2011 referendum options simulator

Mark C. Wilson
www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~mcw/blog/

Department of Computer Science
University of Auckland

CMSS Seminar, 2011-05-10

Key references

FM1998 D. Felsenthal, M. Machover. The Measurement of Voting Power, Edward Elgar, 1998.

Key references

FM1998 D. Felsenthal, M. Machover. The Measurement of Voting Power, Edward Elgar, 1998.

LV2008 A. Laruelle, F. Valenciano. Voting and Collective Decision-Making. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Key references

FM1998 D. Felsenthal, M. Machover. The Measurement of Voting Power, Edward Elgar, 1998.

LV2008 A. Laruelle, F. Valenciano. Voting and Collective Decision-Making. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

DNW1981 P. Dubey, A. Neyman, R. J. Weber. Value theory without efficiency. Mathematics of Operations Research 6 (1981), 122–128.

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Usually, $v(\emptyset) = 0$ is required - we do here.

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Usually, $v(\emptyset) = 0$ is required - we do here.
- For each $S \subseteq X$, $v(S)$ is supposed to represent the total payoff to the coalition S.

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Usually, $v(\emptyset) = 0$ is required - we do here.
- For each $S \subseteq X$, $v(S)$ is supposed to represent the total payoff to the coalition S.
- Notation:

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Usually, $v(\emptyset) = 0$ is required - we do here.
- For each $S \subseteq X$, $v(S)$ is supposed to represent the total payoff to the coalition S.
- Notation:
  - $\mathcal{G}$: collection of all TU games - a real vector space

TU games

- A transferable utility (TU) game $G = (X, v)$ is specified by a finite set X (the players) and a characteristic function $v : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Usually, $v(\emptyset) = 0$ is required - we do here.
- For each $S \subseteq X$, $v(S)$ is supposed to represent the total payoff to the coalition S.
- Notation:
  - $\mathcal{G}$: collection of all TU games - a real vector space
  - $\mathcal{G}(X)$: collection of all TU games with underlying set X - a real vector space

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.
- Alternatively, it can be specified by X and the set of winning coalitions, $W := \{S \subseteq X \mid v(S) = 1\}$.

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0,1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.
- Alternatively, it can be specified by X and the set of winning coalitions, $W := \{S \subseteq X \mid v(S) = 1\}$.
- Often, $\emptyset \notin W$ is required - we do here. Often $W \neq \emptyset$ is required - we don't.

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.
- Alternatively, it can be specified by X and the set of winning coalitions, $W := \{S \subseteq X \mid v(S) = 1\}$.
- Often, $\emptyset \notin W$ is required - we do here. Often $W \neq \emptyset$ is required - we don't.
- Notation:

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.
- Alternatively, it can be specified by X and the set of winning coalitions, $W := \{S \subseteq X \mid v(S) = 1\}$.
- Often, $\emptyset \notin W$ is required - we do here. Often $W \neq \emptyset$ is required - we don't.
- Notation:
  - $\mathcal{SG}$: collection of all simple games - a lattice

Simple games

- A simple game is a TU game with $v(S) \in \{0,1\}$ for all $S \subseteq X$.
- Alternatively, it can be specified by X and the set of winning coalitions, $W := \{S \subseteq X \mid v(S) = 1\}$.
- Often, $\emptyset \notin W$ is required - we do here. Often $W \neq \emptyset$ is required - we don't.
- Notation:
  - $\mathcal{SG}$: collection of all simple games - a lattice
  - $\mathcal{SG}(X)$: collection of all simple games with underlying set X - a lattice

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Key motivating examples of simple games

- Unanimity games: choose $S \subseteq X$ and let $v(T) = 1$ if and only if $S \subseteq T$. Every member of S has a veto.

Key motivating examples of simple games

- Unanimity games: choose $S \subseteq X$ and let $v(T) = 1$ if and only if $S \subseteq T$. Every member of S has a veto.
- Weighted majority games $[q; w_1, w_2, \ldots w_n]$. Player i has weight w_i; choose a quota q and let $v(S) = 1$ iff $\sum_{i \in S} w_i \geq q$. Used to model yes-no voting in committees. Examples: stockholder elections, EU Council of Ministers, ordinary majority voting in Parliament.

