Arguing about voting rules

Olivier Cailloux Matias Nunez

1st December, 2016







Goal

- Voting rule: a systematic way of aggregating different opinions and decide
- Multiple reasonable ways of doing this

Our goal

We want to justify an election outcome by means of a sequence of simple arguments

Example

Who should win?

```
Voter 1: a > b > c

Voter 2: a > b > c

Voter 3: c > b > a
```

- Veto rule chooses h
- Borda rule chooses a

Voter 1: a > b > cVoter 2: a > b > cVoter 3: c > b > a

System: Take the *red subprofile*. Here, *a should*

[unanimity]

win, right? User: Obviously!

System: Now consider the *green subprofile*. For [cancellation]

symmetry reasons, there should be a three-

way tie, right?

User: Sounds reasonable.

System: So, as there was a three-way tie for the [reinforcement]

green part, the red part should decide the

overall winner, right?

User: Yes

System: To summarise, you agree that a should win. Goal Example Approach Internship

Approach

- Translate axioms into propositional logic formulas
- Build a general argumentation scheme by manipulating those formulas
- In case of Borda: solve a simple system of equations to find intermediate profiles
- Display a justification for the Borda winners from *any* starting profile

Topic of the internship

- Programming: show a justification to a user
- Integrate into Whale4
- Research: develop other (simple) argumentation schemes
- Find out interesting profiles automatically

Goal Example Approach **Internship**

Further information

Contacts

- Olivier Cailloux: olivier.cailloux@dauphine.fr
- Matias Nunez: matias.nunez@dauphine.fr

Bibliography

Olivier Cailloux and Ulle Endriss. 2016. "Arguing about Voting Rules". In Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-2016), IFAAMAS. http://www.lamsade.dauphine.fr/~ocailloux/#publications

Arguing about voting rules

Thank you for your attention!

