathcal{N}) = \{k|l\}$ *and* $f(S,\{ij\},\mathcal{N}) = \{kl\}$*.*

This rule satisfies coherence of expectations. This is seen as follows. If $|S| = 1$ *or* $|S| = 3$*, then*
$f(S^c, f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{S}\cup f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N})) = f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{S}\cup\mathcal{N}|_{S^c}) = (\mathcal{S}\cup\mathcal{N}|_{S^c})|_S = \mathcal{S}$*.*
If $S = \{i,j\}$*, and* $\mathcal{S} = \{i|j\}$*, then*
$f(S^c, f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{S}\cup f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N})) = f(\{k,l\},\{k|l\},\{i|j\}\cup\{k|l\}) = \{i|j\} = \mathcal{S}$*.*
If $S = \{i,j\}$ *and* $\mathcal{S} = \{ij\}$*, then*
$f(S^c, f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{S}\cup f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N})) = f(\{k,l\},\{kl\},\{ij\}\cup\{kl\}) = \{ij\} = \mathcal{S}$*.*

The rule violates subset consistency, because with $\mathcal{N} = \{1234\}$*,* $S = \{1,2\}$*,* $\mathcal{S} = \{1|2\}$*, and* $T = \{1\}$*, we have that* $f(T,\mathcal{S}|_T,\mathcal{N})|_{S^c} = \{34\} \neq \{3|4\} = f(S,\mathcal{S},\mathcal{N})$*.*

3.4 Superadditivity

The next axiom pertains to the superadditivity of the coalitional functions $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ generated by the expectation formation rule f.

Definition 3.13 *The expectation formation rule* f *satisfies* superadditivity *(SA) if, for every partition function* v*, the coalitional function* $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ *is superadditive for all* $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$*.*

Superadditivity is an interesting property to study in the context of the core because the core of a coalitional game is based on the assumption that the grand coalition $\overline{N}$ will be formed - an assumption that is generally acknowledged to be problematic when the coalitional game is not superadditive.

4 Axiomatizations of expectation formation rules

In this section we demonstrate that the axioms on expectation formation rules that we identified in the previous section can be used to axiomatize some of the rules. We first consider rules that satisfy responsiveness to the position of external players in the original partition and find that the projection rule takes a special position in the class of responsive expectation formation rules. We then consider rules that are independent of the original partition and find that the $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous rules and the pessimistic rule are singled out among the independent expectation formation rules based on some of the axioms.

4.1 Responsive rules

We first axiomatize rules which depend on the current partition $\mathcal{N}$. The following theorem demonstrates that the projection rule is the only subset consistent rule among the responsive expectation formation rules.

Theorem 4.1 *Let $n \geq 4$. An expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency and responsiveness to the position of external players in the original partitions if and only if it is the projection rule.*

Proof: It is clear that the projection rule satisfies subset consistency and RPEOP. Now, consider an expectation formation rule f that satisfies the two axioms. Because the expectation formation rule satisfies subset consistency, the partition $\mathcal{S}$ does not influence $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ and we omit $\mathcal{S}$ as an argument of the expectation formation rule f. Also, by Proposition 3.6 f satisfies IPDOP and thus for any $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$ it holds that

$$f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) = f(S, \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, v) \text{ for any } \mathcal{U} \in \Pi(S). \tag{7}$$

Using this, and with minimal abuse of notation, we can write $f(S, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, v)$ whenever we do not want to explicitly specify the behavior of $\mathcal{N}$ on players not in S^c.

First notice that if $|S| = n-1$, then $S^c = \{i\}$ for some $i \in N$ and trivially $f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) = \{i\}$ for all $\mathcal{N}$.

Claim 4.2 *For any $S \subseteq N$ such that $|S| = n-2$, and any $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$ it holds that $f(S, \mathcal{N}, v) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$.*

Proof of the Claim: Because the expectation rule f satisfies RPEOP, it must assign a different partition to every $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \in \Pi(S^c)$ when taken as given a coalition $S \subset N$ and partition function game v. Thus, for every pair of players $i, j \in N$, either

$$f(\{i,j\}^c, \{ij\}, v) = \{ij\} \text{ and } f(\{i,j\}^c, \{i|j\}, v) = \{i|j\}$$

or

$$f(\{i,j\}^c, \{ij\}, v) = \{i|j\} \text{ and } f(\{i,j\}^c, \{i|j\}, v) = \{ij\}.$$

Hence, once we determine $f(\{i,j\}^c, \{ij\}, v)$, we have no flexibility in choosing the expectation $f(\{i,j\}^c, \{i|j\}, v)$.

