Computational Social Choice: Autumn 2013

Ulle Endriss
Institute for Logic, Language and Computation
University of Amsterdam

Social Choice Theory

SCT studies collective decision making: how should we aggregate the preferences of the members of a group to obtain a "social preference"?

Agent 1:	$\triangle \succ \bigcirc \succ \square$
Agent 2:	$\bigcirc \succ \square \succ \triangle$
Agent 3:	$\square \succ \triangle \succ \bigcirc$
Agent 4:	$\square \succ \triangle \succ \bigcirc$
Agent 5:	$\bigcirc \succ \square \succ \triangle$

?

SCT is traditionally studied in Economics and Political Science, but now also by "us": *Computational Social Choice*.

Organisational Matters

Prerequisites: This is an advanced course: I assume mathematical maturity, we'll move fast, and we'll often touch upon recent research. On the other hand, little specific background is required (just a bit of *complexity theory*).

Examiniation: Homework (best $n-1$ of n, 80%) + presentation (20%).

Website: Lecture slides, homework assignments, papers to present, and other important information will be posted on the course website:

`http://www.illc.uva.nl/~ulle/teaching/comsoc/2013/`

Seminars: There are occasional talks at the ILLC that are relevant to the course and that you are welcome to attend (e.g., at the COMSOC Seminar).

Plan for Today

Today's lecture has two parts:

- Part I. Informal introduction to some of the topics of the course
- Part II. A classical result: Arrow's Theorem

Part I: Examples, Problems, Ideas

Three Voting Rules

How should n *voters* choose from a set of m *alternatives*?

Here are three *voting rules* (there are many more):

- *Plurality:* elect the alternative ranked first most often (i.e., each voter assigns 1 point to an alternative of her choice, and the alternative receiving the most points wins)
- *Plurality with runoff:* run a plurality election and retain the two front-runners; then run a majority contest between them
- *Borda:* each voter gives $m-1$ points to the alternative she ranks first, $m-2$ to the alternative she ranks second, etc.; and the alternative with the most points wins

Example: Choosing a Beverage for Lunch

Consider this election with nine *voters* having to choose from three *alternatives* (namely what beverage to order for a common lunch):

4 Dutchmen:	Milk	$\succ$	Beer	$\succ$	Wine
3 Frenchmen:	Wine	$\succ$	Beer	$\succ$	Milk
2 Germans:	Beer	$\succ$	Wine	$\succ$	Milk

Which beverage *wins* the election for

- the plurality rule?
- plurality with runoff?
- the Borda rule?

Example: Electing a President

Remember Florida 2000 (simplified):

49%:	Bush $\succ$ Gore $\succ$ Nader
20%:	Gore $\succ$ Nader $\succ$ Bush
20%:	Gore $\succ$ Bush $\succ$ Nader
11%:	Nader $\succ$ Gore $\succ$ Bush

Questions:

- Who wins?
- Is that a fair outcome?
- What would your advice to the Nader-supporters have been?

Example: Voting in Multi-issue Elections

Suppose 13 voters are asked to each vote *yes* or *no* on three issues; and we use the plurality rule for each issue independently:

- 3 voters each vote for YNN, NYN, NNY.
- 1 voter each votes for YYY, YYN, YNY, NYY.
- No voter votes for NNN.

But then NNN wins: 7 out of 13 vote *no* on each issue (*paradox!*).

What to do instead? The number of (combinatorial) alternatives is *exponential* in the number of issues (e.g., $2^3 = 8$), so even just representing the voters' preferences is a challenge ...

S.J. Brams, D.M. Kilgour, and W.S. Zwicker. The Paradox of Multiple Elections. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 15(2):211–236, 1998.

Judgment Aggregation

Preferences are not the only structures we may wish to aggregate.
In JA we aggregate people's judgments regarding complex propositions.

	p	$p \to q$	q
Judge 1:	Yes	Yes	Yes
Judge 2:	Yes	No	No
Judge 3:	No	Yes	No
		?	

Fair Division

Fair division is the problem of dividing one or several goods amongst two or more agents in a way that satisfies a suitable fairness criterion. One instance of this problem is *cake cutting*.

For *two agents*, we can use the *cut-and-choose* procedure:

- ▶ *One agent cuts the cake in two pieces (she considers to be of equal value), and the other chooses one of them (the piece she prefers).*

The cut-and-choose procedure is *proportional:*

- ▶ Each agent is guaranteed at least one half (general: $1/n$) according to her own valuation.

What if there are more than two agents? Is proportionality the best way of measuring fairness? What about other types of goods?

