

# Power and freedom in mechanisms

Christian Basteck & Ulysse Lojkin

December 2025

Latest version [here](#)

## Abstract

In a strategy-proof mechanism, the influence of an agent may be measured as the set of outcomes an agent can bring about by varying her (reported) type. More specifically, we refer to an agent's influence on her own relevant outcomes as her freedom, and to the influence on outcomes relevant for other agents as her power over others. The framework generalises both the notion of opportunity set from the freedom of choice literature, and established power indices for binary voting. It identifies constrained efficient mechanisms as those that maximise agents' freedom. Applying our framework to the analysis of assignment rules, we provide novel characterisations of the top trading cycles rule and bipolar serial dictatorships in terms of their freedom and power properties.

# 1 Introduction

Contemporary economic theory addresses issues of freedom and power, but in a scattered fashion. We possess a rich theory of power in voting committees, yet it remains confined to that specific setting. Industrial organisation and bargaining theory also address the concept within their respective frameworks, but no unified theory of power spans these domains. At the same time, there is a literature on freedom of choice (Pattanaik and Xu, 1990, 1998), which aims to rank opportunity sets according to the freedom they offer. Again, this is a highly specific framework, which excludes strategic interactions between agents; and it remains largely disconnected from the literature on power. As Dowding and Van Hees (2008) note, “a growing literature on the formal analysis of freedom emerged largely independent of the literature on power,” which leads them to wish for “the formulation of a general formal framework that enables integration of the analyses of power and freedom.”

A generalisation of the existing theories in several directions thus appears desirable: to extend the analysis of power beyond voting; to extend the analysis of freedom beyond individual choice from a given set; and to integrate both concepts within a common framework. Such a generalisation would also foster dialogue with other disciplines. Entire strands of normative philosophy and political theory—such as Anderson (1999)’s relational egalitarianism or Pettit (2006)’s republicanism—advocate evaluating economic institutions not in terms of welfare, but in terms of freedom and power. So far, economic theory has not been able to contribute much to this discussion, at least once we move beyond voting systems.

This paper takes a first step toward this research agenda, by proposing a tool that applies to a class of mechanisms much broader than those mentioned above—although still bounded by the assumption of strategy-proofness. To do so, our guiding intuition is based on the *menu* of an agent, the set of possible outcomes she can bring about by varying her (reported) preferences – a concept used under this or other names by various authors (Hammond, 1979; Barberà et al., 1991; Gonczarowski et al., 2023; Katuščák and Kittsteiner, 2025).

Existing measures of both freedom of choice and voting power can be understood as special cases of this approach. The freedom of choice literature ranks opportunity sets in terms of how much choice they offer. In game-theoretic terms, the same setting can be reinterpreted as a direct mechanism with a single agent who reports a preference list and receives, among the available items, the one she ranked highest. The opportunity set thus coincides with the set of items the agent could obtain for some preference report. So the opportunity set appears as a special case of the menu when the mechanism involves only one player. Regarding voting, it is well known that existing power indices—whether Banzhaf or Shapley-Shubik—can be obtained as the probability that a player is decisive, i.e. able to determine the outcome through their vote. But if the voting game is interpreted as a direct mechanism, then in our terms, an agent is decisive if their menu is  $\{\text{Yes}, \text{No}\}$ , and non-decisive if their menu is a singleton, either  $\{\text{Yes}\}$  or  $\{\text{No}\}$ .

Once built, these categories are put to work, first by deriving general results concerning the relationship between power and welfare. As both philosophers and voting theorists have long understood, these two concepts need not coincide: one may enjoy high welfare without any power—think of the slave of a benevolent master, or a disenfranchised citizen whose preferences happen to align with those of the voting majority. Yet we show (Theorem 1) a connection at another level: one mechanism gives you more freedom than another (a larger menu in the sense of set inclusion) for any opposing preference profile if and only if it also gives you higher welfare at any profile. Extending that intuition in a cardinal direction, we show that, when the set of possible outcomes is finite and

preferences are drawn uniformly following the “impartial culture” assumption, a mechanism that generates a higher probability for you to receive a cardinally larger menu also lets you with a higher probability obtain an outcome ranked higher in your preferences.

So far, we have used the terms power and freedom interchangeably to describe an agent’s influence over the game’s unique outcome. In some settings, however, agents may care about a particular dimension of the outcome—especially in assignment mechanisms, where an agent’s preferences, it is typically assumed, concern only the object she personally receives. In such cases, the menu concept can be refined. On the one hand, an agent’s menu for herself (this is how the notion was defined by the authors mentioned above) denotes the set of objects she could obtain by ranking them at the top of her preferences; we refer to this as her freedom. On the other hand, an agent’s menu for others captures how changes in her preferences affect the allocations of other agents; we refer to this as her power over others.

We show that classical assignment mechanisms satisfy a condition of quantitative equality between each agent’s freedom and their power over the rest. We provide a detailed mapping of freedom and power within the class of assignment mechanisms that are group-strategy-proof and efficient—trading cycles mechanisms, as they are called by Pycia and Ünver (2017). In particular, we analyse the trade-off between two properties that may be normatively appealing: first, universal possibility of complete freedom, i.e. granting everyone full freedom at some opposing preference profile; the other property is minimal bilateral power, i.e. ensuring that no individual can influence another’s outcome beyond what is necessary. Top trading cycle has the first property and is characterised by it among group-strategy-proof and efficient rules (this is our theorem 2); but it generates situations where an agent has maximal bilateral power over another. The bipolar serial dictatorship mechanism (a class of rules similar to the canonical serial dictatorship) has the second property and is characterised by it among hierarchical exchange rules (this is our theorem 3); but this is at the cost of imposing *ex ante* who will have more and who will have less freedom.