Key motivating examples of simple games

- Unanimity games: choose $S \subseteq X$ and let $v(T) = 1$ if and only if $S \subseteq T$. Every member of S has a veto.
- Weighted majority games $[q; w_1, w_2, \dots w_n]$. Player i has weight w_i; choose a quota q and let $v(S) = 1$ iff $\sum_{i \in S} w_i \geq q$. Used to model yes-no voting in committees. Examples: stockholder elections, EU Council of Ministers, ordinary majority voting in Parliament.
- Disequilibrium games: for a given noncooperative game and fixed profile of actions, declare a subset to be winning if is a witness to the profile not being a strong Nash equilibrium. Examples: voting rules with the sincere profile.

Basic concepts of TU games and simple games

monotonicity $S \subseteq T \implies v(S) \leq v(T)$.

We usually assume monotonicity for simple games, in which case we need only specify the minimal winning coalitions in order to specify the game. A dummy is not an element of any minimal winning coalition.

Basic concepts of TU games and simple games

monotonicity $S \subseteq T \implies v(S) \leq v(T)$.

dummy $i \in X$ is a dummy if for all $S \subseteq X$, $v(S) = v(S \setminus \{i\})$.

We usually assume monotonicity for simple games, in which case we need only specify the minimal winning coalitions in order to specify the game. A dummy is not an element of any minimal winning coalition.

Basic concepts of TU games and simple games

monotonicity $S \subseteq T \implies v(S) \leq v(T)$.

dummy $i \in X$ is a dummy if for all $S \subseteq X$, $v(S) = v(S \setminus \{i\})$.

proper simple game $S \in W, T \in W \implies S \cap T \neq \emptyset$.

We usually assume monotonicity for simple games, in which case we need only specify the minimal winning coalitions in order to specify the game. A dummy is not an element of any minimal winning coalition.

Example: voting in the EU Council of Ministers

- From 1958 to 2003 various weighted majority games were used. Such games are proper if the quota is large enough (more than half the sum of all weights).

Example: voting in the EU Council of Ministers

- From 1958 to 2003 various weighted majority games were used. Such games are proper if the quota is large enough (more than half the sum of all weights).
- In first version (Treaty of Rome), game was $[12; 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 1]$. Luxembourg was a dummy!

Example: voting in the EU Council of Ministers

- From 1958 to 2003 various weighted majority games were used. Such games are proper if the quota is large enough (more than half the sum of all weights).
- In first version (Treaty of Rome), game was $[12; 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 1]$. Luxembourg was a dummy!
- Last version (1995–2003) had $[62; 10, 10, 10, 10, 8, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2]$.

Example: voting in the EU Council of Ministers

- From 1958 to 2003 various weighted majority games were used. Such games are proper if the quota is large enough (more than half the sum of all weights).
- In first version (Treaty of Rome), game was $[12; 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 1]$. Luxembourg was a dummy!
- Last version (1995–2003) had $[62; 10, 10, 10, 10, 8, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2]$.
- Treaty of Nice (currently in force) uses weights (totalling 345) but has more conditions. A coalition is winning iff it has at least 50% of the countries, 74% of the weights, 62% of the population.

Example: voting in the EU Council of Ministers

- From 1958 to 2003 various weighted majority games were used. Such games are proper if the quota is large enough (more than half the sum of all weights).
- In first version (Treaty of Rome), game was $[12; 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 1]$. Luxembourg was a dummy!
- Last version (1995–2003) had $[62; 10, 10, 10, 10, 8, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2]$.
- Treaty of Nice (currently in force) uses weights (totalling 345) but has more conditions. A coalition is winning iff it has at least 50% of the countries, 74% of the weights, 62% of the population.
- Treaty of Lisbon (from 2014): coalition wins iff it has at least 55% of countries and 65% of population. This method is easily implemented if new members join, and avoids complex negotiations over weights.