Computational Social Choice

Research can be broadly classified along two dimensions —
The kind of *social choice problem* studied, e.g.:

- electing a winner given individual preferences over candidates
- aggregating individual judgements into a collective verdict
- fairly dividing a cake given individual tastes
- finding a stable matching of students to schools

The kind of *computational technique* employed, e.g.:

- algorithm design to implement complex mechanisms
- complexity theory to understand limitations
- logical modelling to fully formalise intuitions
- knowledge representation techniques to compactly model problems
- deployment in a multiagent system

Y. Chevaleyre, U. Endriss, J. Lang, and N. Maudet. A Short Introduction to Computational Social Choice. Proc. SOFSEM-2007.

Part II: Arrow's Theorem

Arrow's Theorem

This is probably the most famous theorem in social choice theory. It was first proved by Kenneth J. Arrow in his 1951 PhD thesis. He later received the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1972.

What we will see next:

- formal framework: *social welfare functions*
- the *axiomatic method* in SCT, and some axioms
- the theorem, its interpretation, and a proof

K.J. Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. John Wiley and Sons, 2nd edition, 1963. First edition published in 1951.

Formal Framework

Basic terminology and notation:

- finite set of *individuals* $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, with $n \geqslant 2$
- (usually finite) set of *alternatives* $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots\}$
- Denote the set of *linear orders* on $\mathcal{X}$ by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$.
  Preferences (or *ballots*) are taken to be elements of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$.
- A *profile* $\boldsymbol{R} = (R_1, \ldots, R_n) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})^n$ is a vector of preferences.
- We shall write $N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y}$ for the set of individuals that rank alternative x above alternative y under profile $\boldsymbol{R}$.

For today we are interested in preference aggregation mechanisms that map any profile of preferences to a single collective preference.

The proper technical term is *social welfare function* (SWF):

$$F : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})^n \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$$

The Axiomatic Method

Many important classical results in social choice theory are *axiomatic*. They formalise desirable properties as "*axioms*" and then establish:

- *Characterisation Theorems*, showing that a particular (class of) mechanism(s) is the only one satisfying a given set of axioms
- *Impossibility Theorems*, showing that there exists *no* aggregation mechanism satisfying a given set of axioms

Anonymity and Neutrality

Two very basic axioms (that we won't actually need for the theorem):

- A SWF F is *anonymous* if *individuals* are treated symmetrically:

$$F(R_1, \ldots, R_n) = F(R_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, R_{\pi(n)})$$

for any profile $\boldsymbol{R}$ and any permutation $\pi : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{N}$

- A SWF F is *neutral* if *alternatives* are treated symmetrically:

$$F(\pi(\boldsymbol{R})) = \pi(F(\boldsymbol{R}))$$

for any profile $\boldsymbol{R}$ and any permutation $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$

(with π extended to preferences and profiles in the natural manner)

Keep in mind:

- not every SWF will satisfy every axiom we state here
- axioms are meant to be *desirable* properties (always arguable)

The Pareto Condition

A SWF F satisfies the *Pareto condition* if, whenever all individuals rank x above y, then so does society:

$$N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y} = \mathcal{N} \text{ implies } (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R})$$

This is a standard condition going back to the work of the Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto (1848–1923).

Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA)

A SWF F satisfies *IIA* if the relative social ranking of two alternatives only depends on their relative individual rankings:

$$N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y} = N^{\boldsymbol{R}'}_{x \succ y} \text{ implies } (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R}) \Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R}')$$

In other words: if x is socially preferred to y, then this should not change when an individual changes her ranking of z.

IIA was proposed by Arrow.

Universal Domain

This "axiom" is not really an axiom ...

Sometimes the fact that any SWF must be defined over *all* profiles is stated explicitly as a *universal domain* axiom.

Instead, I prefer to think of this as an integral part of the definition of the framework (for now) or as a *domain condition* (later on).

Arrow's Theorem

A SWF F is a *dictatorship* if there exists a "dictator" $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $F(\boldsymbol{R}) = R_i$ for any profile $\boldsymbol{R}$, i.e., if the outcome is always identical to the preference supplied by the dictator.

Theorem 1 (Arrow, 1951) *Any SWF for $\geqslant 3$ alternatives that satisfies the Pareto condition and IIA must be a dictatorship.*

Next: some remarks, then a proof

K.J. Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. John Wiley and Sons, 2nd edition, 1963. First edition published in 1951.

Remarks

- Note that this is a *surprising* result!
- Note that the theorem does *not* hold for *two* alternatives.
- Note that the *opposite direction* clearly holds: any dictatorship satisfies both the Pareto condition and IIA.
- Common misunderstanding: the SWF being *dictatorial* does not just mean that the outcome coincides with the preferences of some individual (rather: it's *the same* dictator for any profile).
- Arrow's Theorem is often read as an *impossibility theorem:*

  There exists no SWF for $\geqslant 3$ alternatives that is Paretian, independent, and nondictatorial.
- Significance of the result: (a) the result itself; (b) *general* theorem rather than just another observation about a flaw of a specific procedure; (c) *methodology* (precise statement of "axioms").

