There is another approach to measuring power, due to the mathematicians Shapley and Shubik (in fact, in 1954, predating Banzhaf's 1965 work).

Idea: Instead of regarding coalitions as groups of players who join **all at once**,

think of coalitions as groups that players join one at a time.

That is, we are looking not at coalitions, but at

sequential coalitions.

Example 1: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1] ...

- First, P_4 proposes a motion.
- Then, P_6 agrees to vote yes.
- Then, P_1 agrees to vote yes.
- ▶ Then, P₅ agrees.
- ▶ Then, P₂ agrees.
- ▶ Then, P₃ agrees.
- Then, P₇ agrees.

Who is the pivotal player?

Example 1: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1] ...

- ▶ First, P₄ proposes a motion. (Vote tally: 3)
- Then, P_6 agrees to vote yes. (Vote tally: 3+1 = 4)
- Then, P_1 agrees to vote yes. (4+6=10)
- Then, P_5 agrees. (10+2 = 12)
- Then, P_2 agrees. (12+4 = 16)
- Then, P_3 agrees. (16+3 = 19)
- Then, P_7 agrees. (19+1 = 20)

Who is the pivotal player?

Example 1: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1] ...

- ▶ First, P₄ proposes a motion. (Vote tally: 3)
- Then, P_6 agrees to vote yes. (Vote tally: 3+1 = 4)
- Then, P_1 agrees to vote yes. (4+6=10)
- Then, P_5 agrees. (10+2 = 12)
- Then, P_2 agrees. (12+4 = 16)
- Then, P_3 agrees. (16+3=19)
- Then, P_7 agrees. (19+1 = 20)

The pivotal player is P_3 .

Example 2: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1]...

Suppose instead that the players join the sequential coalition in a different order:

$$\langle P_7, P_3, P_2, P_5, P_1, P_6, P_4 \rangle.$$

Who is the pivotal player? 🔶 📩

Example 2: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1]...

Suppose instead that the players join the sequential coalition in a different order:

$$\langle P_7, P_3, P_2, P_5, P_1, P_6, P_4 \rangle.$$

Who is the pivotal player? 🔶 🕇

Player P _i	P_7	P_3	P_2	P_5	P_1	P_6	P_4
Tally	1	4	8	10	16	17	20

Example 2: In the WVS [17; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1]...

Suppose instead that the players join the sequential coalition in a different order:

$$\langle P_7, P_3, P_2, P_5, P_1, P_6, P_4 \rangle.$$

Who is the pivotal player? 🔶 🕇

Player
$$P_i$$
 P_7
 P_3
 P_2
 P_5
 P_1
 P_6
 P_4

 Tally
 1
 4
 8
 10
 16
 17
 20

Example 3: [13; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1] (note change in q!)

As in Example 2, suppose again that the players join the sequential coalition in the order:

$$\langle P_7, P_3, P_2, P_5, P_1, P_6, P_4 \rangle.$$

Now who is the pivotal player?

Player P _i	P_7	P_3	P_2	P_5	P_1	P_6	P_4
Tally	1	4	8	10	16	17	20

Example 3: [13; 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1] (note change in q!)

As in Example 2, suppose again that the players join the sequential coalition in the order:

$$\langle P_7, P_3, P_2, P_5, P_1, P_6, P_4 \rangle.$$

Now who is the pivotal player?

Player
$$P_i$$
 P_7
 P_3
 P_2
 P_5
 P_1
 P_6
 P_4

 Tally
 1
 4
 8
 10
 16
 17
 20

 \uparrow
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark
 \checkmark

Sequential Coalitions and Pivotal Players

Example 3: In the WVS [**11**; 7, 5, 4], what are **all** the possible sequential coalitions and their pivotal players?

Sequential Coalitions and Pivotal Players

Example 3: In the WVS [**11**; 7, 5, 4], what are **all** the possible sequential coalitions and their pivotal players?

Sequential coalition	Tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, \underline{P_2}, P_3 \rangle$	7, 12 , 16	P_2
$\langle P_1, \ \underline{P_3}, \ P_2 \rangle$	$7, \ 11, \ 16$	P_3
$\langle P_2, \ \underline{P_1}, \ P_3 \rangle$	5, 12 , 16	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, \underline{P_1} \rangle$	5, 9, 16	P_1
$\langle P_3, \ \underline{P_1}, \ P_2 \rangle$	$4, \ \bm{11}, \ 16$	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_2, \underline{P_1} \rangle$	4, 9, 16	P_1

	Coalitions	Sequential Coalitions
How many players?	Any number	All N players
How many are critical or pivotal?	None, some, or all players may be critical	Exactly one pivotal player
Notation	$\{P_2, P_3, P_5, P_7\}$ Order doesn't matter	$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ Order matters

Idea: The more sequential coalitions for which player P_i is pivotal, the more power s/he wields.

