

## How to aggregate the preferences of a group of individuals

$X$  set of alternatives that society has to choose from.

$N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  set of individuals

For every  $i \in N$ ,  $\succsim_i$   $i$ 's preference relation over  $X$

Complete and transitive

- complete: for every  $x, y \in X$ , either  $x \succsim_i y$  or  $y \succsim_i x$  or both
- transitive: for every  $x, y, z \in X$  if  $x \succsim_i y$  and  $y \succsim_i z$  then  $x \succsim_i z$

$x \succsim_i y$   $i$  considers  $x$  to be at least as good as  $y$

$x \succ_i y$   $i$  considers  $x$  to be better than  $y$

$x \sim_i y$   $i$  " " just as good as  $y$

Issue: how to aggregate the preferences of the individuals into a single ranking that can be viewed as "society's ranking".

$\succsim$  (without subscript) society's preference relation over  $X$

$x \succsim y$  for the group  $x$  is at least as good as  $y$

$x \succ y$  better than

$x \sim y$  just as good as

function  $f: (\succsim_1, \succsim_2, \dots, \succsim_n) \mapsto \succsim$

social preference function

5 people, 2 alternatives

1:  $A \succ_1 B$   $\#(A \succ B) = 2$

2:  $A \succ_2 B$   $\#(B \succ A) = 1$

3:  $B \succ_3 A$

Majority rule says:

4:  $A \sim_4 B$

$A \succ B$

5:  $A \sim_5 B$

$\#(x \succ y)$  : number of people for whom  $x$  is better than  $y$

$\#(y \succ x)$  : " " "  $y$  is better than  $x$

Majority rule:  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ if } \#(x \succ y) > \#(y \succ x) \text{ then} \\ \text{declare } x \succ y \\ \bullet \text{ otherwise declare } x \sim y \end{array} \right.$

## Majority rule

Let  $X = \{A, B, C\}$  and  $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and

	1's ranking	2's ranking	3's ranking
best	A	C	B
	B	A	C
worst	C	B	A

#  $(A \succ B) = 2$  , #  $(B \succ A) = 1$     so declare     $A \succ B$

#  $(B \succ C) = 2$  , #  $(C \succ B) = 1$     "     $B \succ C$

#  $(C \succ A) = 2$  , #  $(A \succ C) = 1$     "     $C \succ A$

Problem 1:  $\succ$  not transitive

Problem 2: can be manipulated. Suppose Individual 2 sets the agenda ...

Suppose individual 2 sets the agenda

First vote between A and B  $\rightsquigarrow$  A by majority

Second vote between A (the winner of vote 1) and C

$\rightsquigarrow$  C by majority

In his 1951 Ph.D. thesis Kenneth Arrow asked: what is a good *social preference function* (or aggregation rule)?

$$\text{function } f: (\succsim_1, \succsim_2, \dots, \succsim_n) \mapsto \succsim$$

There are MANY possible social preference functions

E.g. let  $X = \{A, B\}$  and  $S = \{1, 2\}$

possible rankings of Individual 1:  $A \succ_1 B, B \succ_1 A, A \sim_1 B$

possible rankings of Individual 2:  $A \succ_2 B, B \succ_2 A, A \sim_2 B$

Thus 9 possible profiles of preferences:

		Individual 2's ranking		
		$A \succ_2 B$	$A \sim_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$
Individual	$A \succ_1 B$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1's	$A \sim_1 B$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ranking	$B \succ_1 A$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

need to have either  $A \succ B$  or  $A \sim B$  or  $B \succ A$

How many different ways to fill these 9 boxes?

i.e. How many different social preference functions?

$$3^9 = 19,693$$

One of them is:

if 1 and 2 agree that  $x$  is better than  $y$  then  $x \succ y$ , otherwise  $x \sim y$

		Individual 2's ranking		
		$A \succ_2 B$	$A \sim_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$
Individual	$A \succ_1 B$	$A \succ B$	$A \sim B$	$A \sim B$
1's	$A \sim_1 B$	$A \sim B$	$A \sim B$	$A \sim B$
ranking	$B \succ_1 A$	$A \sim B$	$A \sim B$	$B \succ A$

Second example:  $X = \{A, B, C\}$  and  $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$

and only strict rankings can be reported:

$A \succ B \succ C$       2

$A \succ C \succ B$

$B \succ A \succ C$       1

$B \succ C \succ A$

$C \succ A \succ B$       3

$C \succ B \succ A$

An input is a triple of strict rankings  $(\succ_1, \succ_2, \succ_3)$

How many possible inputs?  $(\boxed{\phantom{1}}, \boxed{\phantom{2}}, \boxed{\phantom{3}})$

$$6^3 = 216$$

SPF  $\boxed{\phantom{1}} \quad \boxed{\phantom{2}} \quad \boxed{\phantom{3}} \quad \dots \quad \boxed{\phantom{216}}$       Fill in 216 boxes  
 ↑  
 one of 6 rankings

$6^{216}$   
 possible SPFs

$$6^{216} = 1.2 \cdot 10^{168}$$

What is a good or reasonable SPF?

Establish some principles or *desiderata* or axioms

Example:  $X = \{A, B\}$ ,  $S = \{1, 2\}$

and only strict rankings:  $A \succ B$  or  $B \succ A$

Then 4 possible profiles and 16 possible functions:

profile $\rightarrow$	$A \succ_1 B$	$A \succ_1 B$	$B \succ_1 A$	$B \succ_1 A$
SPF $\downarrow$	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$
<del>SPF - 1</del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>
SPF - 2	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
<del>SPF - 3</del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>B \succ A</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>
SPF - 4	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$
<del>SPF - 5</del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>B \succ A</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>
SPF - 6	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
<del>SPF - 7</del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>	<del><math>B \succ A</math></del>	<del><math>B \succ A</math></del>	<del><math>A \succ B</math></del>
SPF - 8	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 9	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$
SPF - 10	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 11	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$
SPF - 12	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 13	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$
SPF - 14	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 15	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$
SPF - 16	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$

Unanimity  
requirement  
Good property:  
if both say  
 $x \succ y$  then  
for society  
 $x \succ y$

UNANIMITY

By appealing to Unanimity we can discard all except:

profile →	$A \succ_1 B$	$A \succ_1 B$	$B \succ_1 A$	$B \succ_1 A$
SPF ↓	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$
SPF - 2	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
→ SPF - 4	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$
→ SPF - 6	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 8	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$

individual 1 is a dictator

individual 2 is a dictator

NON-DICTATORSHIP



profile →	$A \succ_1 B$	$A \succ_1 B$	$B \succ_1 A$	$B \succ_1 A$
SPF ↓	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$	$A \succ_2 B$	$B \succ_2 A$
SPF - 2	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$
SPF - 8	$A \succ B$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$	$B \succ A$

## Arrow's axioms

- **Axiom 1: Unrestricted Domain or Freedom of Expression**

At the individual level, any complete and transitive ranking should be allowed.

- **Axiom 2: Rationality**

Also the social ranking should be complete and transitive