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.
- Some basic desirable properties are:

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.
- Some basic desirable properties are:

  Anonymity each player's payout depends only on their contribution, not the player name;

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.
- Some basic desirable properties are:

  Anonymity each player's payout depends only on their contribution, not the player name;

  Linearity $a\xi_i((X, v_1)) + b\xi_i((X, v_2)) = \xi(X, av_1 + bv_2)$.

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.
- Some basic desirable properties are:

  Anonymity each player's payout depends only on their contribution, not the player name;

  Linearity $a\xi_i((X, v_1)) + b\xi_i((X, v_2)) = \xi(X, av_1 + bv_2)$.

  Positivity $\xi_i(G) \geq 0$ if G is monotone;

Efficient values

- We seek an allocation rule that will distribute the total value of the grand coalition X among the players. An allocation is a function giving a real number for each element of X.
- An efficient value is a function ξ that does this: it takes every TU game to an allocation, such that the individual payouts (denoted $\xi_i(G)$) have sum $v(X)$.
- Some basic desirable properties are:

  Anonymity each player's payout depends only on their contribution, not the player name;

  Linearity $a\xi_i((X, v_1)) + b\xi_i((X, v_2)) = \xi(X, av_1 + bv_2)$.

  Positivity $\xi_i(G) \geq 0$ if G is monotone;

  Dummy $\xi_i(G) = 0$ if i is a dummy in G.

The Shapley value

- Shapley proved that there is a unique efficient value satisfying Anonymity, Dummy and Linearity. Explicitly it is given by

$$\sigma_i(G) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{S \subseteq X} (n - |S|)!(|S| - 1)! \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

The Shapley value

- Shapley proved that there is a unique efficient value satisfying Anonymity, Dummy and Linearity. Explicitly it is given by

$$\sigma_i(G) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{S \subseteq X} (n - |S|)!(|S| - 1)! \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

- This can be interpreted in terms of a coalition-formation or bargaining model, not without controversy.

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

The Shapley value

- Shapley proved that there is a unique efficient value satisfying Anonymity, Dummy and Linearity. Explicitly it is given by

$$\sigma_i(G) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{S \subseteq X} (n - |S|)!(|S| - 1)! \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

- This can be interpreted in terms of a coalition-formation or bargaining model, not without controversy.
- The idea is to consider all possible orders of players with equal probability, and give player i its expected marginal contribution.

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Beyond efficiency

- Values satisfying Anonymity, Dummy, Positivity and Linearity are called semivalues.

Beyond efficiency

- Values satisfying Anonymity, Dummy, Positivity and Linearity are called semivalues.
- Dubey, Neyman and Weber (1981) showed that a function is a semivalue if and only if it has the form

$$\xi_i(G) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} p(n,k) \sum_{|S|=k, S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})]$$

where $p(n,k) \geq 0$ and the following identities hold

$$\sum_k \binom{n-1}{k-1} p(n,k) = 1$$

$$p(n,k) = p(n-1,k-1) - p(n,k-1)$$

Beyond efficiency

- Values satisfying Anonymity, Dummy, Positivity and Linearity are called semivalues.
- Dubey, Neyman and Weber (1981) showed that a function is a semivalue if and only if it has the form

$$\xi_i(G) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} p(n,k) \sum_{|S|=k, S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})]$$

where $p(n,k) \geq 0$ and the following identities hold

$$\sum_{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1} p(n,k) = 1$$

$$p(n,k) = p(n-1,k-1) - p(n,k-1)$$

- If all $p(n,k) \neq 0$, the semivalue is called regular.

Semivalues

- $\xi_i(G)$ represents the expected marginal contribution of player i if all coalitions of size k are equally likely to contain i and $p(n, k)$ is the probability that i is in a given coalition of size k.