Let SS_i = number of sequential coalitions where P_i is pivotal.

The **Shapley-Shubik power index** of player *P_i* is the fraction

 $\sigma_i = \frac{SS_i}{\text{total number of sequential coalitions.}}$

and the **Shapley-Shubik power distribution** of the entire WVS is the list

 $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_N)$

Example 3: WVS [11; 7, 5, 4].

Sequential coalitions



Shapley-Shubik power distribution: (2/3, 1/6, 1/6).

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with *N* players?

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

► There are **N** different players who could join first.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.

...

.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.
- ► After the first K players have joined, there are N K remaining players who could join (K + 1)th.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.
- ► After the first K players have joined, there are N K remaining players who could join (K + 1)th.

...

.

.

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.
- ► After the first K players have joined, there are N K remaining players who could join (K + 1)th.
- There are 2 remaining players who could join next-to-last.

...

How many possible sequential coalitions are there in a WVS with N players?

- There are N different players who could join first.
- ► After the first player has joined, there are N 1 remaining players who could join second.
- ► After the first two players have joined, there are N 2 remaining players who could join third.
- ► After the first K players have joined, there are N K remaining players who could join (K + 1)th.
- There are 2 remaining players who could join next-to-last.
- There is just 1 remaining player who could join last.

The number of sequential coalitions with N players is

$$N \times (N-1) \times (N-2) \times \cdots \times 2 \times 1.$$

For short, this is called N! (pronounced "N factorial").

Ν	N!	Ν	N!
1	1	6	720
2	$2 \times 1 = 2$	7	5040
3	3 imes 2 imes 1 = 6	10	3628800
4	$4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 24$	20	[19 digits]
5	5 imes 4 imes 3 imes 2 imes 1 = 120	100	[158 digits]

To be exact,

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{100!} = 93,326,215,443,944,152,681,699,238,856,266,700,\\ 490,715,968,264,381,621,468,592,963,895,217,599,993,229,915,\\ 608,941,463,976,156,518,286,253,697,920,827,223,758,251,185,\\ 210,916,864,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000.\\ \end{array}$

By comparison,

 $\mathbf{2^{100}} = 1,267,650,600,228,229,401,496,703,205,376$

and

 $100^2 = 10,000.$

Calculating Shapley-Shubik Power Indices

For any weighted voting system with N players:

- 1. Write out all sequential coalitions (there are N! of them).
- 2. For each one, determine the pivotal player.
- 3. Count the number of times that each player P_i is pivotal. Call this number SS_i .
- 4. The Shapley-Shubik power index of P_i is

$$\sigma_{\rm i} = SS_{\rm i} / N!$$

The **Shapley-Shubik power distribution** of the weighted voting system is the complete list

$$(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_N).$$

Shapley-Shubik Power: Example 1

Example 1: The WVS [13; 9, 7, 5]

Example 1: The WVS [13; 9, 7, 5]

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	9, 16	<i>P</i> ₂
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	9, 14	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	7, 16	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	7, 12, 21	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	5, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	5, 12, 21	P_1

Example 1: The WVS [13; 9, 7, 5]

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	9, 16	P_2
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	9, 14	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	7, 16	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	7, 12, 21	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	5, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	5, 12, 21	P_1

 $SS_1 = 4$ $SS_2 = 1$ $SS_3 = 1$

Shapley-Shubik power distribution: (4/6, 1/6, 1/6)

Example 2: The weighted voting system [8; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	<i>P</i> ₂
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9	P_3
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9	P_2

 $SS_1 = 2$ $SS_2 = 2$ $SS_3 = 2$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (2/6, 2/6, 2/6) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)

Example 2: The weighted voting system [8; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	<i>P</i> ₂
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9	P_3
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9	P_2

 $SS_1 = 2$ $SS_2 = 2$ $SS_3 = 2$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (2/6, 2/6, 2/6) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)All players have equal power. Example 3: The weighted voting system [10; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_2
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_1

 $SS_1 = 3$ $SS_2 = 3$ $SS_3 = 0$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (3/6, 3/6, 0) = (1/2, 1/2, 0)

Example 3: The weighted voting system [10; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_2
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10	P_1
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_1

 $SS_1 = 3$ $SS_2 = 3$ $SS_3 = 0$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (3/6, 3/6, 0) = (1/2, 1/2, 0)Player P₃ is a dummy. **Example 4:** The weighted voting system [12; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10, 14	P ₃
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10, 14	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_1

 $SS_1 = 2$ $SS_2 = 2$ $SS_3 = 2$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (2/6, 2/6, 2/6) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)

Example 4: The weighted voting system [12; 5, 5, 4].