**Literature review** An inspiration for this paper is the work of Napel and Widgren (2004) and Kurz et al. (2021), who define the power of an agent over an outcome as the sensitivity of that outcome to a “tremble” in the agent’s preferences<sup>1</sup>. While they confine themselves to voting games, our framework is more general.

Independently from one another, several papers have developed freedom or power measures in interactive contexts that formalise in different ways the common intuition of equilibrium menus<sup>2</sup>. In the context of Bayesian games, Rommeswinkel (2014) and Sher (2018) develop cardinal freedom measures, which require a probability distribution on the players’ preferences, which we do not need for our main results. Sher also exogenously imposes an “intrinsic value” to the (“attributes” of the) potential outcomes independently from the agents’ preferences.

Görlach and Motz (2024) define a cardinal power index in a non-cooperative game by computing the effect of a counterfactual variation in the agent’s preferences and like ours, their measure is specific to a given preference profile. But in their paper, the domain of potential preferences for a given player that they consider is the set of preferences of the other players, which makes sense in some situations, but less in others; among others, it prevents measuring power in a game with only one agent, thus disconnecting power from freedom. A second difference is that they measure the

<sup>1</sup>On the debate of these authors with Braham and Holler (2005a) over the definition of power, see Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup>This is in contrast with another strand of the literature which conceives power as a property of rules of the game only, abstracting from players’ preferences, as in the study of effectivity functions in cooperative game theory (Moulin and Peleg, 1982; Abdou and Keiding, 1991; Karos and Peters, 2018).

effect of such a counterfactual preference change on the outcome through its effect on the actual utility function of the agent, which makes their index dependent not only on the ordinal but also on the cardinal preferences of the agents.

Finally, our interest in equilibrium menus brings us in contact to the mechanism design literature on menus, such as Gonczarowski et al. (2023). The last section of the paper makes an intensive use of the literature on assignment rules, including Pápai (2000)’s and Pycia and Ünver (2017)’s studies of efficient and group-strategy-proof rules, as well as Bogomolnaia et al. (2005)’s definition of Bipolar Serial Dictatorship. An alternative proof of Long and Velez (2021)’s result also obtains as a corollary of our theorem 2.

**Outline of the paper** Section 2 provides the framework for defining menus in strategy-proof mechanisms. In section 3, we propose two ways to compare menus, by set inclusion or by cardinality, and we establish their relation to welfare comparisons. Section 4 disaggregates between freedom and power over others when each agent cares only about a dimension of the overall outcome, and it provides a sufficient condition for each agent’s cardinal freedom to coincide with her cardinal power over others. Finally, Section 5 applies these tools to strategy-proof assignment rules, pointing to their shared properties in terms of freedom and its distribution as well as to the specificities of two mechanisms, (Bipolar) Serial Dictatorship and Top Trading Cycles.

## 2 Setting

### Outcomes and preferences

Let  $A$  be a set of *outcomes* and  $N$  a set of agents. Agents have *preferences* over outcomes, given by a weak order  $R_i$  for every  $i \in N$ ;<sup>3</sup> let  $I_i$  denote the symmetric and  $P_i$  denote the asymmetric part of  $R_i$ .<sup>4</sup> Further, let  $\mathcal{R}_i$  denote a set of possible preference relations for agent  $i$  and refer to it as the domain of  $i$ ’s preferences; let  $\mathcal{R} = \times_{i \in N} \mathcal{R}_i$  be the corresponding *domain* of possible preference profiles.<sup>5</sup> For each  $i \in N$ , the opposing preference profile is denoted by  $R_{-i} = \times_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} R_j$  and the domain of opposing preference profiles as  $\mathcal{R}_{-i}$ . For each  $G \subseteq N$ , define  $R_G \in \mathcal{R}_G$  and  $R_{-G} \in \mathcal{R}_{-G}$  analogously.

Together the set of outcomes  $A$ , the set of agents  $N$ , and the domain of agents’ preferences over outcomes  $\mathcal{R}$  form an (economic) *environment*  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ .

In many economic environments, it is reasonable to assume that only some aspects of an outcome are relevant to an agent. For example, in a pure exchange economy where an outcome is an allocation of all goods among all agents, it is commonly assumed that only the own bundle of allocated goods is relevant to an individual agent. Formalising this, we say that  $a$  and  $b$  are equivalent for  $i$ , denoted  $a \equiv_i b$ , if for all  $R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$  we have  $a I_i b$ . For a given environment and agent  $i$ , this gives rise to equivalence classes of outcomes  $A$  under  $\equiv_i$  which we denote as  $[a]_i = \{b \in A : a \equiv_i b\}$ . We refer to  $[a]_i$  as an  *$i$ -relevant outcome*<sup>6</sup> and denote the partition of  $A$  into  $i$ -relevant outcomes as

<sup>3</sup>I.e., a binary relation that is strongly connected (for all  $a, b \in A$  we have  $a R_i b$  or  $b R_i a$ ) and transitive (for all  $a, b, c \in A$ , if  $a R_i b$  and  $b R_i c$  then  $a R_i c$ ).

<sup>4</sup>I.e.,  $a I_i b$  iff  $a R_i b$  and  $b R_i a$  and  $a P_i b$  iff  $\neg b R_i a$ .

<sup>5</sup>We restrict attention to domains of preferences profiles that are the Cartesian product of individuals’ preference domains.

