

STRUCTURED VOTING FOR STRUCTURED COMMITTEES

KARL-DIETER CRISMAN

ABSTRACT. There has been much recent work on multiwinner voting systems. However, sometimes a committee is highly structured, and if we want to vote for such a committee, our voting method should be more structured as well.

We consider committees consisting of representatives for disjoint parts of a collective; for instance, n departments of an organization might each have m possible representatives to choose from. However, in our model the *entire population* still gets to vote on the committee, and we need to respect that symmetry, which we do by building on earlier work of Barcelo et al. using representation theory of wreath products.

The main thrust of this paper is to advertise and catalog the surprising variety of possible points-based (linear) voting methods in this framework. For instance, if a voter ranks all possible structured committees, it may be reasonable to use weights which depend on the relations between the ranked committees, and not just their order as in ‘traditional’ voting frameworks!

1. INTRODUCTION

We begin by justifying our interest in studying *structured* committees, giving some basic examples, and outlining the rest of the paper.

1.1. Motivation and Context.

Why Committees? There has been a recent explosion of interest in multiwinner elections, a relatively ‘new challenge’ for the social choice community ([7]). Nearly every voting system used in practice has the *possibility* of more than one winner¹, but in this area the focus is on systems taking voter (or artificial-intelligence) preferences to come up with a selected set of winners of a predetermined size. Examples might range from voting for municipal committees² to choosing corporate boards to a streaming company selecting five ‘best’ options to pick from for your family movie night.

Why Structured Committees? In a series of intriguing papers starting with [12], Ratliff describes elections involving *structured* committees. For a presidential search committee at his institution, each of three academic divisions were to have one of two possible representatives selected; however, the faculty as a whole was allowed to vote (separately) on the representatives for each division. As it turned out, these

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 91B12; Secondary 91B14, 20C05.

Key words and phrases. Voting theory, committees, representation theory, social choice.

This work was partly supported by a Gordon College sabbatical leave.

¹Possibly made resolute by coin toss.

²In my own city, one may vote for up to n of the (at most) $2n$ candidates for n seats in the general election, where $n = 4$ for councilors-at-large and $n = 6$ for the school committee.

preferences were *not* separable; despite essentially universal desire for a mixed-gender committee (particularly since his institution had only recently even begun admitting male students!), the committee selected was all men.

Such structure is inherent in any representative body, but what is unusual here is that the *entire* electorate votes on the *entire* committee, yet with this additional structure. Such nonseparable structure in a group decision need not be about actual representation, of course. In an entertainment example, a group of friends going to a large festival might want to attend one sporting event, one play, and one musical performance – but one could easily imagine the friend who either wants all three outdoors or all three indoors, and would strongly dislike any mixing of location.

For a related paradox, see [20]. One important point is that this is not the same kind of committee diversity raised in [6] where the objective may either be to have some sort of proportional representation (as with diverse electorates) or simply at least one option for each category regardless of popularity (as with a buffet). In neither of these cases is the structure necessarily fixed ahead of time, as in our model.

Why Structured Voting? There are many possible approaches one could take in such circumstances. In [12], Ratliff describes the experience of asking all faculty to rank *all eight* possible committees, and then using the Borda count on submitted preferences. In [13] and [14] (the latter joint work with Saari), voting methods are analyzed which involve separate point values for a ‘diversity’ candidate, and requiring diverse ballots (where ‘diverse’ here may simply mean non-homogeneous).

The point with any such system is to join the structure of representative systems with a universal ‘electorate’ in order to achieve an acknowledged structural goal. One goal of research in this area should be to contribute to the structural understanding of structured voting procedures.

1.2. Background and Examples. A big step in this direction was taken with [1], building on thesis work in [11]. Suppose there are n departments, each potentially represented by one of m candidates, yielding m^n possible committees. The authors suppose (as in [12]) that voters will submit a ranking of *all* of these structured committees, and then a series of weights (not necessarily Borda weights) are applied to give a score for each committee, with the highest score yielding a winning committee. It is important to note that while this could be useful for ‘diverse committee’ voting as in [12], that additional layer is *not* part of their model (or ours).

To see how more analysis might help, consider the smallest possible case of $m = n = 2$, which occurs several times in [1] and [11]. Here, there are only four possible committees, and voters are asked to rank all four of them. The committee notation $(1_1, 2_1)$ designates selecting the first option in both departments 1 and 2.

Example 1.1. Suppose we have three voters, three with preference $(1_1, 2_1) \succ (1_2, 2_2) \succ (1_1, 2_2) \succ (1_2, 2_1)$ and two with preference $(1_2, 2_1) \succ (1_2, 2_2) \succ (1_1, 2_2) \succ (1_1, 2_1)$. If we apply Borda weights $(3, 2, 1, 0)$ to these voters, we see easily that $(1_2, 2_2)$ receives ten points and is the winner.

So far, this example isn’t really any different from ‘normal’ voting theory. But consider the *full* set of scores.

Example 1.2. Continuing Example 1.1, we obtain the scoring vector $[9, 5, 6, 10]^T$ in lexicographical order by committee $((1_1, 2_1)$ through $(1_2, 2_2))$. However, we can

rewrite this as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 9 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 9.5 \\ 5.5 \\ 5.5 \\ 9.5 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -.5 \\ -.5 \\ .5 \\ .5 \end{bmatrix}$$

Considering this additional structure, it seems we have an outcome which primarily emphasizes the two *disjoint* committees $(1_1, 2_1)$ and $(1_2, 2_2)$, with a slight emphasis on committees involving 1_2 as a representative.

The additional structure gives us more information – information which should be useful in analyzing anything from separability paradoxes to manipulation.

The decomposition in the previous example may seem fairly arbitrary, but it is not. The authors of [1] use representation theory to canonically decompose both the space of all possible voter preferences, or *profiles*, as well as that of possible outcome point totals. There are several main results, all of which we will precisely state in the ensuing sections of this paper (or see the next subsection for a brief preview).

- The space of *profiles of rankings* has the structure of many copies of the regular representation of the wreath product group $S_m \wr S_n$ (defined below). Essentially, every possible structured subspace is there, many times!
- The space of *results*, or *committees*, has a much tighter structure, indexed only by integers $0 \leq k \leq n$, so we know that most profile information will be ignored by any procedure involving weights.
- Just as in ‘ordinary’ voting theory, we can construct profiles which can lead to radically different outcomes if we use different weights.

These results are a major step forward in understanding structured voting on committees.

1.3. This Paper. This paper builds on³ [1] to provide more explicit information about such voting systems. We alternate more technical results about the vector spaces in question (which may be skimmed on a first reading) with detailed information about a large number of new procedures. In addition to this introduction and some final thoughts in Section 6, it proceeds as follows.

- In Section 2 we give explicit, *meaningful* bases for the space of possible results. For example, a nice analog to Saari’s Borda subspace is given a good basis in Theorem 2.16. In addition, we rectify the statement of the relevant theorem on the result space in [1].
- Then in Section 3 we use this information to describe a new set of procedures where the voter is only required to submit their most-preferred committee, but meaningful point totals are given to all committees. Proposition 3.3 describes them all with just $n + 1$ parameters, which we then give examples of.
- In Section 4 we clarify the role of orbits (or ‘pockets’, in [11]) in the (huge) space of profiles, and its implications for creating voting paradoxes. Example 4.3 gives a clear analysis for the $n = m = 2$ case.

³And, in certain cases, fixes statements from.

- Section 5 uses this machinery to richly expand the number of systems heretofore recognized, using *multiple sets of weights* to create unexpectedly interesting ways to vote on structured committees. Proposition 5.1 gives the full variety of $\frac{m^n!m^n}{(m!)^n n!}$ parameters, which we then fully analyze for the case $n = m = 2$ in Subsections 5.2 and 5.3.
- We append more involved proofs in Appendix A.

We hope this paper will be another encouragement to researchers – and practitioners – to consider structure in multi-winner voting.

2. THE COMMITTEE SPACE

2.1. Introduction. Given the structure already mentioned, there are m^n total possible committees, which we notate as follows.

Notation 2.1. Suppose there are n departments, each with m options for representation in a committee. Committees are denoted as $(1_{j_1}, 2_{j_2}, \dots, n_{j_n})$, where i_{j_i} means the member selected for this committee from the i th department is the j_i th option for that department's representative. We order these lexicographically. (See Section 2.1 of [1].) The set of all such committees may be denoted $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ for convenience.

Definition 2.2. The finite-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector space with a natural basis indexed by the elements of $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ is called the *committee space*, or the *results space* in certain contexts. If need be, we will call this space $R = R_{m,n}$ (because C and c will stand for committees).

Our main goal in this section is to have a systematic way to decompose vectors in this space meaningful in terms of the committee structure.