Sequential coalition	Weight tallies	Pivotal player
$\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10, 14	P_3
$\langle P_1, P_3, P_2 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_2, P_1, P_3 \rangle$	5, 10, 14	P_3
$\langle P_2, P_3, P_1 \rangle$	5, 9, 14	P_1
$\langle P_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_2
$\langle P_3, P_2, P_1 \rangle$	4, 9, 14	P_1

 $SS_1 = 2$ $SS_2 = 2$ $SS_3 = 2$

Sh.-Sh. power distribution: (2/6, 2/6, 2/6) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)All players have equal power. **Note:** The WVS's [8; 5, 5, 4] and [12; 26, 5, 5, 4] have the same Shapley-Shubik power distribution, namely

(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)

(see Examples 2 and 4 above).

However, these two WVS's are **not** equivalent to each other.

The WVS [8; 26, 5, 5, 4] requires only two out of three players to agree, while [12; 26, 5, 5, 4] requires unanimity.

On the other hand, **if** two WVS's are equivalent then they must have the same Shapley-Shubik power distribution.

Example 5: The weighted voting system [22; 26, 5, 5, 4].

4! = 24 sequential coalitions. Must we write them all out?
 ★

Example 5: The weighted voting system [22; 26, 5, 5, 4].

- 4! = 24 sequential coalitions. Must we write them all out?
- Fortunately, no. In every sequential coalition, P₁ ("Mom") is the pivotal player, no matter what position she is in.

$$SS_1 = 24$$
 $SS_2 = SS_3 = SS_4 = 0$

Shapley-Shubik power distribution: (1, 0, 0, 0)

Player P_1 is a dictator.

The UN Security Council consists of

- ▶ 5 permanent members (China, France, Russia, UK, USA)
- 10 rotating members

Passing a motion requires at least nine votes, including all five of the permanent members. (Assume no abstentions.)

What is the Shapley-Shubik power distribution?

(If you thought $2^{15} = 32,768$ coalitions was a lot to consider for Banzhaf power, now it's much worse: there are 15! = 1,307,674,368,000 sequential coalitions.)

Permanent members: each pivotal for 256,657,766,400 s.c.'s Rotating members: each pivotal for 2,438,553,600 s.c.'s

Permanent members: each pivotal for 256,657,766,400 s.c.'s Rotating members: each pivotal for 2,438,553,600 s.c.'s

Sh.-Sh. power index of each permanent member:

 $\frac{256,657,766,400}{1,307,674,368,000} \approx 0.1963 = 19.63\%$

Permanent members: each pivotal for 256,657,766,400 s.c.'s Rotating members: each pivotal for 2,438,553,600 s.c.'s

Sh.-Sh. power index of each permanent member:

 $\frac{256,657,766,400}{1,307,674,368,000} \approx 0.1963 = 19.63\%$

Sh.-Sh. power index of each rotating member:

 $\frac{2,438,553,600}{1,307,674,368,000} \ \approx \ 0.0019 \ = \ \boldsymbol{0.19\%}$

	Permanent	Rotating
Banzhaf	16.69%	1.65%
Shapley-Shubik	19.63%	0.19%

Both power indices confirm that the permanent members have much more power than rotating members. (It is moot whether France has 10 times or 100 times the power that Gabon has.)

So, which is a more accurate measure of power? The Banzhaf power distribution or the Shapley-Shubik power distribution?

The Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power indices give the same answer to the question of which of two players is more powerful:

- If Alice has a higher BPI than Bob, then Alice has a higher SSPI than Bob.
- If Alice has the same BPI as Bob, then Alice has the same SSPI as Bob.
- If Alice has a lower BPI than Bob, then Alice has a lower SSPI than Bob.

Banzhaf vs. Shapley-Shubik

 Both the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power indices recognize dictators correctly.

Any dictator has both BPI and SSPI equal to 1 (=100%). Conversely, any non-dictator has both BPI and SSPI less than 1.

 Both the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power indices recognize dummies correctly.

Any dummy has both BPI and SSPI equal to 0.

Conversely, any non-dummy has both BPI and SSPI more than 0.

Banzhaf vs. Shapley-Shubik

- Both the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power indices recognize when two players have equal power.
- Both measures of power yield the same answers for equivalent weighted voting systems.
- Neither can always distinguish non-equivalent weighted voting systems.

For example, neither Banzhaf nor Shapley-Shubik can tell the difference between [8; 5, 5, 4] and [12; 5, 5, 4].

The upshot: The similarities between the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power distributions are more important than the differences, and both are are good ways to measure power.

- For a large WVS, one distribution may be easier to calculate than the other. There are many fewer coalitions (2^N) than sequential coalitions (N!), but on the other hand sequential coalitions are more symmetric.
- Depending on the WVS being studied, it may be more accurate to model coalitions as groups of players that form all at once (Banzhaf), or as groups that players join one at a time (Shapley-Shubik).