Consider three players, 1, 2 and 3, the set $T = \{1,2,3\}^c$, and the three sets $S_1 = \{2,3\}^c$, $S_2 = \{1,3\}^c$ and $S_3 = \{1,2\}^c$. Notice that $T \neq \emptyset$ as $n \geq 4$. Given that the expectation formation rule satisfies RPEOP, it is sufficient to construct $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v)$ for each S_i (where $i \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $j, k \in \{1,2,3\} \setminus \{i\}$, $j \neq k$), so there are eight ways in which we can construct the partitions $f(S_i, \mathcal{N}|_{S_i^c}, v)$, $i = 1,2,3$. Disregarding cases which are symmetric up to a permutation of the players, we only need to consider four different cases: (i) the case where $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{jk\}$ for all $i = 1,2,3$, (ii) the case where $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{jk\}$ for two players $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, and $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{j|k\}$ for the third player, (iii) the case where $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{jk\}$ for one player $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, and $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{j|k\}$ for the other two players and (iv) the case where $f(S_i, \{jk\}, v) = \{j|k\}$ for all three players.

Now consider the expectations of players in $T = \{1,2,3\}^c$. T is a subset of S_i for each $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. We will use subset consistency to prove that cases (ii), (iii) and (iv) result in a contradiction.

Consider case (ii) when $f(S_1, \{23\}, v) = \{23\}$, $f(S_2, \{13\}, v) = \{13\}$, and $f(S_3, \{12\}, v) = \{1|2\}$. Then, by subset consistency, for a partition $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$ such that $\mathcal{N}|_{T^c} = \{123\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(T, \{123\}, v)|_{\{12\}} &= f(S_3, \{12\}, v) &&= \{1|2\} \\
f(T, \{123\}, v)|_{\{13\}} &= f(S_2, \{13\}, v) &&= \{13\} \\
f(T, \{123\}, v)|_{\{23\}} &= f(S_1, \{23\}, v) &&= \{23\}
\end{aligned}$$

resulting in a contradiction, as we cannot find a partition $f(T, \{123\}, v)$ of $\{123\}$ that projects into $\{1|2\}$, $\{13\}$, and $\{23\}$.

Consider case (iii) when $f(S_1, \{23\}, v) = \{23\}$, $f(S_2, \{13\}, v) = \{1|3\}$, and $f(S_3, \{12\}, v) = \{1|2\}$. Again, by subset consistency,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(T,\{1|2|3\},v)|_{\{12\}} &= f(S_3,\{1|2\},v) &&= \{12\}\\
f(T,\{1|2|3\},v)|_{\{13\}} &= f(S_2,\{1|3\},v) &&= \{13\}\\
f(T,\{1|2|3\},v)|_{\{23\}} &= f(S_1,\{2|3\},v) &&= \{2|3\}
\end{aligned}$$

resulting in a contradiction because we cannot find a partition $f(T,\{1|2|3\},v)$ of $\{123\}$ that projects into $\{12\}$, $\{13\}$, and $\{2|3\}$.

Finally, in case (iv), consider

$$\begin{aligned}
f(T,\{1|23\},v)|_{\{12\}} &= f(S_3,\{1|2\},v) &&= \{12\}\\
f(T,\{1|23\},v)|_{\{13\}} &= f(S_2,\{1|3\},v) &&= \{13\}\\
f(T,\{1|23\},v)|_{\{23\}} &= f(S_1,\{23\},v) &&= \{2|3\}
\end{aligned}$$

resulting in a contradiction because we cannot find a partition $f(T,\{1|23\},v)$ of $\{123\}$ that projects into $\{12\}$, $\{13\}$, and $\{2|3\}$.

Since cases (ii), (iii), and (iv) all lead to a contradiction, we are left the conclusion that case (i) must hold, which proves the claim.

We finish the proof of the theorem by induction. Let $m < n$ such that $m \geq 3$ and suppose that we have shown that $f(S,\mathcal{N}|_{S^c},v) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$ for all coalitions S such that $|S^c| < m$, and any $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$. Consider a set T such that $|T^c| = m$. For all $i \in T^c$, define the set $S_i := T \cup i$. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$. For each $i \in T^c$, we have $T \subset S_i$ and $|S_i^c| = m-1$, and thus by applying subset consistency and the induction hypothesis, we obtain

$$f(T,\mathcal{N}|_{T^c},v)|_{S_i^c} = f(S_i,\mathcal{N}|_{S_i^c},v) = \mathcal{N}|_{S_i^c}. \tag{8}$$