Proof

We'll sketch a proof adapted from Sen (1986), using the "decisive coalition" technique. Full details are in my review paper.

Claim: *Any SWF for $\geqslant 3$ alternatives that satisfies the Pareto condition and IIA must be a dictatorship.*

So let F be a SWF for $\geqslant 3$ alternatives that satisfies Pareto and IIA.

Call a coalition $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ *decisive* on (x, y) iff $G \subseteq N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y} \Rightarrow (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R})$.

Proof Plan:

- Pareto condition $=$ $\mathcal{N}$ is decisive for all pairs of alternatives
- Lemma: G with $|G| \geqslant 2$ *decisive* for all pairs $\Rightarrow$ some $G' \subset G$ as well
- Thus (by induction), there's a decisive coalition of size 1 (a *dictator*).

A.K. Sen. *Social Choice Theory*. In K.J. Arrow and M.D. Intriligator (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, Volume 3, North-Holland, 1986.

U. Endriss. Logic and Social Choice Theory. In A. Gupta and J. van Benthem (eds.), *Logic and Philosophy Today*, College Publications, 2011.

About Decisiveness

Recall: $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ *decisive* on (x, y) iff $G \subseteq N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y} \Rightarrow (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R})$

Call $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ *weakly decisive* on (x, y) iff $G = N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x \succ y} \Rightarrow (x, y) \in F(\boldsymbol{R})$.

Claim: G weakly decisive on $(x, y) \Rightarrow G$ decisive on *any* pair (x', y')

Proof: Suppose x, y, x', y' are all distinct (other cases: similar).

Consider a profile where individuals express these preferences:

- Members of G: $x' \succ x \succ y \succ y'$
- Others: $x' \succ x$ and $y \succ y'$ and $y \succ x$ (rest still undetermined)

From G being weakly decisive for (x, y): society ranks $x \succ y$
From Pareto: society ranks $x' \succ x$ and $y \succ y'$
Thus, from transitivity: society ranks $x' \succ y'$

Note that this works for any ranking of x' vs. y' by non-G individuals.
By IIA, it still works if individuals change their non-x'-vs.-y' rankings.

Thus, for *any* profile $\boldsymbol{R}$ with $G \subseteq N^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{x' \succ y'}$ we get $(x', y') \in F(\boldsymbol{R})$. ✓

Contraction Lemma

Claim: If $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ with $|G| \geqslant 2$ is a coalition that is decisive on all pairs of alternatives, then so is some nonempty coalition $G' \subset G$.

Proof: Take any nonempty G_1, G_2 with $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset$.

Recall that there are $\geqslant 3$ alternatives. Consider this profile:

- Members of G_1: $x \succ y \succ z \succ$ *rest*
- Members of G_2: $y \succ z \succ x \succ$ *rest*
- Others: $z \succ x \succ y \succ$ *rest*

As $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ is decisive, society ranks $y \succ z$. Two cases:

(1) Society ranks $x \succ z$: Exactly G_1 ranks $x \succ z \Rightarrow$ By IIA, in any profile where exactly G_1 ranks $x \succ z$, society will rank $x \succ z \Rightarrow G_1$ is weakly decisive on (x, z). Hence (previous slide): G_1 is decisive on all pairs.

(2) Society ranks $z \succ x$, i.e., $y \succ x$: Exactly G_2 ranks $y \succ x \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow$ G_2 is decisive on all pairs.

Hence, one of G_1 and G_2 will always be decisive. ✓
This concludes the proof of Arrow's Theorem.

Summary

In the first part, we have seen examples for different *types of problems* in collective decision making:

- voting and preference aggregation
- judgment aggregation
- fair division

We have also hinted at some of the *problems* we will discuss:

- paradoxes and the need to be precise (axiomatic method)
- dealing with strategic behaviour
- the challenge of having many alternatives (combinatorial domains)

In the second part, we have seen *Arrow's Theorem*, *the* seminal result in (classical) SCT, and we have gone through a proof.

What next?

Next, we will see two further classical impossibility theorems:

- Sen's Theorem on the Impossibility of a Paretian Liberal
- The Muller-Satterthwaite Theorem

Go over the proof of Arrow's Theorm once more by yourself: we will use the same approach for the Muller-Satterthwaite Theorem.

Later in the course we will revisit many of the ideas we have touched upon earlier today in much more depth.