Example 2.3. We can further decompose the vector in Example 1.2 as a sum of three mutually orthogonal vectors

$$\begin{bmatrix} 9 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 7.5 \\ 7.5 \\ 7.5 \\ 7.5 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -.5 \\ -.5 \\ .5 \\ .5 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 2.5 \\ -2.5 \\ -2.5 \\ 2.5 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{matrix} (1_1, 2_1) \\ (1_1, 2_2) \\ (1_2, 2_1) \\ (1_2, 2_2) \end{matrix}.$$

Note from the committee labels on the right that if we relabel the committees in any systematic way (such as $1_1 \leftrightarrow 1_2$), these summands at most change sign on an individual basis, while the original vector would change substantially.

In examining this example, it should be clear there is no particular reason it has to indicate scores from a voting method. We could just as easily be examining a set of thirty voters, each of which has a favorite committee out of the four options. Under this interpretation, one third of the voters think 1_2 and 2_2 should be working together. This explains why we can call this vector space either a results space or a committee space; Section 3 will pursue this idea.

More immediately, it seems plausible that our initial ad-hoc decomposition may be able to be refined meaningfully, and hopefully systematically. The rest of this section will unpack this fully, building throughout on [1].

2.2. Representations. To exploit the structure in our committees, we will need a symmetry group. While there are m^n committees, the additional structure evident by department suggests we should not consider all $(m^n)!$ different permutations of all committees, but only the ones corresponding a combination of permutations of

departments combined with permutations *within* departments. Recall the following ([1] (2.2)):

Definition 2.4. The *wreath product* $S_m \wr S_n$ is given by the set of all pairs $(\sigma; \pi)$ where $\pi \in S_n$ and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n) \in S_m^n$. The group structure is given as expected for S_n , but where π permutes the elements of σ' if we multiply $(\sigma; \pi)$ by $(\sigma'; \pi')$.

Most important for this paper is that there is an action of $S_m \wr S_n$ on $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$, given by sending $(1_{j_1}, 2_{j_2}, \dots, n_{j_n})$ to $(1_{\sigma_1(j_{\pi^{-1}(1)}), 2_{\sigma_2(j_{\pi^{-1}(2)}), \dots, n_{\sigma_n(j_{\pi^{-1}(n)})}$). This is notationally dense, but is the same as first permuting the departments by π and then permuting within each department i by σ_i . The relabeling mentioned in Example 2.3 is the action of the element $((12), e; e)$.

This action on $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ immediately extends to an action on $R_{m,n}$ by permuting the entries by basis vector, which clearly commutes with multiplication by scalars in \mathbb{Q} . This gives R the structure of a (permutation) *representation* over \mathbb{Q} , or $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -module⁴.

Now recall that an *irreducible* representation is a vector space with compatible group (here, $S_m \wr S_n$) action such that no proper nontrivial subspace is closed under the group action. One of the wonderful facts about representations is that, given the (finite) symmetry group, there is always a decomposition of any representation V as a direct sum of copies of a *finite* number of isomorphism classes of irreducible representations – and this can often be explicitly computed.

To do so in this case, recall that a *partition* λ of m , or $\lambda \vdash m$, is a (weakly) ordered set of positive integers summing to m . For $S_m \wr S_n$, [9] tells⁵ us that the irreducible representations of $S_m \wr S_n$ are indexed S^λ , where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{p(m)})$. Here, $p(m)$ is the partition counting function (so the entries are ordered by the lexicographic ordering of partitions of m as well), and $\lambda_j \vdash \ell_j$ where $\sum_{j=1}^{p(m)} \ell_j = n$ (and where if $\ell_j = 0$ then the partition is necessarily \emptyset).

In general a space indexed by such ‘partition of partitions’ could be quite complex, but for $R_{m,n}$ [1] shows the committee space is much simpler.

Theorem 2.5. *The committee/results space $R_{m,n}$ has the following decomposition into simple $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -submodules:*

$$R_{m,n} \simeq \bigoplus_{k=0}^n S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}.$$

Each such submodule has dimension $\binom{n}{k}(m-1)^k$, and is in fact a direct sum of $\binom{n}{k} S_m^n$ -isomorphic (but not equal) modules of the form $S^{(m)^{\otimes n-k}} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)^{\otimes k}}$.

This is essentially [1], Theorem 3.8, which had an error in its statement and proof; see A.1 below for the proof. We have already used this in Examples 1.1, 1.2, and 2.3, where the spaces are indexed by $((2), \emptyset)$, $((1), (1))$, and $(\emptyset, (2))$.

2.3. Explicit Construction of Useful Bases. In order to use these spaces concretely, the remainder of this section will give as much information as possible about

⁴See e.g. [17] for basic information on representations.

⁵See section 4.3.34, sections 4.4.1-4.4.3, explicitly so on page 154, with computations for $S_2 \wr S_3$ on pages 156-7.

The direct sum of the three spaces generated by these bases clearly will now have an $S_n = S_3$ -action as well, so that larger space will be $S^{((2),(1))}$ by our earlier construction.

The basis in Example 2.7 is interesting – for each department j , we have a vector with 2 points for a committee with j_1 (and -1 points otherwise) and similarly for j_2 . By construction the following is easy to see.

Proposition 2.8. *Choose a particular ordering of the tensors of $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ corresponding to choosing k of the n departments. For each possible subcommittee c_k for these departments, we can use the construction in Fact 2.6 (with $m-1$ in the position of the candidate for department i for c_k) to construct a basis vector b_{c_k} in (that ordering of) $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$. The value of an entry will be $(m-1)^\ell (-1)^{k-\ell} (1)^{n-k} = \pm (m-1)^\ell$ precisely if it agrees with the subcommittee c_k in exactly ℓ of the k departments in question.*

Doing so for all orderings of $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ will yield a basis for $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$.

Remark 2.9. We observe that in Fact 2.6 and Proposition 2.8, only $m-1$ of the candidates from each department will show up in the bases as constructed. However, the spanning set of m such vectors is useful, and they sum to zero. This is even true when $k > 1$, if we hold all but one department fixed – the Kronecker construction cannot undo a dependence relation.

Example 2.10. If we had done the same construction for $k = 2$ in Example 2.7, we would have gotten 4 points for any committee sharing j_2 and j_3 , -2 points for any including just one of them, and 1 point for those sharing none.

We will have opportunity to use the same type of construction often, so we introduce some notation.

Notation 2.11. Given n , we denote an element \mathbf{p} of $R_{m,n}$ such that there exists a committee C where the value of $\mathbf{p}[C']$ depends strictly on the cardinality of $C \cap C'$ by $\mathbf{p} = [p_0; p_1; p_2; \dots; p_n]$, where C should be clear by context.

The previous example then may be notated $[4; -2; 1]$.

Now we use the preceding work to get a much more interesting basis for $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$. See A.1 for the proof.

Proposition 2.12. *Select a specific full committee C and a choice of compatible subcommittees c_k of size k (that is, each $c_k \subset C$ as sets), one for each set of k of the n departments. Then choose the $\binom{n}{k}$ vectors b_{c_k} from each $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ in Proposition 2.8.*

Their sum b_C is a vector in \mathbb{Q}^{m^n} which corresponds to the committee C in the following sense. For each entry in the vector b corresponding to the committee $C' = (1_{j'_1}, 2_{j'_2}, \dots, n_{j'_n})$, its value is determined solely by the cardinality of $C \cap C'$, and these values depend solely on m, n, k , not on C .

Remark 2.13. The similarity to the table in Section 4.2 of [2], where various pieces of the space of all profiles on linear orders decompose with entries depending only the rank of a candidate in each order, should be evident. See also [15], [16].

A simple induction argument⁶ using Remark 2.9 yields the following important result.

Proposition 2.14. *The set of all such b_C , including the ones mentioned in Remark 2.9, spans $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$.*

⁶For example, the one by [8] at <https://math.stackexchange.com/a/4453618/24113>.

Example 2.15. Consider the same setup as in Example 2.7 ($m, n = 3$ and $k = 1$). Using⁷ Proposition 2.14, here is a *different* meaningful basis for $S^{((2),(1),\emptyset)}$.

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 6 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \\ 6 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 6 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -3 \\ -3 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$(1_1, 2_1, 3_1)$
 $(1_1, 2_1, 3_2)$
 $(1_1, 2_1, 3_3)$
 $(1_1, 2_2, 3_1)$
 $(1_1, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_1, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_1, 2_3, 3_1)$
 $(1_1, 2_3, 3_3)$
 $(1_1, 2_3, 3_3)$
 $(1_2, 2_1, 3_1)$
 $(1_2, 2_1, 3_2)$
 $(1_2, 2_1, 3_3)$
 $(1_2, 2_2, 3_1)$
 $(1_2, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_2, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_2, 2_3, 3_1)$
 $(1_2, 2_3, 3_3)$
 $(1_2, 2_3, 3_3)$
 $(1_3, 2_1, 3_1)$
 $(1_3, 2_1, 3_2)$
 $(1_3, 2_1, 3_3)$
 $(1_3, 2_2, 3_1)$
 $(1_3, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_3, 2_2, 3_3)$
 $(1_3, 2_3, 3_1)$
 $(1_3, 2_3, 3_3)$
 $(1_3, 2_3, 3_3)$

Note that each vector ‘awards’ 6 points to a ‘target’ committee, 3 points to any committee sharing two candidates with this committee, 0 points to one sharing only one member, and -3 points to any committee disjoint to the ‘target’. So the vectors above have the form $[6; 3; 0; -3]$.