Fix two players $i,j \in T^c$. Then either i and j belong to different blocks in the partition $\mathcal{N}$ or they belong to the same block in the partition $\mathcal{N}$. Because $|T^c| = m \geq 3$, we can find a player $k \in T^c$, $k \notin \{i,j\}$, and by equation (8) we know that for the set $S_k = T \cup k$

$$f(T,\mathcal{N}|_{T^c},v)|_{S_k^c} = \mathcal{N}|_{S_k^c}.$$

Note that i and j do not belong to S_k. It thus follows that i and j belong to different blocks in the partition $f(T,\mathcal{N}|_{T^c},v)$ if and only if they belong to different blocks in the partition $\mathcal{N}|_{S_k^c}$, and they belong to different blocks in the partition $\mathcal{N}|_{S_k^c}$ if and only if they belong to different blocks in $\mathcal{N}$. This establishes that $f(T, \mathcal{N}|_{T^c}, v) = \mathcal{N}|_{T^c}$, completing the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Theorem 4.1 characterizes the projection rule as the only responsive rule that satisfies subset consistency. Notice that this characterization only holds for $n \geq 4$. For $n = 3$, we can find responsive and subset consistent rules that are not the projection rule, as is shown in the following example.

Example 4.3 *(A rule that is responsive and subset consistent for $n = 3$ and that does not coincide with the projection rule).*
Suppose that $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Define the expectation formation rule f as follows. If $S = \{i, j\}$, then $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \{k\}$. If $S = \{i\}$ and $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = \{jk\}$, then $f(S, \{i\}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \{j|k\}$. If $S = \{i\}$ and $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = \{j|k\}$, then $f(S, \{i\}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \{jk\}$.

Clearly, f satisfies RPEOP. It also satisfies subset consistency, because the only possible choices for two nested coalitions $T \subset S \subseteq N$ are $S = \{i, j\}$ and $T = \{i\}$ and then $f(T, \mathcal{S}|_T, \mathcal{N}, v)|_{S^c} = \{k\}$ because the only possible partition of a singleton is a singleton. However, the rule f is not the projection rule.

An alternative characterization of the projection rule can be given in terms of subset consistency and coherence of expectations.

Theorem 4.4 *An expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency, independence of the position of deviating players in the original partition and coherence of expectations if and only if it is the projection rule.*

Proof: It is easy to check that the projection rule satisfies coherence of expectations and IPDOP in addition to subset consistency. Now, consider an expectation formation rule f that satisfies the three axioms. Because the expectation formation rule satisfies subset consistency, $\mathcal{S}$ does not influence[9] $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ and because the expectation formation rule satisfies IPDOP, we know that the behavior of $\mathcal{N}$ on S does not influence $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$. Let $S \subseteq N$, $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$, and $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) &= f(S, f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{N}, v), \mathcal{N}, v) \\ &= f(S, f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{N}, v), \mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \cup f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{N}, v), v) \\ &= \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \end{aligned}$$

[9]See footnote 5.

where the first equality follows from subset consistency (changing the partition of S from $\mathcal{S}$ to $f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ has no influence on the expectation), the second equality follows from IPDOP because $(\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \cup f(S^c, \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}, \mathcal{N}, v))\,|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$, and the third equality follows by applying coherence of expectations (with the roles of S^c and S interchanged). This shows that f is the projection rule. $\square$

The three axioms in Theorem 4.4 are logically independent. The rule in Example 3.11 satisfies subset consistency and IPDOP, but violates coherence of expectations. The rule in Example 3.12 satisfies coherence of expectations and IPDOP, but is not subset consistent. Finally, the next example displays a rule that satisfies subset consistency and coherence of expectations, but violates IPDOP.

Example 4.5 *(A rule that satisfies subset consistency and coherence of expectations, but violates independence of the position of deviating players in the original partition.)*
We define an expectation formation rule f that does not depend on $\mathcal{S}$ or v and we simplify notation accordingly. We define $f(S, \mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}$ if $\mathcal{N} \neq \overline{N}$ and $f(S, \overline{N}) = \underline{S^c}$.

f satisfies subset consistency because for any $T \subset S \subseteq N$ it holds that $f(T, \mathcal{N})|_{S^c} = (\mathcal{N}|_{T^c})\,|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = f(S, \mathcal{N})$ if $\mathcal{N} \neq \overline{N}$, while $f(T, \overline{N})|_{S^c} = \underline{T^c}|_{S^c} = \underline{S^c} = f(S, \overline{N})$.

f satisfies coherence of expectations because $f(S^c, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{N})) = f(S^c, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{N}|_{S^c}) = (\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{N}|_{S^c})|_S = \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{N} \neq \overline{N}$, while $f(S^c, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \overline{N})) = f(S^c, \mathcal{S} \cup \underline{S^c}) = (\mathcal{S} \cup \underline{S^c})|_S = \mathcal{S}$.

f does not satisfy IPDOP and indeed is not the projection rule.