<sup>6</sup>Here we follow Gonczarowski et al. (2023). Barberà et al. (2016) refer to  $[a]_i$  as the *consequence* that *alternative*  $a$  has for  $i$ . The role of these equivalence classes, which is to group together outcomes that are not meaningfully distinct from a freedom of choice perspective, can be compared to that of the “attributes” in Nehring and Puppe

$A_i = \{[a]_i | a \in A\}$ . In a slight abuse of notation we use  $R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$  to also denote  $i$ 's preferences over  $i$ -outcomes, i.e., the weak order on  $A_i$  induced by  $i$ 's preferences over outcomes,<sup>7</sup> and  $\mathcal{R}_i$  to denote the domain of such preferences on the  $i$ -relevant outcome.

Last, as a weak richness condition, we may assume that each  $i$ -relevant outcome may be ranked as most-preferred for at least one of  $i$ 's possible preferences.

**Definition 1** (Top-rich preference domains). Let  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$  be an environment. We say that  $\mathcal{R}_i$ ,  $i \in N$ , is top-rich if for every  $[a]_i \in A_i$ , there exists  $R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$  such that  $[a]_i P_i [b]_i$  for all  $[a]_i \neq [b]_i \in A_i$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{R}$  is top-rich if  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is top-rich for every  $i \in N$ .

Top-richness is a commonly invoked condition in social choice theory, for example, referred to simply as ‘rich’ by Barberà et al. (1991); Serizawa (1995); Barberà et al. (1999), or ‘minimally rich’ by Chatterji and Sen (2011); Chatterji and Zeng (2018);<sup>8</sup> in the context of (object) assignment rules, Hu and Zhang (2025) refer to it as ‘top-one richness’. Moreover, many other common domain assumptions imply top richness:

**Example 1.** Consider a finite set of agents  $N$  and a set of objects  $O$  with  $|N| = |O|$ . Each agent should receive one object, so that the set of outcomes  $A$  is the set of all bijections  $\mu : N \rightarrow O$  while an agent's  $i$ -relevant outcome can be identified with the object they receive under  $\mu$ . Let the domain of agents preferences over objects be the domain of all strict orderings. Then, as any object is ranked uniquely at the top for some of  $i$ 's possible preferences, the domain is top-rich.

**Example 2.** Consider a set of voters  $N$  who have to choose an alternative  $a \in A$ . Agents have single peaked preferences over  $A$ . Since no agent  $i$  is indifferent between any two alternatives for *all* of her possible preferences, the equivalence classes  $[a]_i$  are all singletons and  $A_i$  may be identified with  $A$  itself. As any alternative may be uniquely top-ranked by any agent, the domain of preferences is top-rich.

## Mechanisms, Social Choice Rules, and Strategy-Proofness

A mechanism allows agents in a given economic environment to each choose a strategy and thereby jointly determine an outcome. We will focus on mechanisms where each agent is sure to have a (weakly) dominant strategy. Thus, w.l.o.g., we consider direct revelation mechanisms where each agent reports her preferences, finds it optimal to do so truthfully, and the mechanism maps preference profiles to outcomes – formally, a strategy-proof social choice rule.

**Definition 2** ((Strategy-proof) Mechanism). Given an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ , a (direct revelation) mechanism is a singleton valued social choice rule, i.e., a function:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \mathcal{R}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{R}_n &\rightarrow A \\ (R_1, \dots, R_n) &\mapsto a. \end{aligned}$$

A mechanism  $\phi$  is *strategy-proof*, if for all  $i \in N$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $R'_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$  we have

$$\phi(R) R_i \phi(R'_i, R_{-i}).$$

**Definition 3** (Menus). Any (direct revelation) mechanism  $\phi$ , together with a given opposing profile of reported preferences  $R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$ , gives rise to an effective choice set of agent  $i$ :

$$\mathcal{M}_i^\phi(R_{-i}) := \{\phi(R_i, R_{-i}) | R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i\} \subseteq A.$$

(2002, 2008); Sher (2018), but the former are derived from preferences whereas the latter are exogenously defined.

<sup>7</sup>I.e. for all  $a, b \in A$ ,  $[a]_i R_i [b]_i$  iff  $a R_i b$ .

<sup>8</sup>The authors restrict attention to strict preferences, so that no two outcomes are equivalent and  $A_i$  may be identified with  $A$  itself; see also Example 2.

Distinguishing only between different  $i$ -relevant outcomes, we correspondingly define

$$\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) := \{[\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_i | R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i\} \subseteq A_i,$$

i.e., the canonical projection of  $\mathcal{M}_i^\phi(R_{-i})$  onto  $A_i$ , which we will call the ( $i$ -relevant) *menu* of  $i$  (given  $R_{-i}$  and  $\phi$ ).<sup>9</sup>

An agent's menu reflects the influence that they have on their own relevant outcome. For example a 'dictatorship', understood as a mechanism on the universal domain of strict preferences, is described by the property that one agent's menu allows them to choose among all possible outcomes, i.e., corresponds to  $A$ , while all other agents have no freedom of choice – their menus are always a singleton.

Similarly, in a binary voting game of outcome Yes or No, given the profile of others' preferences, a given agent's menu is reduced to a singleton,  $\{\text{Yes}\}$  or  $\{\text{No}\}$ , if her vote has no influence on the outcome, whereas her menu is  $\{\text{Yes}, \text{No}\}$  if there is no majority without her vote, i.e. she is decisive. As developed in Appendix A, we believe that such an understanding of the ability of a player to influence an outcome overcomes the dichotomy drawn by Felsenthal and Machover (1998, 2004) between *a priori* and actual power.