2.4. The Committee Subspaces. In Example 2.15, we saw that $S^{((2),(1),\emptyset)}$ has a particularly nice basis, where the entries of a given vector seem to be a linear function of how many candidates are shared. This is not a coincidence.

Theorem 2.16. *In Proposition 2.14, let b_C be the vote/points vector corresponding to a committee C . Suppose also $k = 1$ (so, we are choosing just one department at a time). The values of the entry for a committee C' in b_C is $(m-1)(n-d) - d = mn - n - md$ precisely when the committees disagree in $|C \cap C'| = d$ departments, or $[mn - n; mn - n - m; \dots; -n]$.*

Example 2.17. When considering five candidates each in three departments ($m = 5, n = 3$), the values for the four possibilities would be twelve ($d = 0$ or $C = C'$), seven, two, and negative three (C disjoint from C') points.

Proof of Theorem 2.16. Each committee C' disagrees in d departments. In that case, the vectors used to form b_C will have value -1 in the vectors corresponding to those d departments, and value $m-1$ in the other $n-d$ vectors. \square

Definition 2.18. We call the $S^{((n-1),(1),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ subspace the *Borda subspace*, by analogy with the Borda subspace in [15] (including both the algebraic structure and weights).

So Theorem 2.16 gives a good basis for the Borda subspace.

⁷If the vectors in Example 2.7 are labeled $b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2$, then this basis is $b_1 + c_1 + d_1$, $b_2 + c_1 + d_1$, $-(b_1 + b_2) + c_1 + d_1$, $b_1 + c_2 + d_1$, $b_1 + c_2 + d_2$, and $b_1 - (c_1 + c_2) + d_1$, corresponding to the committees $(1_1, 2_1, 3_1)$, $(1_2, 2_1, 3_1)$, $(1_3, 2_1, 3_1)$, $(1_1, 2_2, 3_1)$, $(1_1, 2_2, 3_2)$, and $(1_1, 2_3, 3_1)$.

Fact 2.19. *There is another basis of potential interest. Since the Borda space is a direct sum of n spaces isomorphic (as S_m -modules) to $S^{(m-1,1)}$, call the one corresponding to the d th department B_d . We can use Fact 2.6 instead with the basis*

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle.$$

This gives vectors $v_{d,i}$ such that, for a given d , with entry 1 for any committee including d_1 , entry -1 including d_i , and zero otherwise.

The Borda space (by Theorem 2.16) expresses, along with the trivial space, the set of all possible points values/profiles with *linear* relationships between the numbers and number of disagreements between committees.

Likewise, each of the $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ irreducible subspaces in the decomposition of the committee space corresponds to a particular size (k) subcommittee in Proposition 2.8. Some of these spaces are useful to delineate further.

Definition 2.20. We call the $S^{(\emptyset,(n),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ subspace the *sign subspace*, since the values in Proposition 2.8 are largely determined by the parity of d the number of departments that disagree with a target committee, $(m-1)^\ell(-1)^{k-\ell} = (-1)^d(m-1)^{n-d}$.

The sign subspace really does just give sign/parity in the important case where there are only two candidates per department.

Proposition 2.21. *For the $S^{((n-2),(2),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ component, the weights in a basis vector from Proposition 2.14 for a committee disagreeing in d spots from a target committee is*

$$\frac{m^2}{2}(d^2 - d) - m(m-1)(n-1)d + \binom{n}{2}(m-1)^2$$

or

$$\frac{m^2}{2}d^2 + \left(-m(m-1)(n-1) - \frac{m^2}{2}\right)d + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}(m-1)^2.$$

See A.1 for the proof. This component, roughly speaking, gives strong weight to committees either sharing *or* not sharing many departments in common with a target committee. (The ‘roughly’ is because there are so many more committees that do *not* share candidates once m is greater than two.)

Example 2.22. When considering five candidates each in three departments ($m = 5, n = 3$), the values would be 48 ($d = 0$ or $C = C'$), 8, -7 , and 3, yielding $[48; 8; -7; 3]$.

The point of all this computation, of course, is to find structure in profiles of voters that we might not suspect. We can use that in Section 3.

Example 2.23. Pick a committee C where $m = n = 3$. Consider a profile with eight voters preferring C , but two voters for each committee disjoint from C and one voter for each committee sharing only one committee member with C . Then this profile has *no* Borda component, which is to say that this voter profile is orthogonal to *all* linear relationships involving how many candidates are shared with a given committee.

3. THE COMMITTEE AS BALLOT

In situations with a fair amount of structure in the set of objects voted on, it is reasonable to ask for voters to use a *plurality ballot* rather than to rank all possible outcomes, or to disaggregate in other ways. While in Section 5 we will look at more complex systems, in the current section we will focus on voting systems which have votes that are simply elements of $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$.

Definition 3.1. Given m, n let $s : \mathcal{C}_{m,n} \times \mathcal{C}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be a *ballot-scoring function*, which we interpret as recording how many points a vote for a given committee would give to another committee. Then a *points-based voting rule* f is a function from $R_{m,n}$ to the power set of $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$, or (by abuse of notation) $R_{m,n} \rightarrow R_{m,n}$, such that, for a profile $\mathbf{p} \in R_{m,n}$, $f(\mathbf{p})$ is the (set of) committee(s) c which maximizes $\sum_{c' \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}} \mathbf{p}[c'] s(c', c)$.

Definition 3.2. Further, we have already seen an action of $S_m \wr S_n$ on $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ and $R_{m,n}$. Then rule f is *committee neutral*, or *neutral*, if s is $S_m \wr S_n$ -invariant, in the sense that for any $(\sigma; \pi) \in S_m \wr S_n$, $s(c', c) = s((\sigma; \pi)(c'), (\sigma; \pi)(c))$.

Note that this is *not* the same as the usual neutrality for plurality ballots, where all ballots are treated equally. We want to take the committee structure explicitly into account, and only require neutrality among department names and individual candidates within each department.

In Section 2, we saw that $R_{m,n}$ has a specific structure as a representation of $S_m \wr S_n$. Given $(\sigma; \pi) \in S_m \wr S_n$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}$, if s comes from a neutral rule, then

$$(\sigma; \pi) \left(\sum_{c' \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}} \mathbf{p}[c'] s(c', c) \right) = \sum_{c' \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}} \mathbf{p}[(\sigma; \pi)^{-1}(c')] s((\sigma; \pi)^{-1}(c'), (\sigma; \pi)^{-1}(c))$$

so a neutral points-based voting rule may be thought of as a $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -module homomorphism. Thus the following applies:

Schur's Lemma. *If M and N are irreducible $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -modules and $g : M \rightarrow N$ is a $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -module homomorphism, then either $g = 0$ or g is an isomorphism ([17] Theorem 1.6.5) given by multiplication by an element of \mathbb{Q} ([9] 4.4.9).*

Proposition 3.3. *Any neutral points-based voting rule on $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ is equivalent to a linear map*

$$\bigoplus_{k=0}^n S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{k=0}^n S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$$

given by multiplication by a scalar for each $S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$.

In other words, any points-based rule for n departments is completely determined by $n + 1$ constants.

Remark 3.4. Effectively there are only $n - 1$ parameters, if we only look at point differentials (killing the trivial $S^{((n), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$) and ignore a scaling factor.

Remark 3.5. By the same principle of ‘the acted upon has become the actor’ in [4] and [1], the weighting vectors also decompose in the same way as profiles in $R_{m,n}$. More precisely, we can use the same notation $[a_0; a_1; \dots; a_n]$ for weights on committees disagreeing in i spots, and we are guaranteed that the weights $[0; 0; \dots; 0; 1; 0; \dots; 0]$ which considers *only* committees that disagree in exactly k spots will have the same decomposition as in the b_C weights in Proposition 2.12.

Now we can talk about properties of such voting systems. The first is essentially a dot product computation using Theorem 2.16.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose we use a Borda-like set of points, where a committee sharing k members with the chosen committee C is given k points, or in general $[n; n-1; \dots; 1; 0]$. Then the parameters involved in the method are all zero, except $a_0 = nm^{n-1}$ and $a_1 = m^{n-1}$.*

That is to say, a Borda-like (linearly weighted) procedure ignores any profile information that is not in the Borda component or which is trivial, and it amplifies the Borda component.