Semivalues

- $\xi_i(G)$ represents the expected marginal contribution of player i if all coalitions of size k are equally likely to contain i and $p(n, k)$ is the probability that i is in a given coalition of size k.
- A semivalue is uniquely determined by its value on unanimity games. For example $\sigma_i(S) = 1/|S|$ for the unanimity game determined by S. In particular, a dictator has value 1.

Semivalues

- $\xi_i(G)$ represents the expected marginal contribution of player i if all coalitions of size k are equally likely to contain i and $p(n,k)$ is the probability that i is in a given coalition of size k.
- A semivalue is uniquely determined by its value on unanimity games. For example $\sigma_i(S) = 1/|S|$ for the unanimity game determined by S. In particular, a dictator has value 1.
- The only efficient semivalue is the Shapley value.

Semivalues

- $\xi_i(G)$ represents the expected marginal contribution of player i if all coalitions of size k are equally likely to contain i and $p(n,k)$ is the probability that i is in a given coalition of size k.
- A semivalue is uniquely determined by its value on unanimity games. For example $\sigma_i(S) = 1/|S|$ for the unanimity game determined by S. In particular, a dictator has value 1.
- The only efficient semivalue is the Shapley value.
- Regular semivalues satisfy Young sensibility: if the marginal contribution to each S is strictly higher in one game than another, then the ξ_i have the same relation.

Semivalues

- $\xi_i(G)$ represents the expected marginal contribution of player i if all coalitions of size k are equally likely to contain i and $p(n,k)$ is the probability that i is in a given coalition of size k.
- A semivalue is uniquely determined by its value on unanimity games. For example $\sigma_i(S) = 1/|S|$ for the unanimity game determined by S. In particular, a dictator has value 1.
- The only efficient semivalue is the Shapley value.
- Regular semivalues satisfy Young sensibility: if the marginal contribution to each S is strictly higher in one game than another, then the ξ_i have the same relation.
- The class of probabilistic values is even more general - the coefficients p can depend on S and not just on $|S|$.

Some explicit semivalues

- (binomial (for fixed $p \in [0, 1]$))

$$\beta_i^p(G) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sum_{|S|=k} \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Some explicit semivalues

- (binomial (for fixed $p \in [0,1]$))

$$\beta_i^p(G) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sum_{|S|=k} \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

- (Banzhaf (binomial with $p = 1/2$))

$$\beta_i(G) = 2^{1-n} \sum_{S \subseteq X} \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

Some explicit semivalues

- (binomial (for fixed $p \in [0,1]$))

$$\beta_i^p(G) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sum_{|S|=k} \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

- (Banzhaf (binomial with $p = 1/2$))

$$\beta_i(G) = 2^{1-n} \sum_{S \subseteq X} \left[v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\}) \right].$$

- (dictatorial)

$$\delta_i(G) = v(\{i\}).$$

Some explicit semivalues

- (binomial (for fixed $p \in [0,1]$))

$$\beta_i^p(G) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sum_{|S|=k} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

- (Banzhaf (binomial with $p = 1/2$))

$$\beta_i(G) = 2^{1-n} \sum_{S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

- (dictatorial)

$$\delta_i(G) = v(\{i\}).$$

- (Shapley)

$$\sigma_i(G) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{|S|=k, S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

Some explicit semivalues

- (binomial (for fixed $p \in [0,1]$))

$$\beta_i^p(G) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sum_{|S|=k} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

- (Banzhaf (binomial with $p = 1/2$))

$$\beta_i(G) = 2^{1-n} \sum_{S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

- (dictatorial)

$$\delta_i(G) = v(\{i\}).$$

- (Shapley)

$$\sigma_i(G) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{|S|=k, S \subseteq X} [v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})] .$$

Potential

- Mas-Colell and Hart (1988) introduced the idea of potential, borrowed from physics.

Potential

- Mas-Colell and Hart (1988) introduced the idea of potential, borrowed from physics.
- Let ξ be a value. A *potential* for ξ is a mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that
$$\Phi(G) - \Phi(G_{-\{i\}}) = \xi_i(G)$$
for all $G = (X, v) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $X \neq \emptyset$. Here $G_{-\{i\}}$ is the game with player set $X \setminus \{i\}$ and the same v.