4.2 Independent expectation formation rules

In this subsection, we consider expectation formation rules that do not depend on the current partition $\mathcal{N}$. Our first result points out that subset consistency then results in exogenous projections.

Theorem 4.6 *An expectation formation rule f satisfies subset consistency and independence of the original partition if and only if it is an exogenous rule.*

Proof: It is clear that for any $\mathcal{M}$, the $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous rule satisfies subset consistency and independence of the original partition. Now, consider an expectation formation rule f that satisfies these two axioms. This implies that neither the new partition of deviating players $\mathcal{S}$ nor the original partition $\mathcal{N}$ influence the expectations, and the expectation formation rule only depends on S and v. To economize notation, we let $f(S, v)$ denote the expectation formation rule throughout the remainder of this proof.

To prove that f is an exogenous rule, we need to show that for any two players $i, j \in N$ and any two coalitions $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \{i, j\}^c$, it holds that i and j are in the same block in the partition $f(S_1, v)$ if and only if they are in the same block in the partition $f(S_2, v)$ or, equivalently, that $f(S_1, v)|_{\{i,j\}} = f(S_2, v)|_{\{i,j\}}$. But this follows directly from subset consistency, which implies

$$f(S_1, v)|_{(S_1 \cup S_2)^c} = f(S_1 \cup S_2, v) = f(S_2, v)|_{(S_1 \cup S_2)^c}.$$

Notice that $\{i, j\} \subseteq (S_1 \cup S_2)^c$, so that i and j belong to the same block in $f(S_1, v)$ if and only if they belong to the same block in $f(S_2, v)$. $\square$

Theorem 4.6 implicitly points out that common independent expectation formation rules such as the optimistic, pessimistic and max expectation rules, do not satisfy subset consistency and result in an inconsistency in the expectation of a coalition of deviating players and a subset of this coalition.

We now turn to superadditivity. For an expectation formation rule f that is independent of the original partition, the coalitional function $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ is the same for all $\mathcal{N}$ and thus there is a unique coalitional function that is generated by f and we refer to this function as w_f. We show in the next proposition that when the expectation formation rule is the pessimistic rule, then the coalitional game w_f is superadditive.

Proposition 4.7 *The pessimistic rule satisfies superadditivity.*

Proof: Let f be the pessimistic rule. We simplify notation by suppressing the original partition and write $f(S, \mathcal{S}, v)$.

Let $S, T \subset N$, $S, T \neq \emptyset$, with $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Define

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)} \sum_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}} v(S_i, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, v))$$

and let $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ be defined similarly. The partition $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ (respectively $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$) is the partition that gives S (respectively T) the maximal worth given its expectations according to the pessimistic expectation formation rule f and thus

$$w_f(S) = \sum_{S_i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}} v(S_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup f(S, \hat{\mathcal{S}}, v))$$

and

$$w_f(T) = \sum_{T_i \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}} v(T_i, \hat{\mathcal{T}} \cup f(T, \hat{\mathcal{T}}, v)).$$

The worth $w_f(S \cup T)$ is obtained when the members of $S \cup T$ organize themselves into a partition that maximizes their worth, expecting that the players in $(S \cup T)^c$ will form a partition that minimizes the worth of the players $S \cup T$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is a partition of $S \cup T$ that may or may not be optimal for $S \cup T$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_f(S \cup T) \;\; \geq \;\; & \sum_{S_i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}} v(S_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}} \cup f(S \cup T, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}}, v)) \\ & + \sum_{T_i \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}} v(T_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}} \cup f(S \cup T, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}}, v)). \end{aligned}$$

Because the expectations $f(S, \hat{\mathcal{S}}, v)$ are pessimistic,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S_i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}} v(S_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}} \cup f(S \cup T, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}}, v)) \;\; \geq \;\; & \sum_{S_i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}} v(S_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup f(S, \hat{\mathcal{S}}, v)) \\ & = w_f(S). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{T_i \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}} v(T_i, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}} \cup f(S \cup T, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{T}}, v)) \geq w_f(T),$$

so that $w_f(S \cup T) \geq w_f(S) + w_f(T)$ follows. □

As the following example shows, superadditivity is a very strong requirement, and other commonly used expectation rules that are independent of the original partition fail to satisfy this axiom.