Example 3.7. With a $S_2 \wr S_2$ vote for $(1_1, 2_1)$ a Borda-like procedure would have weighting vector $[2, 1, 1, 0]^T = [2; 1; 0]$.

With $S_3 \wr S_2$ a vote for $(1_1, 2_1, 3_1)$ would give points (in the lexicographic order) as per the vector $[2, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0]^T = [2; 1; 0]$ as well.

Given that the Borda space only has dimension $n(m-1)$, just as in regular voting theory, a Borda-like set of weights (intentionally) ignores much of the information in a profile. If, in designing a system, you believe that the influence of a voter on the score of a particular committee should increase predictably with its intersection with the voter's favorite committee, this is a powerful feature.

This means, of course, that *any system which is not Borda-like* will be emphasizing also some of the other components. For instance, in the $S_2 \wr S_2$ case, any non-linear set of weights will ‘stretch’ the subspace generated by $[1, -1, -1, 1]^T$, which favors a committee *and* its opposite over against others.

Example 3.8. Consider the voting rule in which a voter is assumed to approve of any committee not completely disjoint from their favorite committee⁸. This would have weights such as $[1; 1; \dots; 1; 0]$.

But this is the trivial rule (every committee gets a point per voter, regardless of profile) minus the rule giving points only to completely disjoint committees, which corresponds to the sign subspace in Definition 2.20. So a direct computation shows this ostensibly innocuous rule decomposes into having parameters

$$[m^n - (m-1)^n; (m-1)^{n-1}; -(m-1)^{n-2}; \dots \pm 1]$$

for the various $S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$ subspaces.

To see how this impacts the symmetries of this system, consider when we have $m = n = 4$ departments and candidates. The $k = 2$ component (with typical basis profile $[54; 18; -2; -6; 6]$) is thus *reversed* in impact by one third as much as the Borda ($[12; 8; 4; 0; -4]$) subspace is confirmed. So even a very clear $[66; 26; 2; -6; 2]$ sum of these profiles in favor of a particular committee would end up with scores (up to constant) $[-18; 6; 14; 6; -18]$.

In favor of this rule is that the huge tie among all committees agreeing in precisely two departments with the favored committee is indeed a representability result, given that a slight plurality of voters (78 versus 66) desired a committee differing slightly from the most-favored one. On the other hand, the final scores put this committee in clear last place along with all totally disjoint committees, so the society had better really value compromise if it uses this rule.

⁸This may be seen as related to the ‘representation-focused’ scoring functions of [6], but in our structured setting.

Depending on the preferences of the designer, emphasizing components other than Borda might even be an explicitly desired feature!

Example 3.9. Consider the case of selecting ingredients for a meal where there is a strong, justified, a priori belief that the ingredients are ‘naturally’ paired with other ingredients for best taste. (Perhaps this is the case with wines and meats.) In that case, different ‘voters’ might have different views as to what the best pairing they desire for dinner tonight would be, but the worst possible outcome would be to have a vote that intends to *mix* these pairs.

In this scenario, a weighting vector like $[1; -1; 1]$ might accurately reflect the ‘electorate’ and its preferences *about* procedures, without forcing anyone to submit a full ranking. Or use an equivalent (in outcomes via the argmax) non-sum-zero weighting vector $[1; 0; 1]$; its parameters are $a_0 = 2$, $a_1 = 0$, and $a_2 = 2$.

Example 3.10. Suppose more generally that $m = 2$. Suppose we use the weighting vector $[1; 0; \dots; 0; 1]$ which allocates points from a voter for C to C itself and to its complementary committee (which makes sense as there are two options for each department).

The surprise is that it is *not* just a_0 and a_n which are nonzero, but *all even* $a_{2k} = 2$ and all odd parameters are zero. So not only is the Borda component killed, but so are all components which fix an odd number of committees to agree with – while the components corresponding to even-cardinality subcommittees are essentially kept unchanged!

Proof. There is an action of \mathbb{Z}_2 on $R_{2,n}$ given by sending a committee to its complement (and extending to the vector space). Since the irreducible spaces are formed by taking tensor product powers of

$$\mathcal{N} \simeq \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \oplus \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

we see that the odd powers would have to be multiplied by -1 if they survived such an action (and hence they do not). Further, since this set of weights gives one point to a committee *and* its complement, that is exactly twice as big as the original vectors coming from $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. \square

Example 3.11. There are other parity criteria one could imagine. When $m = 2$, we could try the weights $[1; 0; 1; 0; \dots]$ where we only give points to committees which disagree with the most-preferred committee in an *even* number of departments. (This could be to structurally embed in the system a value for having *pairs* of representatives being valued, but where any pair would do.) A similar argument to the previous example shows that this kills all but the sign and trivial components, as one would expect for $m = 2$.

Example 3.12. More interestingly, when $m = 4$ something similar occurs. Normalize to avoid a large a_0 component and consider the weights $[1; -1; 1; \dots; \pm 1]$. The points-based rule associated to these weights does not kill *any* components, and instead up to a scaling factor alternates preserving exactly and inverting each component coming from an even or odd number of *disagreements* ($a_i = (-1)^{i+n} 2^n$).

That is, if we give points based on the parity of the agreement of a committee with a vote with an even number of committees, we really scale up the components *least* directly connected to individual members of the committees.

As always, the real message is if we use weights which have a non-zero dot product with this set of weights, we get some of this same (undesired?) behavior.

Proof. For each committee, we know a basis element for $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ comes from Kronecker products of vectors of the form $[1, 1, 1, 1]^T$ and $[3, -1, -1, -1]^T$. At the department level, then, the specified committee from a given basis vector will receive $1 - 1 - 1 - 1 = -2 = 1 \cdot -2$ points from each agreeing department and $3 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6 = 3 \cdot 2$ from each disagreeing department. Multiplying these together and recalling that Proposition 2.8 does the same with 3 and -1 means that this propagates to $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$, with an extra factor of 2 for each department and an extra factor of -1 for each agreeing department. \square

That this happens for $m = 4$, $n = 2$ is very specific to the number-theoretic fact that $(m - 1)n$ is an exact multiple of $2 - m$, and does *not* easily generalize. There are many other combinatorial or number-theoretic facts about which components different procedures emphasize, but we have tried to emphasize some with more evident voting interest.

4. THE PROFILE SPACE

The papers [1] and [11] analyze the suggestion of [12] that each voter submit a *full ranking* of all possible structured committees. Since there are m^n possible committees, there are $(m^n)!$ possible rankings! But for artificial intelligence applications, having agents with one of this gargantuan number of strict rankings may be a reasonable assumption.

Section 5 will discuss the amazing variety of voting rules of this type that can be devised, and why this variety might be of use. However, in this section we first examine the space of all profiles and tighten up some of the results from [1], in order to understand this space deeply.

Definition 4.1. The finite-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector space with a natural basis indexed by strict rankings $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}_{m,n})$ is called the *profile space* $P_{m,n}$, or just P if m, n are clear from context.

Because the $S_m \wr S_n$ -action on committees permutes them, P will also have a natural action by the wreath product. Recall from Subsection 2.2 that the irreducible submodules under this action are indexed by partitions of partitions, S^λ .

Proposition 4.2 (Theorems 3.7 and 3.1 of [1]). *The profile space $P_{m,n}$ has the following decomposition as irreducible $S_m \wr S_n$ -modules:*

$$P_{m,n} = \bigoplus_{\frac{(m^n)!}{(m!)^n n!} \lambda \text{ irr.}} \bigoplus (S^\lambda)^{\oplus \dim(S^\lambda)}$$

In particular, P decomposes as one copy of the regular representation of $S_m \wr S_n$ for each orbit of the set of strict rankings under the $S_m \wr S_n$ -action.

Example 4.3. It will shortly be crucial to see how this decomposition works, so let $m = n = 2$, the simplest possible case. Following [11], let $W = (1_1, 2_1)$, $X = (1_1, 2_2)$, $Y = (1_2, 2_1)$, and $Z = (1_2, 2_2)$. Then in Figure 1 we list all twenty-four rankings in a very specific order. If we consider $W \succ Y \succ X \succ Z$ as a ‘reference’ ranking since it has disjoint committees as its first and last options, then the second orbit comes via the cycle permuting the second to fourth to third

item in each ranking, while the third orbit comes from swapping the second and last item in the rankings.