Potential

- Mas-Colell and Hart (1988) introduced the idea of potential, borrowed from physics.
- Let ξ be a value. A *potential* for ξ is a mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that
$$\Phi(G) - \Phi(G_{-\{i\}}) = \xi_i(G)$$
for all $G = (X, v) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $X \neq \emptyset$. Here $G_{-\{i\}}$ is the game with player set $X \setminus \{i\}$ and the same v.
- The initial condition $\Phi(\emptyset, v) = 0$ is usually assumed.

Potential

- Mas-Colell and Hart (1988) introduced the idea of potential, borrowed from physics.
- Let ξ be a value. A *potential* for ξ is a mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that
$$\Phi(G) - \Phi(G_{-\{i\}}) = \xi_i(G)$$
for all $G = (X, v) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $X \neq \emptyset$. Here $G_{-\{i\}}$ is the game with player set $X \setminus \{i\}$ and the same v.
- The initial condition $\Phi(\emptyset, v) = 0$ is usually assumed.
- There is a unique efficient value having a potential function, and it is the Shapley value. Explicitly, the potential looks like
$$\Phi(G) = \sum_k \frac{1}{k\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{|S|=k, S\subseteq X} v(S).$$

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Potential without efficiency

- Calvo and Santos (2000) described exactly which values possess a potential function.

Potential without efficiency

- Calvo and Santos (2000) described exactly which values possess a potential function.
- The answer: ξ has a potential if and only if it satisfies Myerson's balanced contributions axiom:

$$\xi_i(G) - \xi_i(G \setminus \{j\}) = \xi_j(G) - \xi_j(G \setminus \{i\})$$

and if and only if it is path-independent.

Potential without efficiency

- Calvo and Santos (2000) described exactly which values possess a potential function.
- The answer: ξ has a potential if and only if it satisfies Myerson's balanced contributions axiom:

$$\xi_i(G) - \xi_i(G \setminus \{j\}) = \xi_j(G) - \xi_j(G \setminus \{i\})$$

  and if and only if it is path-independent.
- In particular, every semivalue has a potential function. Explicitly:

$$\Phi(G) = \sum_k p(n,k) \sum_{|S|=k} v(S)$$

  the expected value of a coalition chosen randomly according to the weights $p(n,k)$.

Measuring power in simple games

- There is a long theory of power in voting games (more generally, simple games). One strand goes back to Banzhaf (1965) and earlier, Penrose (1946).

Measuring power in simple games

- There is a long theory of power in voting games (more generally, simple games). One strand goes back to Banzhaf (1965) and earlier, Penrose (1946).
- Shapley and Shubik (1954) used the Shapley value as a measure of power.

Measuring power in simple games

- There is a long theory of power in voting games (more generally, simple games). One strand goes back to Banzhaf (1965) and earlier, Penrose (1946).
- Shapley and Shubik (1954) used the Shapley value as a measure of power.
- The underlying idea is to measure the extent to which a player is important for winning coalitions. A key observation is that for weighted majority games, the relative power of the players can vary dramatically from the relative weights.

Measuring power in simple games

- There is a long theory of power in voting games (more generally, simple games). One strand goes back to Banzhaf (1965) and earlier, Penrose (1946).
- Shapley and Shubik (1954) used the Shapley value as a measure of power.
- The underlying idea is to measure the extent to which a player is important for winning coalitions. A key observation is that for weighted majority games, the relative power of the players can vary dramatically from the relative weights.
- Much has been written, but no standard definition of a power measure/index has been agreed. There are many conceptual confusions in the literature and some controversy.

Concepts of power in simple games

- Felsenthal and Machover: there are at least two kinds of "power" and previous authors have conflated them. P-power deals with distribution of the spoils of power; I-power deals with decisiveness. The former may not be well-defined, but the latter is. The former is always relative, but the latter is absolute.