**Definition 4** (Freedom of choice). Given an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ , a mechanism  $\phi$  grants (weakly) more *freedom (of choice)* to agent  $i \in N$  than mechanism  $\varphi$ , if  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i})$  for all  $R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$ ; it grants  $i \in N$  strictly more freedom if there is some  $R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$  for which the inclusion is strict. A mechanism  $\phi$  *maximises individuals' freedom*, if there is no mechanism  $\varphi$  that awards each  $i \in N$  weakly more freedom and strictly more to some agent  $j \in N$ .

While we will be interested in menus as a measure of freedom that an agent enjoys under different mechanisms (or different agents within the same mechanism<sup>10</sup>), they also give rise to a well-known description of strategy-proofness:

**Proposition 1** (Hammond (1979)). *A mechanism  $\phi$  is strategy proof iff at each  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , every agent is ensured an  $R_i$ -optimal choice from  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ , i.e., iff*

$$\forall R \in \mathcal{R}, x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) : [\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_i R_i x.$$

Last, we will also be interested in comparing different mechanisms by their welfare, in particular in terms of Pareto-dominance.

**Definition 5** (Pareto-domination). Given an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ , a mechanism  $\phi$  Pareto-dominates another mechanism  $\varphi$  iff

$$\forall R \in \mathcal{R}, i \in N : [\phi(R)]_i R_i [\varphi(R)]_i,$$

where the preference is strict for at least one  $R$  and  $i$ .

**Definition 6** ((Constrained) Pareto-efficiency). Given an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ , a mechanism  $\phi$  is Pareto-efficient if there is no mechanism  $\varphi$  that Pareto-dominates it. A strategy-proof mechanism  $\phi$  is constrained (Pareto-)efficient if there is no strategy-proof mechanism  $\varphi$  that Pareto-dominates it.

<sup>9</sup>Here we follow Gonczarowski et al. (2023). Other authors have referred to these sets as option sets (Barberà et al., 1991), proper budget sets (Leshno and Lo, 2021), feasible sets (Katušćák and Kittsteiner, 2025).

<sup>10</sup>Observe that a 'dictatorship' also maximises freedom, in that there is no alternative mechanism that grants more freedom to *all* agents, including the 'dictator'. This motivates the development of measures by which we can compare freedom between agents.

### 3 Freedom

Freedom and welfare are distinct concepts. An agent can be satisfied even when she has no freedom of choice in our sense – think of a simple majority vote where there is a consensus on the outcome. Each individual agent is satisfied with the outcome, while at the same time having no individual possibility to change it if she would like to<sup>11</sup>. But this example already suggests that such a happy coincidence cannot be systematic.

Indeed, our next result shows a connection between freedom and welfare. Since a strategy-proof mechanism chooses optimally from each agents' menu, a strategy-proof mechanism that offers agents larger menus than an alternative mechanism (in a set inclusion sense) cannot lead to worse outcomes – and under a mild richness condition on preferences, the former will Pareto-dominate the latter. Perhaps surprisingly, the converse also holds: the *only* possible way to improve upon a strategy-proof mechanism is to ensure that all agents have weakly larger menus at all possible preference profiles.

**Lemma 1.** *Consider an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$  and  $i \in N$  where  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is top-rich, and two strategy-proof mechanisms  $\phi$  and  $\varphi$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- For all  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , we have  $\phi(R) R_i \varphi(R)$ .
- $\phi$  grants more freedom to  $i$  than  $\varphi$ , i.e., for all  $R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$  we have  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that for all  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  we have  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i})$ . By strategy-proofness (Proposition 1),  $[\phi(R)]_i R_i x$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ , thus in particular for  $x = [\varphi(R)]_i$ .

For the other direction, suppose that for all  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  we have  $\phi(R) R_i \varphi(R)$  and, towards a contradiction, assume there exist  $R^* \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}^*) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}^*)$ . By top-richness of  $\mathcal{R}$ , there exists some  $R_i^z \in \mathcal{R}_i$  such that  $z$  is the unique  $R_i^z$ -most preferred  $i$ -relevant outcome, i.e.,  $z P_i^z x$  for all  $x \in A_i \setminus \{z\}$ . But then  $[\varphi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i = z P_i^z x$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}^*) \subseteq A_i \setminus \{z\}$ , in particular  $[\varphi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i P_i^z [\phi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i$  – a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Consider an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$  where  $\mathcal{R}$  is top-rich, and two strategy-proof mechanisms  $\phi$  and  $\varphi$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- $\phi$  Pareto-dominates  $\varphi$ .
- $\phi$  grants weakly more freedom than  $\varphi$  to each  $i \in N$  and strictly more to some  $i^* \in N$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that for all  $i \in N$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  we have  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i})$ . Thus, by Lemma 1,  $[\phi(R)]_i R_i [\varphi(R)]_i$  for all  $i \in N$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Further, suppose there exists  $i \in N$ ,  $R_{-i}^* \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}^*) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}^*)$ . By top-richness of  $\mathcal{R}$ , there exists some  $R_i^z \in \mathcal{R}_i$  such that  $z$  is the unique  $R_i^z$ -most preferred  $i$ -relevant outcome, i.e.,  $z P_i^z x$  for all  $x \in A_i \setminus \{z\}$ . But then  $[\phi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i = z P_i^z x$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}^*) \subseteq A_i \setminus \{z\}$ , in particular  $[\phi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i P_i^z [\varphi(R_i^z, R_{-i}^*)]_i$ . Thus  $\phi$  Pareto-dominates  $\varphi$ .