Orbit 1:	W	W	Z	Z	Y	Y	X	X
Disjoint committees	Y	X	Y	X	Z	W	Z	W
first/last or middle	X	Y	X	Y	W	Z	W	Z
	Z	Z	W	W	X	X	Y	Y
Orbit 2:	W	W	Z	Z	Y	Y	X	X
Disjoint committees	X	Y	X	Y	W	Z	W	Z
first/third or second/last	Z	Z	W	W	X	X	Y	Y
	Y	X	Y	X	Z	W	Z	W
Orbits 3:	W	W	Z	Z	Y	Y	X	X
Disjoint committees	Z	Z	W	W	X	X	Y	Y
first/second or third/last	X	Y	X	Y	W	Z	W	Z
	Y	X	Y	X	Z	W	Z	W

FIGURE 1. Ranking committees by orbits

Considering each of these rankings as giving a basis element for $P_{2,2}$, then the decomposition $P \simeq (\mathbb{Q}S_2 \wr S_2)^{\oplus 3}$ is given by these three orbits; each of the subspaces then decomposes as

$$\mathbb{Q}S_2 \wr S_2 \simeq S^{((2),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{((1),(1))^{\oplus 2}} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(2))} \oplus S^{((1,1),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(1,1))}$$

We will get a finer-grained description in Section 5.

Remark 4.4. The paper [1] consider voting rules which extend Definitions 3.1 and 3.2 to functions from $P_{m,n}$ to $R_{m,n}$ (or the underlying power set of possible committees). The definition of neutrality is exactly the same – invariance under $S_m \wr S_n$. The only difference is that our ballot-scoring function now must involve the rankings, so that $s : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}_{m,n}) \times \mathcal{C}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$. Then a points-based voting rule on rankings is simply an $S_m \wr S_n$ -module homomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{\frac{(m^n)!}{(m!)^n n!}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \text{ irr.}} (S^\lambda)^{\oplus \dim(S^\lambda)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{k=0}^n S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}.$$

It is immediate (from Schur’s Lemma) that any such rule will have any irreducible not of the form $S^{((n-k),(k),\emptyset,\dots,\emptyset)}$ in its kernel, *and* even in the $m = n = 2$ case with only $\frac{2^2!}{(2!)^2 2!} = 3$ orbits, that the kernel will include much isomorphic to those irreducibles as well.

In [1], the case considered is where one set of m^n weights is used for all rankings, regardless of orbit⁹. In this case, we may consider a rule $P_{m,n} \rightarrow R_{m,n}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}S_{m^n}$ -module homomorphism as well, which is the situation in [4] and ‘ordinary’ voting theory.

⁹In [5], Sections 2.6 and 2.7, the action of $S_m \wr S_n$ on our set of committees is considered as an action on the set of functions $f : [n] \rightarrow [m]$, sometimes written $[m]^{[n]}$. This action is called the *product action*, and since it faithfully permutes the committees, it gives a canonical way to embed $S_m \wr S_n$ as a subgroup of S_{m^n} .

A major result of regular voting theory is that, given a large number of weighting vectors and possible outcomes, there exists a *single* profile which yields each of those outcomes for one of the weights. The nominal content of Theorem 4.2 in [1] is that this specializes to the structured committee case. The following is a more precise and powerful statement of that result (proof in A.2).

Theorem 4.5 (Expansion of Theorem 4.2 of [1]). *Let $n \geq 2$. Suppose that $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_j$ form a set of sum-zero weighting vectors such that for each $k \in [n]$ their projections $\text{Proj}_k(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_j)$ onto $S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$ are linearly independent. Let $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_j$ be any results vectors whose entries sum to zero. Then, for a decomposition of $P_{m,n}$ into orbits, then there exist infinitely many profiles \mathbf{p} in each orbit such that $T_{\mathbf{w}_i}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{r}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j$. So the set of such profiles has $\frac{(m^n)!}{(m!)^n n!}$ parameters.*

For example, in Example 4.3 of [1] the authors give an element of $\mathbb{Q}S_2 \wr S_2$ corresponding to the first orbit in Figure 1. The theorem says that we should expect one of these for *each* of the three orbits. For larger m, n these come in quite large numbers.

Example 4.6. In the case of $S_3 \wr S_3$, we can take any *six* weighting vectors that stay linearly independent in the three nontrivial subspaces. Then pick *any* six results, and we get $\frac{3^3!}{(3!)^3 3!} = 8401905440137617408000000$ ‘dimensions’ of profiles that yield these specific results vectors from these specific weights!

The tradeoff, if we wish to stick with rules that observe the more restricted symmetry of the wreath product, is that we do not have as many possible different outcomes from a single profile as in regular voting theory, but a *much* larger dimension space of such profiles to choose from. As for the number of weights/outcomes, other than for $m = 2$ a short combinatorial analysis shows that the Borda component is the smallest nontrivial component, so that in Theorem 4.5 one may take $j = n(m - 1)$.

5. SYSTEMS UPON SYSTEMS

5.1. Taking orbits into account. We left off in Proposition 4.2 and Remark 4.4 with the observation that a (neutral) points-based voting rule on rankings is simply an $S_m \wr S_n$ -module homomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{\frac{(m^n)!}{(m!)^n n!} \lambda \text{ irr.}} \bigoplus (S^\lambda)^{\oplus \dim(S^\lambda)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{k=0}^n S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}.$$

In the remainder of Section 4 we only considered the specific case of weighting vectors on voters’ rankings that are always the same.

However, there is a *huge*, and very interesting, variety of voting rules available to us if we keep the decomposition of $P_{m,n}$ into orbits in mind. Section 4.2 of [11] foresaw just how complex it could get, though without considering different weights in different orbits.

Proposition 5.1. *There are $\frac{m^n! m^n}{(m!)^n n!}$ parameters involved in a general points-based voting rule on rankings of committees.*

Proof. For each k , each results subspace $S^{((n-k), (k), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$ has (by Theorem 2.5) dimension $\binom{n}{k}(m-1)^k$. That means in the regular representation of $S_m \wr S_n$ there are $\binom{n}{k}(m-1)^k$ of them, so by Schur's Lemma for *each* orbit there are that many parameters (for each k). Apply the identity $\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}(m-1)^k = m^n$ and multiply. \square

Example 5.2 (Example 4.6, cont.). Even in the case of $m = 3$ candidates for each of $n = 3$ departments, we would have an astonishing 226851446883715670016000000 parameters to divide up among the over 8 septillion orbits.

The interplay between these analyses can yield much fruit. By regular voting theory (e.g. [4]) we then are analyzing functions $P \simeq \mathbb{Q}S_{m^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{m^n}$, and for any set of nontrivial weights there is a profile that can yield any particular outcome vector (by Schur's Lemma and the decomposition $\mathbb{Q}^{m^n} \simeq S^{(m^n)} \oplus S^{(m^n-1,1)}$). This is also true of the Borda count, but in the committee setting there is a useful contrast!

Proposition 5.3. *The Borda weights $[m^n - 1, m^n - 2, \dots, 3, 2, 1, 0]^T$, considered as an element of R , are in the trivial and Borda subspaces.*

(Proof in A.3.)

Proposition 5.4. *Ordinarily, the Borda weight used uniformly would have an image of the entirety of R . However, the previous result shows that if we use these weights under the action of S_{m^n} in each orbit, the image will lie only in $S^{((n), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)} \oplus S^{((n-1), (1), \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)}$.*

We will explain ‘under the action’ by example in Remark 5.8.

5.2. Weights and spaces for the case $S_2 \wr S_2$. The number of possible rules is too big to visualize in any case beyond $m = n = 2$, but even here the diversity of methods is quickly apparent, and worth exploring.

Let $m = n = 2$. Recall the three orbits involving $W = (1_1, 2_1)$, $X = (1_1, 2_2)$, $Y = (1_2, 2_1)$, and $Z = (1_2, 2_2)$ in Figure 1. Recall also that we can think of $P_{2,2}$ as being a vector space generated by a basis with elements indexed by the twenty-four rankings, and with $S_2 \wr S_2$ -action induced by the action on the actual committees. By Proposition 5.1 there should be twelve parameters for a given voting rule.

These parameters are grouped by orbit type.

- For rankings where the first and last place committees are disjoint (such as $W \succ X \succ Y \succ Z$), we can give a_1 points to the first-place committee, b_1 points to second-place, c_1 and d_1 for the last two spots.
- If a ranking is in the second orbit where the first and third place committees are disjoint (such as $W \succ X \succ Z \succ Y$), call the weights a_2, b_2 , etc.
- Finally, if for some reason a voter put disjoint committees in the first two spots (like $W \succ Z \succ X \succ Y$), call them a_3, b_3 , etc.

Hence we have three sets of four weights, for twelve total. It is extremely important to emphasize that *there is absolutely no requirement that any of these weights be connected with each other*. In principle, we can have completely different weights for rankings with different structures – in the $m = n = 2$ case, where they place disjoint committees in different relationships to each other. That said, to obtain one set of weights \mathbf{w} as in [1] and [11], we simply need to let all $a_i = a$ and so forth.

Since a voting rule can be thought of as a linear transformation, there should be a matrix for each rule, corresponding to the scoring function s . For most of

the maps in this paper we omit the matrices for length and size consideration, but it is worth including Figure 2 where we give the complete matrix of weights for a voting rule, *organized by orbits*. For example, if a voter chose a ranking where the first and last choice were *not* disjoint but of the form $W \succ X \succ Z \succ Y$, W would receive a_2 points, X would receive b_2 points, and so forth.