Concepts of power in simple games

- Felsenthal and Machover: there are at least two kinds of "power" and previous authors have conflated them. P-power deals with distribution of the spoils of power; I-power deals with decisiveness. The former may not be well-defined, but the latter is. The former is always relative, but the latter is absolute.
- Laruelle and Valenciano: there are at least two kinds of situation, and previous authors have conflated them. Take it or leave it committees must only vote; pure bargaining committees involve complex negotiations. In the first case, decisiveness is not as important as "success". P-power in fact is related to decisiveness via bargaining committees.

Decisiveness (individual)

- A player i is decisive for coalition S if S wins with i but not without i. In other words, the marginal contribution $v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})$ is 1.

Decisiveness (individual)

- A player i is decisive for coalition S if S wins with i but not without i. In other words, the marginal contribution $v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})$ is 1.
- The basic idea of I-power is to measure how often each player is decisive.

Decisiveness (individual)

- A player i is decisive for coalition S if S wins with i but not without i. In other words, the marginal contribution $v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})$ is 1.
- The basic idea of I-power is to measure how often each player is decisive.
- The most common measure is the Banzhaf measure, the specialization of the Banzhaf semivalue: the probability that i is decisive for a uniformly randomly chosen coalition containing i.

Decisiveness (individual)

- A player i is decisive for coalition S if S wins with i but not without i. In other words, the marginal contribution $v(S) - v(S \setminus \{i\})$ is 1.
- The basic idea of I-power is to measure how often each player is decisive.
- The most common measure is the Banzhaf measure, the specialization of the Banzhaf semivalue: the probability that i is decisive for a uniformly randomly chosen coalition containing i.
- This measure was discovered first for simple games by Penrose and rediscovered by Banzhaf (1965) in the context of a court case over the Nassau County Board of Supervisors (weighted voting game $[16; 9, 9, 7, 3, 1, 1]$).

Decisiveness (collective)

- A collective decisiveness measure should measure the overall ability of the system to form a winning coalition. We could try to axiomatize it.

Decisiveness (collective)

- A collective decisiveness measure should measure the overall ability of the system to form a winning coalition. We could try to axiomatize it.
- Example: Coleman (1971) introduced the measure $C = |W|/2^n$, the probability that a uniformly chosen random coalition is winning. The basic model is of each voter deciding Yes or No independently with probability $1/2$.

Decisiveness (collective)

- A collective decisiveness measure should measure the overall ability of the system to form a winning coalition. We could try to axiomatize it.
- Example: Coleman (1971) introduced the measure $C = |W|/2^n$, the probability that a uniformly chosen random coalition is winning. The basic model is of each voter deciding Yes or No independently with probability $1/2$.
- Again, no standard definition/axioms exist. Note that C could be generalized to TU games: $2^{-n} \sum_S v(S)$.

Decisiveness (collective)

- A collective decisiveness measure should measure the overall ability of the system to form a winning coalition. We could try to axiomatize it.
- Example: Coleman (1971) introduced the measure $C = |W|/2^n$, the probability that a uniformly chosen random coalition is winning. The basic model is of each voter deciding Yes or No independently with probability $1/2$.
- Again, no standard definition/axioms exist. Note that C could be generalized to TU games: $2^{-n} \sum_S v(S)$.
- Example: EUCM under Treaty of Nice has $C \approx 0.02$. Very hard to pass any motion, hence the need for reform in Treaty of Lisbon (which currently has $C \approx 0.13$).

From individual to collective decisiveness

- Observation: the Coleman measure is essentially the potential function for the Banzhaf measure.

From individual to collective decisiveness

- Observation: the Coleman measure is essentially the potential function for the Banzhaf measure.
- Idea: define a collective decisiveness measure to be the potential function of an individual decisiveness measure. At least now we only have to define one of them! This means that any individual decisiveness measure must satisfy the balanced contributions axiom.