For the other direction, suppose that  $\phi$  Pareto-dominates  $\varphi$ . Then, by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i})$  for all  $i \in N$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Moreover, there exists  $i \in N$ ,  $R^* \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $[\phi(R^*)]_i P_i^* [\varphi(R^*)]_i$ . But then  $[\phi(R^*)]_i \notin \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}^*)$ , thus  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}^*) \supsetneq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\varphi(R_{-i}^*)$ .  $\square$

<sup>11</sup>In such a situation, we can say that the individual agent is *lucky* in the sense of Barry (1980), i.e. successful not because of herself, but thanks to others.

**Example 3.** Consider a set of agents with preferences over two alternatives  $a$  and  $b$ , and compare the following two strategy-proof mechanisms:  $\phi$  imposes  $a$  irrespective of agents preferences, whereas  $\psi$  selects alternative  $b$  if all players weakly prefer  $b$  to  $a$ , and  $a$  otherwise.  $\psi$  Pareto-dominates  $\phi$ , and offers everyone weakly larger menus.

In particular, this implies that a strategy-proof mechanism can be (constrained) Pareto-efficient only if further enlarging the freedom of some agent will reduce the freedom of some other agent.

**Corollary 1.** *Consider an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$  where  $\mathcal{R}$  is top-rich. Then a strategy-proof mechanism  $\phi$  is constrained Pareto-efficient if and only if it maximises individuals' freedom.*

**Remark** To see the role of the assumption that  $\mathcal{R}$  is top-rich, consider a set of possible outcomes  $A = \{a, b, c\}$ , an agent  $i \in N$  with a (non top-rich) preference domain  $\mathcal{R}_i = \{R_i^1, R_i^2\}$  where  $R_i^1 : aP_i^1bP_i^1c$  and  $R_i^2 : bP_i^2aP_i^2c$  and other agents who are indifferent between all outcomes. Further, consider two mechanisms  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  such that  $\phi(R_i^1, R_{-i}) = a$ ,  $\phi(R_i^2, R_{-i}) = b$ , and  $\psi(R_i^1, R_{-i}) = \psi(R_i^2, R_{-i}) = c$  for all  $R_{-i}$ . Then  $\phi$  Pareto dominates  $\psi$  but  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\psi(R_{-i}) = \{c\}$  is not a subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = \{a, b\}$ .

## Cardinal index

While comparing freedom of choice under different mechanisms based on set inclusion of their menus is very compelling whenever such comparisons can be made, a drawback of this conservative approach lies in the fact that oftentimes agents' menus will not be directly comparable in this way.

To construct a more fine-grained measure of freedom of choice, we adapt to our framework the canonical cardinal ranking of opportunity sets, by defining the following *cardinal index of freedom*:

$$\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) := |\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})|,$$

whenever  $A_i$  is finite, i.e., count the number of different  $i$ -relevant outcomes in  $i$ 's menu (given  $\phi$  and  $R_{-i}$ ). Comparisons based on this cardinal index induce an ordering over menus that is finer than set inclusion.

Pattanaik and Xu (1990) have proposed an axiomatisation for the cardinal ordering of opportunity sets, based on three properties — indifference between no-choice situations, independence, and strict monotonicity. The same axioms can be used to characterise our cardinal index. Where we innovate is by applying the cardinal measure to an endogenously defined menu rather than an exogenous opportunity set, and further by applying it to  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$  rather than to  $\mathcal{M}_i^\phi(R_{-i})$ , i.e., count only elements that are distinct from  $i$ 's welfare perspective. Thus, we partially address a criticism of the simple cardinal approach pointed out by Pattanaik and Xu (1990) themselves: enlarging the menu of an agent by an alternative that does not differ in a relevant sense would force the ranking of choice sets to declare that the enlarged set offers strictly more freedom.<sup>12</sup> To address this weakness, Pattanaik and Xu (2000) introduce exogenous measures of 'similarity' of alternatives, i.e., with similarity defined independently of agents preferences. Instead, we declare some outcomes  $a, b \in A$  similar, or rather identical from the point of view of agent  $i$ , whenever  $[a]_i = [b]_i$ , i.e., whenever an agent is indifferent between them at every possible preference relation, thus endogenising the notion of similarity by deriving it from agents' preferences.

<sup>12</sup>Pattanaik and Xu (1990) provide an example where an agent is offered different modes of transportation in different option sets and the option 'red car' is added to a set that already includes the option 'blue car'.

Theorem 1 pointed out a close relation between freedom of choice as described by menus and welfare in the Paretian sense. The introduction of the cardinal index allows us to extend that result in a quantitative direction by pointing out the relation between an agent's cardinal freedom index and the ranking of the outcome in her preferences when they are randomly drawn.

**Definition 7** (Rank). Consider  $\phi$  is a mechanism,  $R$  a preference profile for all agents,  $i$  an agent such that  $A_i$ , the set of  $i$ -relevant outcomes is finite. Then  $\rho_i^\phi(R)$  is the rank of the  $i$ -relevant outcome in  $i$ 's preferences:

$$\rho_i^\phi(R) = |\{x \in A_i | x R_i [\phi(R)]_i\}|$$

We are now equipped to describe the relation that exists between an agent's freedom index and the rank of the outcome in her preferences, when the latter are random and the outcome space is finite.

**Proposition 2.** Consider two environments  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ ,  $(A, N', \mathcal{R}')$ , two agents  $i \leq N$ ,  $j \leq N'$  such that  $\mathcal{R}_i$ ,  $\mathcal{R}'_j$  are the sets of strict orderings on  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  with  $|A_i| = |A_j|$ , and two strategy-proof mechanisms  $\phi$  (on  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ ) and  $\psi$  (on  $(A, N', \mathcal{R}')$ ). Suppose  $R_{-i}$ ,  $R'_{-j}$  are given while  $R_i$  and  $R'_j$  are both uniformly random in  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . Then:

$$\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \geq \Delta_{j|j}^\psi(R'_{-j}) \Leftrightarrow \rho_j^\psi(R') \text{ first order stochastically dominates } \rho_i^\phi(R)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix B. It relies on an explicit characterisation of the probability law of  $\rho_i^\phi(R)$ , conditional on  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ .