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccc|cccc|cccc} a_1 & a_1 & d_1 & d_1 & c_1 & b_1 & c_1 & b_1 & a_2 & a_2 & c_2 & c_2 & b_2 & d_2 & b_2 & d_2 & a_3 & a_3 & b_3 & b_3 & c_3 & d_3 & c_3 & d_3 \\ c_1 & b_1 & c_1 & b_1 & d_1 & d_1 & a_1 & a_1 & b_2 & d_2 & b_2 & d_2 & c_2 & c_2 & a_2 & a_2 & c_3 & d_3 & c_3 & d_3 & b_3 & b_3 & a_3 & a_3 \\ b_1 & c_1 & b_1 & c_1 & a_1 & a_1 & d_1 & d_1 & d_2 & b_2 & d_2 & b_2 & a_2 & a_2 & c_2 & c_2 & d_3 & c_3 & d_3 & c_3 & a_3 & a_3 & b_3 & b_3 \\ d_1 & d_1 & a_1 & a_1 & b_1 & c_1 & b_1 & c_1 & c_2 & c_2 & a_2 & a_2 & d_2 & b_2 & d_2 & b_2 & b_3 & b_3 & a_3 & a_3 & d_3 & c_3 & d_3 & c_3 \end{array} \right)$$

FIGURE 2. Matrix for the three orbits

It is now much easier to see where everything goes. We have three copies of $\mathbb{Q}S_2 \wr S_2$, each of which decomposes as

$$\mathbb{Q}S_2 \wr S_2 \simeq S^{((2),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{((1),(1))^{\oplus 2}} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(2))} \oplus S^{((1,1),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(1,1))}$$

We know the latter two (one-dimensional) subspaces will go to zero since they do not show up in the decomposition of R , but there are four other subspaces and hence four other weights in each orbit. For each of the three orbits, the following decomposition of the weights is most useful.

$$\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \end{bmatrix} = x_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + x_2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + x_3 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} + x_4 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The following proposition clarifies exactly which subspaces $S^{((2),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{((1),(1))^{\oplus 2}} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(2))}$ are in the kernel of our voting rule in each orbit (considering the three orbits as isomorphic), as well as the exact subspace which is the orthogonal complement to the kernel, the *effective space* of [4], which by Schur's Lemma must have the same algebraic structure. We say *governs* if a parameter (including one from Schur's Lemma) is directly proportional to another parameter.

Proposition 5.5. *The $S^{((2),\emptyset)}$ subspace in all three orbits is governed by x_1 , which is governed by $a + b + c + d$. If this is zero, then it is killed, otherwise not. The behavior of the other spaces is more complex.*

In the first orbit:

- The parameter x_2 is governed by whether or not $a + d = b + c$ (if so, x_2 is zero). It governs $S^{(\emptyset,(2))}$.
- The parameters x_3, x_4 in both cases work with $S^{((1),(1))}$ subspaces, and their precise combination determines which precise two-dimensional subspace is in the effective space (and its complement in $S^{((1),(1))^{\oplus 2}}$ is in the kernel).

In the second orbit:

- The parameter x_2 in the other two orbits will go with the weight $[1, 1, -1, -1]^T$, so if it is nonzero there will be a $S^{((1),(1))}$ subspace of the effective space (and its complement in the kernel).

- In the second orbit the weights for x_3 and x_4 become $[1, -1, 0, 0]^T$ and $[0, 0, 1, -1]^T$, so if $x_3 = x_4$ it kills the respective $S^{(\emptyset, (2))}$ and if $x_3 = -x_4$ the same for one of the $S^{((1), (1))}$, otherwise not.

In the third orbit this situation is the same as the second orbit, except the roles of $x_3 = \pm x_4$ is reversed.

Proof. This all follows by direct computation of the rank of each 4×8 matrix, or in a few cases checking whether the all-ones vector is in its row space. \square

We can verify now that if all weights are the same, as in Theorem 4.5, we recover computations from voting theory where all four committees are treated identically (such as the first part of Proposition 5.4). As samples, we include another confirmation of this, and then a computation with an interesting system.

Corollary 5.6. *Even if $x_1 = x_2 = 0$, it is impossible to get only some $S^{((1), (1))}$ as the effective space of the entire $T_{\mathbf{w}}$. Moreover, it's impossible to get just $S^{((2), \emptyset)} \oplus S^{(\emptyset, (2))}$, so there is no possible way to get a two-dimensional effective space.*

Consider the following variant on Example 3.9.

Example 5.7. If $\mathbf{w} = [1/2, -1/2, -1/2, 1/2]^T$ (first and last place count) then $x_2 = 1/2$, so the system seems simple. But while the first orbit has $S^{(\emptyset, (2))}$ as its effective space, the other orbits have $S^{((1), (1))}$ (in fact, *identicals*, not just isomorphic, ones, given the order of the rankings) so the overall effective space is three-dimensional.

A typical basis vector in the effective space consists of a profile with a vote for all rankings with W in first or last place, and a negative vote for all others. This rule would send such a vector to a vector in R in the space spanned by $[3, -1, -1, -1]^T$, where W is the only winner and the other committees tie.

If you don't buy the connection to Example 3.9, for another reason why Example 5.7 is important, suppose we are examining a system using only one \mathbf{w} where $a + d \neq b + c$, such as $a = 5$, $b = 4$, $c = 3$, and $d = 0$ which attempts to de-emphasize the last-place committee on a given ballot. This will have a nonzero x_2 , so the example applies to this rule as well.

5.3. More interesting systems for $S_2 \wr S_2$. The biggest interest in these computations comes from what would happen if we did *different* things in each orbit. First, let us examine the theoretical question of whether we could avoid the results of Proposition 5.5 which have each orbit behaving differently.

Remark 5.8. We can use Proposition 5.5 to make all three orbits have *identical* effective spaces¹⁰ by undoing the permutations which yield the orbits.

- For the first orbit, let $a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1 = a, b, c, d$.
- In the second orbit let $a_2 = a$, but let $b_2 = c$, $c_2 = d$, and $d_2 = b$.
- In the third orbit, let $a_3 = a$, $c_3 = c$, but $b_3 = d$ and $d_3 = b$.

Example 5.9. Recalling Proposition 5.4, we examine a 'permuted' Borda count, which should yield results orthogonal to $[1, -1, -1, 1]^T$, which generates $S^{(\emptyset, (2))}$ in $R_{2,2}$. For convenience we switch to the otherwise equivalent sum-zero set of weights $\mathbf{w}_1 = [1, 1/3, -1/3, -1]^T$, $\mathbf{w}_2 = [1, -1/3, -1, 1/3]^T$, and $\mathbf{w}_3 = [1, -1, -1/3, 1/3]^T$.

¹⁰Here by 'identical' of course we mean identical as eight-dimensional vector spaces under the isomorphism given by identifying the \mathbb{Q}^8 spaces in the obvious way based on Figure 2.

Consider a profile (differential) with three voters for each of the six ballots with W in first place, one for each one with W in second place, negative one for W in third place, and negative three for each with W in last place. Using w_i as weights, we obtain a result with W the lone winner and Z the lone (!) *loser*, with Y and X receiving a net score of zero; indeed, this profile is a basis vector for the effective space. (Compare to if we had used w_1 for all three orbits, where we would¹¹ get W as the winner with others tied, as in Example 5.7.)

As strange as it may seem on first glance, this effective space makes perfect sense from the wreath product (committee) standpoint; if we have favored W , then the only committee disjoint with it is Z , which should thus be disfavored. The same thing would thus happen if we had made the same profile, but with X as the favored committee (where Y would have been the unique loser).

Example 5.10. Suppose $\mathbf{w}_1 = [1/2, -1/2, -1/2, 1/2]^T$, $\mathbf{w}_2 = [1/2, -1/2, 1/2, -1/2]^T$, and $\mathbf{w}_3 = [1/2, 1/2, -1/2, -1/2]^T$; this is Example 5.7 but with weights moved as in Remark 5.8.

A typical basis vector in the effective space is as follows: In the orbit order from Figure 1, the first orbit has 1 voter for each ranking with W (or Z) in first or last place and -1 voter for the other rankings, and in the second and third orbits the same except $W(/Z)$ in first or third place, and $W(/Z)$ in first or second place, respectively.

Now instead of emphasizing a particular committee, the effective space emphasizes a particular *structure*! And since the procedure simply projects from this subspace and kills anything orthogonal to it, the result will *necessarily* be either a tie W/Z winning, X/Y losing, or vice versa. This is quite different from Example 5.7, and in an interesting way.

The procedure in the previous example may not be a very useful one, but it's possible without further constraints – and *any* system with weights not orthogonal to these has some of its behavior. Notice the importance a decomposition makes!