From individual to collective decisiveness

- Observation: the Coleman measure is essentially the potential function for the Banzhaf measure.
- Idea: define a collective decisiveness measure to be the potential function of an individual decisiveness measure. At least now we only have to define one of them! This means that any individual decisiveness measure must satisfy the balanced contributions axiom.
- Idea: define an individual decisiveness measure to be the restriction of a semivalue to $\mathcal{SG}$. Note: such functions satisfy Anonymity, Positivity, Dummy, and Modularity (the replacement for Linearity).

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Assuming no abstentions/absences, a bill will pass if and only if 62 votes are obtained. Under strict party discipline (bloc voting):

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Assuming no abstentions/absences, a bill will pass if and only if 62 votes are obtained. Under strict party discipline (bloc voting):
  - There are 11 minimal winning coalitions and 252 winning coalitions overall. Note that parties 2-5, and parties 6-9, are equivalent.

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Assuming no abstentions/absences, a bill will pass if and only if 62 votes are obtained. Under strict party discipline (bloc voting):
  - There are 11 minimal winning coalitions and 252 winning coalitions overall. Note that parties 2-5, and parties 6-9, are equivalent.
  - Power vector for Shapley-Shubik: $\sigma = (0.611, 0.090, 0.090.0.090, 0.090, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008)$.

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Assuming no abstentions/absences, a bill will pass if and only if 62 votes are obtained. Under strict party discipline (bloc voting):
  - There are 11 minimal winning coalitions and 252 winning coalitions overall. Note that parties 2-5, and parties 6-9, are equivalent.
  - Power vector for Shapley-Shubik: $\sigma = (0.611, 0.090, 0.090.0.090, 0.090, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008)$.
  - (Normalized) power vector for Banzhaf: $\beta = (0.657, 0.074, 0.074.0.074.0.074, 0.011, 0.011, 0.011, 0.011)$.

NZ Parliament

- The current (May 2011) Parliament has parties with the following numbers of MPs by party (including independents): 58, 42, 9, 5, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1.
- Assuming no abstentions/absences, a bill will pass if and only if 62 votes are obtained. Under strict party discipline (bloc voting):
  - There are 11 minimal winning coalitions and 252 winning coalitions overall. Note that parties 2-5, and parties 6-9, are equivalent.
  - Power vector for Shapley-Shubik: $\sigma = (0.611, 0.090, 0.090.0.090, 0.090, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008, 0.008)$.
  - (Normalized) power vector for Banzhaf: $\beta = (0.657, 0.074, 0.074.0.074.0.074, 0.011, 0.011, 0.011, 0.011)$.
  - Coleman index: $C = 0.492$.

My interpretation: power measures

- Define an individual power measure to be a regular semivalue on the class of simple games and a collective power measure to be the potential function.

My interpretation: power measures

- Define an individual power measure to be a regular semivalue on the class of simple games and a collective power measure to be the potential function.
- There are many possible measures (semivalues). Which one to use should be dictated by the specifics of the situation being modelled.

My interpretation: power measures

- Define an individual power measure to be a regular semivalue on the class of simple games and a collective power measure to be the potential function.
- There are many possible measures (semivalues). Which one to use should be dictated by the specifics of the situation being modelled.
- Efficiency is an obvious requirement if a fixed prize is being divided, and this usually leads to the Shapley value (Shapley-Shubik index). Otherwise efficiency is meaningless and should be dropped.

My interpretation: power measures

- Define an individual power measure to be a regular semivalue on the class of simple games and a collective power measure to be the potential function.
- There are many possible measures (semivalues). Which one to use should be dictated by the specifics of the situation being modelled.
- Efficiency is an obvious requirement if a fixed prize is being divided, and this usually leads to the Shapley value (Shapley-Shubik index). Otherwise efficiency is meaningless and should be dropped.
- Collective decisiveness certainly is important, so individual power measures do measure something important, even if it is not "power".

Manipulation and query model

- The simple game describing manipulability can have no winning coalitions. It can have several conflicting coalitions which intersect. It can have conflicting coalitions that do not intersect. More complicated than the yes-no voting examples.