Example 4.8 *(A partition function game that does not generate a superadditive coalitional game for usual independent expectation formation rules other than the pessimistic rule.)*
Let $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. *Consider the symmetric partition function game* v *defined by* $v(i, i|j|k|l) = 2$, $v(ij, ij|k|l) = 7$, $v(k, ij|k|l) = 0$, $v(ij, ij|kl) = 10$, $v(ijk, ijk|l) = 8$, $v(l, ijk|l) = 4$, $v(ijkl, ijkl) = 21$.

Note that $w_f(N)$ *is independent of the expectation formation rule* f. *In this example, it is accomplished in the partition* $\overline{N}$ *and equals 21. Also, when* $|S| = n-1$, *then* $S^c = \{i\}$ *for some* $i \in N$ *and necessarily* $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v) = \{i\}$, *no matter how the rule* f *is defined. Thus,* $w_f(S)$ *is independent of the expectation formation rule that is used, and in this example it is equal to 8.*

If the expectation formation rule f is the $\underline{N}$-exogenous rule, then we derive $w_f(i) = v(i, i \cup j|k|l) = 2$ and $w_f(i,j) = \max\{v(ij, ij \cup k|l), v(i, i|j \cup k|l) + v(j, i|j \cup k|l)\} = 7$. This coalitional game is shown in the second column of the table below.

We list the values for the coalitional games w_f for other IOP expectation formation rules f without computations.

$\|S\|$	$\underline{N}$-*exogenous*	$\overline{N}$-*exogenous*	*optimistic*	*pessimistic*	*max*
1	2	4	4	0	4
2	7	10	10	7	10
3	8	8	8	8	8
4	21	21	21	21	21

While the coalition game w_f obtained when f is the pessimistic rule is superadditive, all the coalitional games derived from the other IOP rules do not satisfy superadditivity because for the games w_f in the other columns it holds that $w_f(i) + w_f(j,k) > w_f(i,j,k)$.

4.3 Summary of properties of expectation formation rules

The table below summarizes the properties satisfied by the usual expectation formation rules.

	IOP	IPDOP	RPEOP	PI	SC	COH	SA
Disintegration				✓		✓	
Projection		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
$\mathcal{M}$-Exogenous	✓	✓		✓	✓		
Optimistic	✓	✓		✓			
Pessimistic	✓	✓		✓			✓
Max	✓	✓		✓			

Most verifications have been covered in the preceding subsections or are immediate. The remaining (lack of) checkmarks in the table are addressed in an appendix. An interesting observation from the table is that path independence does not allow us to distinguish between the various commonly used expectation formation rules. The other consistency axioms - subset consistency and coherence of expectations - are much more discriminating.

5 Cores of partition function games

In this section we take a closer look at cores of partition function form games. In Subsection 5.1 we explain that each expectation formation rule gives rise to a different definition of the core of a partition function game, and we show that the core with respect to the optimistic rule is the smallest and the core with respect to the pessimistic rule the largest. In Subsection 5.2 we extend the idea of balancedness for coalitional games to partition function games and show that this approach leads us to the core based on the optimistic rule.

5.1 Expectation formation rules and cores of partition function games

Given an expectation formation rule f and a partition $\mathcal{N}$, we construct the TU coalitional game $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}$ as in equation (1):

$$w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(S) = \max_{\mathcal{S}\in\Pi(S)} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)).$$

The cores of these games - the set of imputations that are immune to deviations by any coalition - will obviously depend on the expectation formation rule used and also on the original partition. As coalitional functions generated by partition functions are not necessarily superadditive, the grand coalition $\overline{N}$ does not necessarily form, and the description of the core must entail a characterization of the coalition structure $\mathcal{N}$ which is formed and serves as a status quo to evaluate coalitional deviations. Clearly, if $\mathcal{N}$ does not maximize the sum of values of all players, the grand coalition can propose a coalitional deviation which increases the payoff of all players. Hence, the only candidate for a coalition structure in the core is a coalition structure $\mathcal{N}^*$ that maximizes the sum of values of all players,

$$\mathcal{N}^* = \text{argmax}_{\mathcal{N}\in\Pi(N)} \sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}} v(S, \mathcal{N}).$$

Definition 5.1 *The core $C_f(v)$ of partition function game v with respect to expectation formation rule f is the set of vectors $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ in $\Re^n$ that satisfy the following two conditions:*

1. $\sum_{i\in N} x_i = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}^*} v(S, \mathcal{N}^*)$
2. $\sum_{i\in S} x_i \geq w_f^{\mathcal{N}^*}(S)$ *for all coalitions* $S \subseteq N$.