Note that this proposition does not rule out  $\phi = \psi$  or  $i = j$ . Hence, if we set  $i = j$ , they connect the freedom of choice (in a cardinal sense) that an agent enjoys under two mechanisms to the welfare they enjoy under the two mechanism. Alternatively, holding the mechanism constant, we can compare the situation of two agents in the same mechanism, and find that if one agent enjoys more freedom than another, they will fare better in a stochastic dominance sense.

So that result can be considered a cardinal analogue of lemma 1: both show that an agent has a larger menu (either in an inclusion or a cardinal sense) if and only if she is better off in terms of welfare (either in deterministic terms, or in the sense of a higher probability of obtaining an outcome ranked higher in her preferences list).

Can this result be generalised when others' preferences are random too? Under the assumption of  $R_i$  (resp.  $R'_j$ ) uniformly random and independent from  $R_{-i}$  (resp.  $R'_{-j}$ ) – the “impartial culture” assumption often invoked in voting theory –, Appendix B provides elements of an answer: first, the forward direction from the equivalence above remains true (corollary 6); second, the expected size of the menu is proportional to the probability of obtaining the preferred outcome, i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})] = |A_i| \times \mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) = 1]$  (corollary 7).

To conclude this section, note that a possible use of the  $\Delta$  index is in cases where we do not know with certainty  $R_{-i}$ , the other players' preference profile, but only a probability distribution for it. Then we can compute the expected  $\Delta$  index.

**Example 4.** We have mentioned above that in a binary voting game  $\phi$ , under a given profile of opposing preferences, an agent's menu includes the two possible outcomes if she is decisive, but only a singleton if she is not. Therefore, under a given probability distribution for  $R_{-i}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i})] = 1 + \mathbb{P}[i \text{ is decisive}]$$

This is the basis for uncovering the relationship that exists between our cardinal index and the Banzhaf and the Shapley-Shubik power indices from the voting literature, as shown in Appendix C.

## 4 Power over others

Variations of the same tools allow to describe the influence that an agent has over others. Let us first modify definition 3 to describe the menu of an agent for the outcome of a group of agents.

**Definition 8** (Menu for others). Consider  $\phi$  is a strategy-proof mechanism,  $N$  the set of agents,  $i \in N$  an agent,  $S \subseteq N$  a subset of agents,  $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots$  the preference domain of the agents and  $R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i}$  a preference profile for agents distinct from  $i$ . Then we define the *choice set* or *menu* of agent  $i$  for group  $S$  as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{i|S}^\phi(R_{-i}) := \{([\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_j)_{j \in S} \mid R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i\}$$

In other words, her menu for group  $S$  is the set of tuples of outcomes relevant to agents in  $S$  obtained when  $i$ 's preferences vary in her domain, the others' preferences being fixed. Note that when concerned with the power of an individual over another, we will write  $\mathcal{M}_{i|j}$  for  $\mathcal{M}_{i|\{j\}}$ .

We will interpret the comparison of these menus for others as comparisons of power: for example, if  $\mathcal{M}_{i|S}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supset \mathcal{M}_{i|S}^\varphi(R_{-i})$ , then we will say that under preference profile  $R_{-i}$ , mechanism  $\phi$  provides agent  $i$  with more power over group  $S$  than mechanism  $\varphi$ .

As we did with freedom, we can extend comparability by measuring the cardinality of these sets when they are finite, defining the *cardinal index of power of agent  $i$  over group  $S$*  as:

$$\Delta_{i|S}^\phi(R_{-i}) := |\mathcal{M}_{i|S}^\phi(R_{-i})|$$

Let us anticipate slightly on the next section by illustrating these two new definitions with the example of a serial dictatorship mechanism.

**Example.** Consider an assignment mechanism  $\phi$  that matches three agents 1, 2, 3 and three objects  $a, b, c$ . Each agent has strict preferences over the objects. The mechanism assigns agent 1 their  $R_1$ -most-preferred object, then agent 2 their  $R_2$ -most-preferred among the remaining ones, and finally agent 3 obtains the remaining object. Suppose that agent 2 and 3 share the same preferences  $R_2 = R_3 : abc$ .

When agent 1 prefers object  $a$ , 2 obtains object  $b$  and 3 obtains  $c$ . When 1 prefers  $b$ , 2 obtains  $a$  and 3 obtains  $c$ . When 1 prefers  $c$ , 2 obtains  $a$  and 3 obtains  $b$ . So the menu of 1 for  $\{2, 3\}$  together is  $\mathcal{M}_{1|-1}^\phi(R_{-1}) = \{(b, c), (a, c), (a, b)\}$ , of cardinality  $\Delta_{1|-1}^\phi(R_{-1}) = 3$ , while the menu of 1 for the individual agent 2 is  $\mathcal{M}_{1|2}^\phi(R_{-1}) = \{a, b\}$ , of cardinality  $\Delta_{1|2}^\phi(R_{-1}) = 2$ .

Our next result shows that under some conditions, there is a connection between the freedom of an agent and her power over all others, in a cardinal sense. To state the result, we first need to introduce the notions of non bossiness and non autarky.