Most interesting would be systems which had *unrelated* weights for the different orbits.

Example 5.11. Suppose that one wanted to create a system that ‘rewarded’ ballots which made the ‘logical’ choice of putting disjoint committees in first and last place. One could simply use Borda weights w_1 for the first orbit, and then use *zero* for all other weights!

Needless to say, the second two orbits would have zero effective space; only people who voted ‘correctly’ would even have usable ballots.

Example 5.12. Suppose our motivation is as in the previous example, but we did not want to completely ignore ‘incorrect’ ballots. A plausible set of weights would be $\mathbf{w}_1 = [1, 1/2, -1/2, -1]^T$, but $\mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_3 = [1, -1/3, -1/3, -1/3]^T$. This, roughly speaking, is a Borda count on the first orbit but plurality on the other two orbits.

Applying Proposition 5.5 to this case, we see that the kernel in the first orbit, as desired, will be $S^{((2),\emptyset)} \oplus S^{(\emptyset,(2))}$. However, from the other two orbits the kernel will be (identically) $S^{((2),\emptyset)}$. So in some sense, even though we might be trying to *minimize* the effect of the ‘undesired’ type of ballots, in terms of the dimension of the effective spaces, they have *more* impact in the sense of which profiles are taken account of.

¹¹As with the Borda subspace in [2, 4, 15, 16].

Example 5.13. In the previous example, there really isn't any particular reason to pick the scaling we did, where 1 is the highest number of points a ranking can get from a given ballot. Suppose the motivation for these weights was instead wanting to imitate combining Borda and plurality as nearly as possible.

In that case, one could point out that the -1 given to the least preferred ranking in the first orbit 'punishes' it more than the $-1/3$ in the other two orbits. In an effort to rectify this potential issue, we could normalize differently and use $\mathbf{w}_1 = [1, 1/2, -1/2, -1]^T$, but $\mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_3 = [1, -1, -1, -1]^T$. But now the second weighting vector is no longer sum-zero! From the point of view of the *differentials* in points assigned to W, X, Y, Z it behaves the same as the weighting vector $\mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_3 = [1.5, -0.5, -0.5, -0.5]^T$, which keeps the same problem in addition to adding the problem of giving more points to the most-preferred option! This is probably the opposite effect¹² of that desired.

The point should be clear; there are a *very* large number of possible voting rules. On the one hand, it allows for a lot of flexibility in designing weights to 'reward' certain behavior, but on the other hand moving even a little away from a 'normal' voting system could yield many violations of standard voting axioms like Pareto.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. Future Work. Needless to say, there is a lot of room for further research. We have scrupulously avoided even hinting at what axioms (other than neutrality and anonymity) might be relevant; as seen in the last few examples, even Pareto may need to be reconsidered when multiple orbits are involved.

For instance, it does not seem obvious at all what we should do with ballots that do not put disjoint committees in opposite ranks. Nevertheless, [12] and [20] make it clear there are serious separability issues in real-life preferences, so such preferences *will* appear. Our model of examining the rules in this way gives the widest possible leeway for future analysis, and we make no apology for it.

Another area for future work is to use the strategy of symmetry (and/or representations) more explicitly in other combinatorial contexts. Two places come immediately to mind.

- One can use a similar framework with the direct product to consider 'diverse' committees directly, as in [14] and [13]. Here, we would *not* consider all wreath symmetries, as that would destroy the diversity criterion. Rather, the direct product may be the appropriate group.
- The work in [6], [18], and [7] is further from the model presented here, but clearly the committee scoring functions are analogous to the ones here. The space of profiles would now be, as in normal voting, the regular representation of S_n , whereas the output might differ. For instance, the k -voting rules would presumably use a space isomorphic to that decomposed so effectively for cooperative games in Kleinberg and Weiss and elsewhere¹³.

We look forward to seeing much more activity in the area of more unusual combinatorial settings such as these, especially connecting the algebraic framework with a more traditional axiomatic one.

¹²For this vector $x_2 \neq 0$, so the effective space is four-dimensional for $\mathbf{w}_{2,3}$ too.

¹³See [10], and the survey [3] for more references, including to some quite recent authors.

6.2. Funding Sources and Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the Gordon College Faculty Development Committee and Provost's Office via a sabbatical leave. The SQuaRE program at the American Institute of Mathematics supported this work indirectly by providing a good working space for improving my overall knowledge about representations and voting, though not this specific research.

Finally, thanks are due to the authors of [11] and [1] for many clear examples, to my SQuaRE team for moral support, as well as to the entire development team of Sage Math ([19]), software which made discovering and verifying many of the results here much, much easier.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS

A.1. Proofs from Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Recall (e.g. from [17]) that the *natural representation* of S_m on the set of integers $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ decomposes canonically as $\mathcal{N} \simeq S^{(m)} \oplus S^{(m-1,1)}$, where S^λ is the irreducible $\mathbb{Q}S_m$ -module indexed by the partition $\lambda \vdash m$.

Character computations in [1] show $R_{m,n}$ is related very closely to $\otimes^n \mathcal{N}$. However, [9] 4.3.9 is misstated as applying to a *induced* representation rather than an *extended* representation. Extension changes the dimension, but here we will simply consider the $\mathbb{Q}S_m^n$ -module $\otimes^n \mathcal{N}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$ -module, which follows because one can simply permute the coordinates of $\otimes^n \mathcal{N}$ for the action of π . Hence¹⁴ we can say

$$R_{m,n} \simeq (\otimes^n \mathcal{N})^\sim$$

where the tilde denotes considering the $\mathbb{Q}S_m^n$ -module to be over the larger group.

The remainder can follow [1] quite closely. We can distribute the tensor product over this sum and see that

$$R \simeq \left(\bigoplus_{k=0}^n \bigoplus_{\binom{n}{k}} \left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k} \right) \right)^\sim,$$

where each $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ is isomorphic *but not equal* to each other under the natural permutations under S_n of subsets of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of size k corresponding to the $S^{(m-1,1)}$ modules. The action of S_n clearly restricts to the sums for each k separately, so we may write

$$\bigoplus_{k=0}^n \left(\bigoplus_{\binom{n}{k}} \left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k} \right) \right)^\sim.$$

Now consider for a moment any *one* of the $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$; a generic one may look like $S^{(m)} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)} \otimes S^{(m)} \otimes \dots \otimes S^{(m)} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}$. This has a Young/inertia subgroup¹⁵ $Y_k \simeq S_{n-k} \times S_k$. Notice that there is still a natural action of Y_k on S_m^n , so that the wreath product $S_m \wr Y_k$ makes sense. Its order is $m^n k! (n-k)!$, which means that $[S_m \wr S_n : S_m \wr Y_k] = \binom{n}{k}$, which would be the

¹⁴[9] 4.3.9 says in general that for a representation D of S_m , $\chi_{(\otimes^n D)^\sim} = \prod_{\nu=1}^{c(\pi)} \chi_D(g_\nu(\sigma; \pi))$.

¹⁵See [9] for more details.

number of copies of the smaller module needed to create an induced module over $S_m \wr S_n$.

Returning now to $\left(\bigoplus_{\binom{n}{k}} \left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}\right)\right)^\sim$, let us consider the way in which this is *extended* to a $S_m \wr S_n$ -module. If we had taken *one* of the $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ as an S_m^n -module, then *extended* that in the obvious way to a $S_m \wr Y_k$ -module, and then *induced* it to $S_m \wr S_n$, we would get precisely the same thing (because $S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}$ stands in notationally for all $\binom{n}{k}$ possible orderings which inducing would need). That is, we may write

$$\left(\bigoplus_{\binom{n}{k}} \left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}\right)\right)^\sim = \left(\left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}\right)^\sim\right) \uparrow_{S_m \wr Y_k}^{S_m \wr S_n}$$

Finally, as in (3.10) of [1] we may tensor with a trivial representation. To be precise, the trivial representation $S^{(n-k)} \otimes S^{(k)}$ of Y_k may be extended to $S_m \wr Y_k$ by acting on the individual S_m components trivially, but permuting them via any $\pi \in Y_k$. So we can write this same representation

$$\left(\left(S^{(m)}{}^{\otimes n-k} \otimes S^{(m-1,1)}{}^{\otimes k}\right) \otimes \left(S^{(n-k)} \otimes S^{(k)}\right)'\right) \uparrow_{S_m \wr Y_k}^{S_m \wr S_n}$$

and the rest of the proof from [1] goes through. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.12. Let C and C' be as in the statement, and let $C \cap C' = D'$ of cardinality f' . For each subset c_k compatible with C , let $c'_k = C' \cap c_k$, of cardinality f'_k .

Now consider another committee C'' such that $C \cap C'' = D''$ and $f'' = f'$ as well. I claim there is an element $(\sigma; \pi) \in S_m \wr S_n$ such that $(\sigma; \pi)(C') = C''$ so that the multiset of cardinalities of the form f''_k of the $c''_k = C'' \cap c_k$ is the same (as multisets) as the collection of f'_k .