Keeping the partition function game v fixed and denoting the optimistic and pessimistic expectation formation rules by o and p, respectively, we have that for any expectation formation rule f and all $S \subseteq N$,

$$w_p(S) \leq w_f^{\mathcal{N}^*}(S) \leq w_o(S).$$

Thus, the optimistic core is the smallest core and the the pessimistic core is the largest core:

$$C_o(v) \subseteq C_f(v) \subseteq C_p(v)$$

for all expectation formation rules f. In his study of the core of partition function games, Hafalir (2007) focuses on convex partition function games[10] and shows that when the partition function game is convex, the grand coalition is efficient so that $\mathcal{N}^* = \overline{N}$. He also shows that for the $\underline{N}$-exogenous expectation formation rule, the core of a convex partition function game is nonempty, implying that the pessimistic core of convex partition function games is nonempty.

5.2 Balancedness of partition function games

One way of trying to select a core generated by a particular expectation formation rule is to parallel the balancedness approach for coalitional games. The core of a coalitional game is a convex polytope characterized by a set of linear inequalities. In order to guarantee the existence of a solution to the set of inequalities, one can consider the dual linear programming problem, resulting in the definition of balanced coalitional games.

By following a similar approach for partition function games, we are led to define the set of *embedded coalitions* $E(N) = \{(S, \mathcal{N}) \mid S \in \mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)\}$ and weights $\delta(S, \mathcal{N}) \geq 0$, $(S, \mathcal{N}) \in E(N)$. A collection of embedded coalitions $\mathcal{E} \subseteq E(N)$ is *balanced* if there exist *balancing weights* $\delta(S, \mathcal{N}) > 0$, $(S, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{E}$, such that for each $i \in N$

$$\sum_{(S,\mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{E}:\, i \in S} \delta(S, \mathcal{N}) = 1.$$

Definition 5.2 *A partition function game v is* balanced *if, for any balanced collection of embedded coalitions $\mathcal{E}$ with balancing weights $(\delta(S, \mathcal{N}))_{(S,\mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{E}}$,*

$$\sum_{(S,\mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{E}} \delta(S, \mathcal{N})\, v(S, \mathcal{N}) \leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}^*} v(S, \mathcal{N}^*).$$

[10] A partition function v is *convex* if, for any $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{N}$, $v(S \cup T, \mathcal{N} \setminus \{S, T\} \cup \{S \cup T\}) + v(S \cap T, \mathcal{N} \setminus \{S, T\} \cup \{S \setminus T, T \setminus S, S \cap T\}) \geq v(S, \mathcal{N}) + v(T, \mathcal{N})$.

The extension of balancedness to partition function games is related to the optimistic expectation formation rule, as evidenced by the next proposition.

Proposition 5.3 *A partition function game v is balanced if and only if its optimistic core $C_o(v)$ is nonempty.*

Proof: Let v be a partition function form game. Consider the linear program

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{maximize} \quad \sum_{(S,\mathcal{N})\in E(N)} \delta(S,\mathcal{N})\, v(S,\mathcal{N}) \\
&\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{(S,\mathcal{N})\in E(N):\, i\in S} \delta(S,\mathcal{N}) = 1 \text{ for each } i \in N \\
&\qquad\qquad\quad \delta(S,\mathcal{N}) \geq 0 \text{ for all } (S,\mathcal{N}) \in E(N)
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and its dual

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{i\in N} x_i \\
&\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i\in S} x_i \geq v(S,\mathcal{N}) \text{ for all } (S,\mathcal{N}) \in E(N)
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The duality theorem tells us that the optimal values of the two programs are the same if they have a solution. We observe that the optimal value of (9) is at least $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}^*} v(S,\mathcal{N}^*)$, because this value is attained for the balancing weights $\delta(S,\mathcal{N}^*) = 1$ for each $S \in \mathcal{N}^*$ and $\delta(S,\mathcal{N}) = 0$ for all other embedded coalitions.

It follows from the definitions that v is balanced if and only if the optimal value of (9) equals $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}^*} v(S,\mathcal{N}^*)$. By the duality theorem this is the case if and only if the optimal value of (10) equals $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}^*} v(S,\mathcal{N}^*)$. In turn, this is the case if and only if there exist $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \Re^n$ such that $\sum_{i\in S} x_i \geq v(S,\mathcal{N})$ for all $(S,\mathcal{N}) \in E(N)$ and $\sum_{i\in N} x_i = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{N}^*} v(S,\mathcal{N}^*)$. The latter is the case if and only if $C_o(v) \neq \emptyset$ (because for all $S \subseteq N$ it holds that $v(S,\mathcal{N}) \leq w_o(S)$ for all $\mathcal{N} \in \Pi(N)$ such that $S \in \mathcal{N}$, and there exists an $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi(S)$ and an $\mathcal{S}^c \in \Pi(S^c)$ such that $w_o(S) = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{S}} v(T, \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c)$). $\square$

Proposition 5.3 shows that balancedness of the partition function game is equivalent to the optimistic core of the game being nonempty. However, because the optimistic core is the smallest core, for a balanced game the cores generated by all expectation formation rules are nonempty.