Manipulation and query model

- The simple game describing manipulability can have no winning coalitions. It can have several conflicting coalitions which intersect. It can have conflicting coalitions that do not intersect. More complicated than the yes-no voting examples.
- Consider a simple query model: we interview voters sequentially at random. At each step we determine their preference order and determine whether we have already found enough voters to form a winning coalition.

Manipulation and query model

- The simple game describing manipulability can have no winning coalitions. It can have several conflicting coalitions which intersect. It can have conflicting coalitions that do not intersect. More complicated than the yes-no voting examples.
- Consider a simple query model: we interview voters sequentially at random. At each step we determine their preference order and determine whether we have already found enough voters to form a winning coalition.
- Let $\overline{Q}$ be the expected number of queries required. Then $n + 1 - \overline{Q}$ is essentially the potential of the Shapley value of the manipulation game.

The University of Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Manipulation and query model

- The simple game describing manipulability can have no winning coalitions. It can have several conflicting coalitions which intersect. It can have conflicting coalitions that do not intersect. More complicated than the yes-no voting examples.
- Consider a simple query model: we interview voters sequentially at random. At each step we determine their preference order and determine whether we have already found enough voters to form a winning coalition.
- Let $\overline{Q}$ be the expected number of queries required. Then $n + 1 - \overline{Q}$ is essentially the potential of the Shapley value of the manipulation game.
- If each voter can have a different cost to recruit (as in bribery), a TU (cost) game is more appropriate than a simple game, but similar ideas should work.

Manipulability measures

- Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem (1973–75) implies that every social choice function (voting rule with all ties resolved) allows a nonempty simple manipulation game for some profile (configuration of preferences).

Manipulability measures

- Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem (1973–75) implies that every social choice function (voting rule with all ties resolved) allows a nonempty simple manipulation game for some profile (configuration of preferences).
- Idea: use collective decisiveness measure on the associated manipulation game to measure the ease of manipulation of a given profile.

Manipulability measures

- Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem (1973–75) implies that every social choice function (voting rule with all ties resolved) allows a nonempty simple manipulation game for some profile (configuration of preferences).
- Idea: use collective decisiveness measure on the associated manipulation game to measure the ease of manipulation of a given profile.
- This is a substantial advance in the theory of measures of manipulability. There has been no definition of what such a measure should be, and no desirable axioms listed. Previous measures have been rather crude.

Manipulability measures

- Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem (1973–75) implies that every social choice function (voting rule with all ties resolved) allows a nonempty simple manipulation game for some profile (configuration of preferences).
- Idea: use collective decisiveness measure on the associated manipulation game to measure the ease of manipulation of a given profile.
- This is a substantial advance in the theory of measures of manipulability. There has been no definition of what such a measure should be, and no desirable axioms listed. Previous measures have been rather crude.
- Some (not all) of the previously used measures can be interpreted as semivalues, but not always regular ones. Our new approach allows a principled choice of measure for a given situation.

Manipulability example

- Consider a voting situation with 3 candidates, where there are 3 voters with sincere preference order abc, 2 with bca, 2 with cba. Voting rule is plurality, with random tiebreaking.

Manipulability example

- Consider a voting situation with 3 candidates, where there are 3 voters with sincere preference order abc, 2 with bca, 2 with cba. Voting rule is plurality, with random tiebreaking.
- Assuming risk-neutral voters, there are two types of minimal winning coalitions: a single cba (respectively bca) votes for b (respectively c). Note that this game is not strong.

Manipulability example

- Consider a voting situation with 3 candidates, where there are 3 voters with sincere preference order abc, 2 with bca, 2 with cba. Voting rule is plurality, with random tiebreaking.
- Assuming risk-neutral voters, there are two types of minimal winning coalitions: a single cba (respectively bca) votes for b (respectively c). Note that this game is not strong.
- The winning coalitions are those containing at least one bca or cba. The Coleman index is $15/16$. The relative Banzhaf (or Shapley-Shubik) index of each cba or bca is $1/4$, and abc voters are dummies.