**Definition 9** (Non-bossiness). Under a mechanism  $\phi$  and given others' preferences  $R_{-i}$ , agent  $i$  with preference domain  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is *non-bossy* if she cannot change another agent's outcome without changing her own, i.e., if:

$$\forall R_i, R'_i \in \mathcal{R}_i : [\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_i = [\phi(R'_i, R_{-i})]_i \Rightarrow [\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_{-i} = [\phi(R'_i, R_{-i})]_{-i}.$$

The mechanism is non-bossy if every agent, given any profile of others' preferences, is.

In the following propositions, we consider the mechanism  $\phi$  and the profile of opposing preferences  $R_{-i}$  as given and drop the related notations, i.e., write  $\Delta_{i,\cdot}$  for  $\Delta_{i,\cdot}^\phi(R_{-i})$ .

**Lemma 2.** If agent  $i$  is non-bossy, then  $\Delta_{i|-i} \leq \Delta_{i|i}$ .

*Proof.* Denote  $\mathcal{F}_i$  (resp.  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$ ) the partition of  $\mathcal{R}_i$  by fibers of  $[\phi(\cdot, R_{-i})]_i$  (resp.  $[\phi(\cdot, R_{-i})]_{-i}$ ). In other words, distinct preferences from  $\mathcal{R}_i$  are regrouped in the same part of  $\mathcal{F}_i$  if they give rise to the same outcome for  $i$ .

Note that the non-bossiness of  $i$  is equivalent to the claim that when two elements are in the same part of  $\mathcal{F}_i$ , they are also in the same part of  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$  is coarser than  $\mathcal{F}_i$ . So the number of parts in  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$  is lower than in  $\mathcal{F}_i$ . But the number of parts in  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{F}_i$ ) is  $\Delta_{i|-i}$  ( $\Delta_{i|i}$ ).  $\square$

This result offers a new interpretation of non-bossiness:<sup>13</sup> being bossy doesn't mean to have power over others, but to have power over others in excess to one's freedom or power over oneself. Now let us introduce a somewhat symmetric notion.

**Definition 10** (Non-autarky). Under mechanism  $\phi$  and facing opposing preferences  $R_{-i}$ , agent  $i$  is *non-autarkic* if she cannot change her own outcome without changing that of at least one other agent, i.e., if

$$\forall R_i, R'_i \in \mathcal{R}_i : [\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_{-i} = [\phi(R'_i, R_{-i})]_{-i} \Rightarrow [\phi(R_i, R_{-i})]_i = [\phi(R'_i, R_{-i})]_i$$

The mechanism is non-autarkic if every of its agents, given any preference profile for the others, is. A proof similar to that of the previous lemma shows that:

**Lemma 3.** *If agent  $i$  is non-autarkic, then  $\Delta_{i|-i}^\phi \geq \Delta_{i|i}^\phi$ .*

Combining these two lemmas provides the following result.

**Proposition 3.** *Consider a mechanism  $\phi$  a finite outcome set, and an agent  $i$  with preference domain  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . If two of the following three claims are satisfied, the third is satisfied as well:*

1.  $i$  is non-autarkic.
2.  $i$  is non-bossy.
3.  $\forall R_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}_{-i} : \Delta_{i|-i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = \Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ .

*Proof.* **(1) and (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3).** Suppose autarky and non-bossiness. Then by direct application of lemmas 2 and 3,  $\Delta_{i,-i} = \Delta_{i,i}$ .

**(1) and (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2).** Consider the partitions  $\mathcal{F}_i$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$  as defined in the proof of lemma 2. Because  $\Delta_{i,i} = \Delta_{i,-i}$ , both partitions have the same number of parts. Because of non-bossiness,  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$  is coarser than  $\mathcal{F}_i$ . So both partitions are the same, so  $\mathcal{F}_i$  is also coarser than  $\mathcal{F}_{-i}$ , i.e.,  $i$  is non-autarkic.

By a similar reasoning, **(2) and (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).**  $\square$

Non formally, in mechanisms where an agent cannot affect others without affecting her own outcome and *vice versa*, her power over others (measured by the tuples of others' outcome) coincides with her freedom (her power over her own outcome).

These twin conditions are satisfied in voting games where the same outcome is relevant to all agents, so that the only way to affect either oneself or others is to change the outcome of the vote, which makes the mechanism both non-bossy and non-autarkic. It is also the case for many common assignment mechanisms that assign one object to each agent, provided there are as many objects as agents. It is to these mechanisms that we turn now.

<sup>13</sup>See Thomson (2016) for a survey of existing justifications of this technical property.

## 5 Assignment problems

In this section, we analyse (object) assignment rules in terms of the freedom of choice and power over others that they award to agents. We start by showing some general implications of efficiency for the structure of agents' menus: at some preference profiles, some agent must have unconstrained freedom of choice while another agent must have no choice. Further, we show that hierarchical exchange rules (Pápai, 2000) are indeed hierarchical in a hitherto unobserved sense: whenever an agent  $i$  has any power over another agent  $j$ , she also has power over any other agent that  $j$  has power over. Moreover, this transitive nature of power characterises hierarchical exchange rules among all group-strategy-proof and efficient rules.

Then we study separately the properties of two canonical rules: (Bipolar) Serial Dictatorship (SD) and Top Trading Cycles (TTC). Among group-strategy-proof, efficient and reallocation-proof assignment rules, we show that (bipolar) SD are characterised by a minimal bilateral power property – the menu of  $i$  for  $j$  is at most of size 2. In contrast, under TTC, there exist preference profiles where some agent  $i$  can assign any of all  $n$  objects to another agent  $j$  by varying her own preferences. While ‘dictatorial’ in that aspect, TTC also offers the possibility of complete freedom – it awards each agent unconstrained freedom of choice at at least some opposing preference profile. Moreover, among group-strategy-proof and efficient rules of four or more agents, TTC is characterised by that property.