6 Conclusion

This paper proposes axiomatic foundations to expectation formation rules, by which deviating players anticipate the reaction of external players in a partition function game. We single out the projection rule – where players anticipate that external players project the current partition – as the only rule satisfying the two properties subset consistency and responsiveness, or the three properties subset consistency, independence of the original partition of deviating players, and coherence of expectations. Exogenous rules are the only rules satisfying subset consistency and independence of the original partition, and the pessimistic rule is the only rule among the common rules proposed in the literature that gives rise to superadditive coalitional games.

One of the major drawbacks of our analysis (as of any analysis of the core) is that we only consider myopic deviations, and do not describe the full process by which coalitions successively deviate from an allocation. In particular, we do not submit the allocation of deviating players to the same stability test as the original allocation. In the context of partition function games, the recursive core studied by Huang and Sjostrom (2003) and Koczy (2007) captures this requirement, by assuming that deviating players anticipate that external players will select a point in the core of the game restricted to external players. Alternatively, one could consider sequential models of coalition formation, as in Bloch (1996) or Ray and Vohra (1999), or farsighted players, as in Chwe (1994) or Diamantoudi and Xue (2003). An important extension of our work would be to analyze the farsighted core of the game generated by different expectation formation rules. When expectation formation rules are independent of the original partition, we suspect that the analysis of the farsighted core is a straightforward extension of the myopic core. When expectation formation rules are responsive to the original partition, as in the case of the projection rule, the analysis of the farsighted core involves a dynamic process of expectation formation, and we hope to undertake such an analysis in future research.

7 References

Aumann, R. (1967) "A survey of cooperative games without side payments," in *Essays in Mathematical Economics*, M. Shubik ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bloch, F. (1996) "Sequential formation of coalitions in games with externalities and fixed payoff division," *Games and Economic Behavior* **14**, 90-123.

Borm,P., Y. Ju and D. Wettstein (2013) “Rational bargaining in games with coalitional externalities,” mimeo.

Chander, P. and H. Tulkens (1997) “The core of an economy with multilateral environmental externalities,” *International Journal of Game Theory* **26**, 379-401.

Chwe, M. (1994) “Farsighted coalitional stability,” *Journal of Economic Theory* **63**, 299-325.

De Clippel, G. and R. Serrano (2008) “Marginal contributions and externalities in the value,” *Econometrica* **76**, 1413-1436.

Diamantoudi, E. and L. Xue (2003) “Farsighted stability in hedonic games,” *Social Choice and Welfare* **21**, 39-61.

Dutta, B., L. Ehlers, and A. Kar (2010) “Externalities, potential, value and consistency,” *Journal of Economic Theory* **145**, 2380-2411.

Grabisch, M. and Y. Funaki (2012) “A coalition formation value for games in partition function form,” *European Journal of Operational Research* **221**, 175-185.

Hafalir, I. (2007) “Efficiency in coalitional games with externalities,” *Games and Economic Behavior* **61**, 242-258.

Hart, S. and M. Kurz (1983) “Endogenous formation of coalitions,” *Econometrica* **51**, 1047-1064.

Huang, C.Y. and T. Sjostrom (2003) “Consistent solutions for cooperative games with externalities,” *Games and Economic Behavior* **43**, 193-216.

Koczy, L. (2007) “A recursive core for partition function form games,” *Theory and Decision* **63**, 41-51.

Macho-Stadler, I., D. Perez-Castrillo and D. Wettstein (2007) “Sharing the surplus: An extension of the Shapley Value for environments with externalities,” *Journal of Economic Theory* **135**, 339-356.

Maskin, E. (2003) “Bargaining, coalitions and externalities,” working paper, Institute for Advanced Study.

McQuillin, B. (2009) “The extended and generalized Shapley value: Simultaneous consideration of coalitional externalities and coalitional structure,” *Journal of Economic Theory* **144**, 696-721.

Myerson, R. (1977) “Values of games in partition function form,” *International Journal of Game Theory* **6**, 23-31.