First, pick any π such that π restricted to D' yields D'' . Since the action of S_n on the set of departments is clearly transitive and the cardinalities of these subsets is the same, this is possible. Next, for each $i \in [n]$ suppose that $\pi(i) = j$, C' includes $i_{k_i'}$, and C'' includes $j_{k_j''}$. Then let $\sigma_i(k_i') = k_j''$ as well as $\sigma_i(k_i) = k_j$ (and otherwise arbitrary). These restrictions are compatible on D' (so that $(\sigma; \pi)(D') = D''$) and, just as importantly, preserve the intersections, so that $C \cap (\sigma; \pi)(C') = D''$.

From this construction, it is immediate that $(\sigma; \pi)(c'_k)$ is a set of committee members such that the size of the intersection with C is preserved (though not necessarily the specific elements); in fact, it would be $(\sigma; \pi)(c_k) \cap (\sigma; \pi)(C'')$, which is one of the c''_k sets.

Now we return to b_C . This is defined to be the sum of b_{c_k} of the types in Proposition 2.8, for precisely these c_k . By this same proposition, its numerical value at the entry for any C' must be the sum of numbers of the form $(m-1)^{f'_k}(-1)^{k-f'_k}$, for all c_k . However, we have just shown that the multiset of numbers f'_k themselves is invariant, given the cardinality of the intersection $C \cap C'$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.21. Certainly the constant term corresponds to choosing all $\binom{n}{2}$ subcommittees of size $k = 2$, and checking whether they fully agree with the reference committee, in which case they get $(m-1)^{k-0}(-1)^0 = (m-1)^2$ points from each basis vector summed in Proposition 2.12 from Proposition 2.8.

Suppose we disagree in precisely $d = 1$ department. Then actually $n - 1$ of the subcommittees of size two must disagree, but only in one spot, so they received $(m - 1)^{k-1}(-1)^1 = -(m - 1)$ points. This is a net loss of $m(m - 1)$ points for each of these $n - 1$ possibilities.

Beyond this, each time we disagree with C in one more department (d increases by one) then $n - d$ more of the subcommittees of size two disagree in one department. That means the *change* in the change is by $m(m - 1)$ *less*. On the other hand, each time d increases (starting with $d = 2$) we add one more subcommittee of size two which disagrees *completely* with the reference committee, all of which receive 1 point (so, a change from $-(m - 1)$ to $+1$). This means the change in the change overall is $m(m - 1) + m = m^2$ with each increase in d .

Now using Newton's interpolation formula for finite differences¹⁶, and noting that $2! = 2$ and the falling factorial $(d)_2 = d(d - 1)$, we get our result. \square

A.2. Proofs from Section 4.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Most of the proof goes through. First, in the construction of L , rather than saying $\mathbf{w} \in \oplus S^\lambda$, it should really be that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \oplus S^\lambda$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ restricted to R is isomorphic to \mathbf{w} , and likewise for \mathbf{w}_i .

More importantly, in the proof of Theorem 4.2 of [1], Jacobson density is used to create a profile $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Q}S_m \wr S_n$, but then is discussed as if it were in $\mathbb{Q}S_{m^n}$; however, the fact that \mathbf{p} is actually in that subalgebra is the novel part of their theorem. Further, in the decomposition into orbits of $P_{m,n}$, one can act by some other element of S^{m^n} to obtain a new profile that otherwise will have the same properties. \square

A.3. Proofs from Section 5.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. We use the basis from Fact 2.19. Let us project a sum-zero version of the Borda weighting vector

$$\left[\frac{m^n - 1}{2}, \frac{m^n - 3}{2}, \dots, \frac{1 - m^n}{2} \right]^T$$

to each of the B_d subspaces; if the sum of those projections is the weighting vector, since the B_d are orthogonal, we are done.

Consider vectors of the form $\frac{m-2i+1}{2}m^{n-d}$ as the entry for every entry corresponding to a committee of the form (\dots, d_i, \dots) , for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $\sum_{c=1}^{m-1} -\frac{m-2c+1}{2} = \frac{1-m}{2}$, this vector is certainly a sum of elements of the alternate basis. If we add all these vectors, the entry corresponding to $C' = (1_{j_1}, 2_{j_2}, \dots, n_{j_n})$ in that sum is

$$\sum_{d=1}^n \frac{m - 2j_d + 1}{2} m^{n-d}.$$

By reindexing this we obtain

$$\sum_{e=0}^{n-1} \frac{m - 2j_{n-e} + 1}{2} m^e$$

¹⁶A very useful analogue of antidifferentiation for discrete calculus.

which may be thought of as a ‘balanced n -ary expansion’ in the lexicographic order of a unique (half-)integer from $\frac{1-m^n}{2}$ to $\frac{m^n-1}{2}$ – precisely the ones in our sum-zero Borda weighting vector. \square

REFERENCES

1. Hélène Barcelo, Megan Bernstein, Sarah Bockting-Conrad, Erin McNicholas, Kathryn Nyman, and Shira Viel, *Algebraic voting theory & representations of $S_m \wr S_n$* , Adv. in Appl. Math. **120** (2020), no. 102077, 1–23. MR 4121950
2. Karl-Dieter Crisman, *The Borda count, the Kemeny rule, and the permutahedron*, The mathematics of decisions, elections, and games, Contemp. Math., vol. 624, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014, pp. 101–134. MR 3308273
3. Karl-Dieter Crisman and Michael E. Orrison, *Representation theory of the symmetric group in voting theory and game theory*, Algebraic and geometric methods in discrete mathematics, Contemp. Math., vol. 685, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017, pp. 97–115. MR 3625572
4. Zaji Daugherty, Alexander K. Eustis, Gregory Minton, and Michael E. Orrison, *Voting, the symmetric group, and representation theory*, Amer. Math. Monthly **116** (2009), no. 8, 667–687. MR MR2572103
5. John D. Dixon and Brian Mortimer, *Permutation groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 163, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. MR 1409812
6. Edith Elkind, Piotr Faliszewski, Piotr Skowron, and Arkadii Slinko, *Properties of multiwinner voting rules*, Soc. Choice Welf. **48** (2017), no. 3, 599–632. MR 3620814
7. Piotr Faliszewski, Piotr Skowron, Arkadii Slinko, and Nimrod Talmon, *Multiwinner voting: A new challenge for social choice theory*, Trends in Computational Social Choice, AI Access (Lulu), 2017, p. Chapter 2.
8. Eric Wofsey (https://math.stackexchange.com/users/86856/eric_wofsey), *making basis for a vector space from bases for subspaces*, Mathematics Stack Exchange, URL:<https://math.stackexchange.com/q/4453618> (version: 2022-05-18).
9. Gordon James and Adalbert Kerber, *The representation theory of the symmetric group*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 16, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1981, With a foreword by P. M. Cohn, With an introduction by Gilbert de B. Robinson. MR MR644144 (83k:20003)
10. Norman L. Kleinberg and Jeffrey H. Weiss, *Algebraic structure of games*, Math. Social Sci. **9** (1985), no. 1, 35–44. MR 795555 (86f:90175)
11. Stephen Lee, *Understanding voting for committees using wreath products*, 2010.
12. Thomas C. Ratliff, *Selecting committees*, Public Choice **126** (2006), no. 3, 343–355.
13. ———, *Selecting diverse committees with candidates from multiple categories*, The mathematics of decisions, elections, and games, Contemp. Math., vol. 624, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014, pp. 159–175. MR 3308276
14. Thomas C. Ratliff and Donald G. Saari, *Complexities of electing diverse committees*, Soc. Choice Welf. **43** (2014), no. 1, 55–71. MR 3217238
15. Donald G. Saari, *Mathematical structure of voting paradoxes. I. Pairwise votes*, Econom. Theory **15** (2000), no. 1, 1–53. MR MR1731508 (2001e:91063)
16. ———, *Mathematical structure of voting paradoxes. II. Positional voting*, Econom. Theory **15** (2000), no. 1, 55–102. MR MR1731509 (2001e:91064)
17. Bruce E. Sagan, *The symmetric group*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 203, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001, Representations, combinatorial algorithms, and symmetric functions. MR 1824028 (2001m:05261)
18. Piotr Skowron, Piotr Faliszewski, and Arkadii Slinko, *Axiomatic characterization of committee scoring rules*, J. Econom. Theory **180** (2019), 244–273. MR 3898269
19. W. A. Stein, M. Hansen, et al., *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 9.0)*, The Sage Development Team, 2020, <http://www.sagemath.org>.
20. Joel Uckelman, *Alice and bob will fight: The problem of electing a committee in the presence of candidate interdependence*, ECAI 2010, IOS Press, 2020, pp. 1023–1024.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, GORDON COLLEGE
Email address: karl.crisman@gordon.edu