Ray, D. (2007) *A Game Theoretic Perspective on Coalition Formation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ray, D. and R. Vohra (1999) “A theory of endogenous coalition structures,” *Games and Economic Behavior* **26**, 286-336.

Shenoy, P. (1979) “On coalition formation: A game theoretical approach,” *International Journal of Game Theory* **8**, 133-164.

Thrall, R.M. and W.F. Lucas (1963) “n-Person games in partition function form”, *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* **10**, 281-298.

Von Neumann, J. and O. Morgenstern (1944), *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

A Verifications of properties of common expectation formation rules

We first consider the disintegration rule. This rule satisfies path independence because for any deviating coalition S it predicts that all blocks U in $\mathcal{N}$ that do not intersect S remain intact, while the other blocks disintegrate into singletons. This is obviously independent of the order in which the members of S form expectations. The disintegration rule also satisfies coherence of expectations because in the partition $\mathcal{S} \cup f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$ the blocks in $\mathcal{S}$ do not intersect the blocks in $f(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{N}, v)$. The disintegration rule violates all other axioms:

Example A.1 *(The disintegration rule.)*

Let $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and let f be the disintegration rule. Because this rule does not depend on $\mathcal{S}$ or v, we simplify notation and write $f(S, \mathcal{N})$.

IPDOP (and thus IOP) is violated because for $\mathcal{N} = \{ijkl\}$ and $\mathcal{N}' = \{ij|kl\}$, and $S = \{i, j\}$, we have that $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} = \mathcal{N}'|_{S^c}$, while $f(S, \mathcal{N}) = \{k|l\} \neq \{kl\} = f(S, \mathcal{N}')$.

RPEOP is violated because for $\mathcal{N} = \{ijkl\}$ and $\mathcal{N}' = \{i|j|k|l\}$, and $S = \{i, j\}$, we have that $\mathcal{N}|_{S^c} \neq \mathcal{N}'|_{S^c}$, while $f(S, \mathcal{N}) = \{k|l\} = f(S, \mathcal{N}')$.

Subset consistency is violated because for $S = \{i, j\}$, $T = \{i\}$, and $\mathcal{N} = \{i|jkl\}$, we have that $f(S, \mathcal{N}) = \{k|l\}$, while $f(T, \mathcal{N}) = \{jkl\}$.

SA is violated for the partition function game in Example 4.8 when $\mathcal{N} = \{i|jkl\}$ because $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(i) + w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(jk) = v(i, i|jkl) + v(jk, i|jk|l) = 4 + 7 > 8 = v(ijk, ijk|l) = w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(ijk)$.

We have already established that the projection rule satisfies IPDOP, RPEOP, PI, SC, and COH. The rule violates SA for the game in example 4.8 when $\mathcal{N} = \{i|jkl\}$, because $w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(i) + w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(jk) = v(i, i|jkl) + v(jk, i|jk|l) = 4 + 7 > 8 = v(ijk, ijk|l) = w_f^{\mathcal{N}}(ijk)$.

The $\mathcal{M}$-exogenous projection rules satisfy IOP, and thus PI. Because these rules satisfy SC and IPDOP, by Theorem 4.4 they violate COH.

The pessimistic, optimistic, and max rules satisfy IOP and thus also PI. By theorem 4.6, they thus violate SC. The following example demonstrates that these rules violate COH.

Example A.2 *(Violations of coherence.)*

Let $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ *and consider a partition function game in which* $v(1|2|34) = (4, 4, 4)$, $v(12|34) = (6, 10)$, $v(1|2|3|4) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$, $v(12|3|4) = (5, 3, 3)$.

Then, for the optimistic rule o*, and* $S = \{12\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{1|2\}$*, we have* $o(S, \mathcal{S}, v) = \{34\}$ *and* $o(S^c, o(S, \mathcal{S}, v), v) = o(34, \{34\}, v) = \{12\} \neq \mathcal{S}$*, demonstrating that the optimistic rule violates COH.*

For the pessimistic rule p*, and* $S = \{12\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{12\}$*, we have* $p(S, \mathcal{S}, v) = \{3|4\}$ *and* $p(S^c, p(S, \mathcal{S}, v), v) = p(34, \{3|4\}, v) = \{1|2\} \neq \mathcal{S}$*, demonstrating that the pessimistic rule violates COH.*

The max rule m *violates COH because when* $S = \{12\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{12\}$*, we have* $m(S, \mathcal{S}, v) = \{34\}$ *and* $m(S^c, m(S, \mathcal{S}, v), v) = m(34, \{34\}, v) = \{1|2\} \neq \mathcal{S}$.