Together, these results yield a form of impossibility theorem: a group-strategy-proof, efficient and reallocation-proof assignment rule can ensure that no participant exerts more than minimal power on another, or can provide each participant the possibility of unconstrained freedom at some profile of the others' preferences, but cannot ensure both.

### 5.1 Formalities

As before, we consider a set of  $n$  agents  $i \in N$ . The task is to assign to each of them one of  $n$  objects  $x \in O$  so that the set of outcomes corresponds to the set of all bijections  $\mu : N \rightarrow O : i \mapsto \mu_i$ . We refer to such outcomes as assignments and denote the set of all possible outcomes as  $\mathcal{A}$ . Each agent is assumed to have strict preferences over the object that they receive and are otherwise indifferent between assignments. Hence, for a given assignment  $\mu$  we can identify agents'  $i$ -relevant outcome  $[\mu]_i$  with the object they receive,  $\mu_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{R} = \times_{i \in N} \mathcal{R}_i$  denote the domain of all such preference profiles.<sup>14</sup> Finally, a social choice rule in this setting, mapping preference profiles to assignments, is referred to as an assignment rule. The object assigned to  $i$  under assignment rule  $\varphi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} : R \mapsto \mu$  is denoted as  $\varphi_i(R)$ .

An assignment rule is efficient if  $\varphi(R)$  is efficient for every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ; it is group-strategy-proof if it is not manipulable by a group, i.e., if there is no  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $G \subseteq N$ , and  $R'_G \in \mathcal{R}_G$  s.t.  $\varphi_i(R'_G, R_{-G})R_i\varphi_i(R)$  for all  $i \in G$  and  $\varphi_j(R'_G, R_{-G})P_j\varphi_j(R)$  for some  $j \in G$ . On the domain of assignment problems, group-strategy-proofness is equivalent to strategy-proofness and non-bossiness (Pápai, 2000).

Pycia and Ünver (2017) provide a characterisation of all efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rules in terms of algorithmic procedures where some objects are assigned to some agents (taking into account agents' preferences) and thus removed, some remaining objects are assigned to some remaining agents (taking into account the previous assignment of objects as well as the

---

<sup>14</sup>Note that the domain is top-rich, i.e., contains for each agent  $i$  and each  $i$ -relevant outcome  $[x]_i$  a preference order  $R_i$  where  $[x]_i$  is ranked at the top.

preferences of so far unmatched agents) and thus removed, etc. To summarise their result we need to introduce some of their additional notation.

First, we define a *submatching*  $\sigma$  as a bijection between a subset  $N_\sigma \subseteq N$  and a subset of  $O_\sigma \subseteq O$ . We say that a submatching is a proper submatching if  $N_\sigma \subsetneq N$  and denote the set of all proper submatchings as  $\mathcal{S}$ . The set of unmatched agents and objects (under  $\sigma$ ) are denoted  $\bar{N}_\sigma$  and  $\bar{O}_\sigma$ . We say that  $\sigma$  is a submatching of  $\sigma'$  if  $N_\sigma \subseteq N_{\sigma'}$  and  $\sigma_i = \sigma'_i$  for all  $i \in N_\sigma$ . Interpreting submatchings as subsets in  $N \times O$ , we also write  $\sigma \subseteq \sigma'$ . The *empty submatching*  $\sigma$  is such that  $N_\sigma = O_\sigma = \emptyset$ ; for simplicity we denote it as  $\sigma = \emptyset$ .

Next, a *structure of control rights*  $c$  maps each proper submatching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and each unassigned object  $x \in \bar{O}_\sigma$  to an unassigned agent who controls it, either as an *owner* ( $o$ ) or as a *broker* ( $b$ ), i.e.,  $c_\sigma(x) \in \bar{N}_\sigma \times \{o, b\}$ , such that (i) no agent is both a broker for one and an owner for another object (while owners may own multiple objects); (ii) if there are  $|\bar{N}_\sigma| \neq 3$  unassigned agents, then there can be at most one broker, (iii) if  $|\bar{N}_\sigma| = 1$ , then the last remaining agent is an owner of the last remaining object, and (iv) if  $|\bar{N}_\sigma| = 3$  there can be no, one or three brokers, each broker brokering a different object.

For  $|N| = |O| > 3$ , a trading cycle (TC) mechanism associated with an control rights structure  $c$ , is then defined by the following algorithm:

- Start with the empty submatching  $\sigma = \emptyset$ . Let all owners point to their most preferred object and, if there exists a broker, let her point to her most preferred object among those that she does not broker. Each object points to the agent who controls it. Each agent in a cycle is assigned the object that they point to, giving rise to a submatching  $\sigma'$ .<sup>15</sup>
- The submatching  $\sigma'$ , together with the control rights structure  $c$  gives rise to new ownership and brokerage rights. If there is at most one broker, proceed as before.
- Repeat until (i) all objects are assigned (with no submatching in the sequence giving rise to three brokers) or, (ii) at the point where 3 unassigned agents and objects remain, and each agent brokers one of the objects – in which case the assignment of the remaining objects is given by an avoidance matching that chooses an efficient assignment of the remaining objects that minimises the number of objects assigned to their respective broker.<sup>16</sup>

For this algorithm to give rise to an assignment rule that is not only efficient but also group-strategy-proof, Pycia and Ünver (2017) identify a number of necessary conditions on the control rights structure. Moreover, and importantly, they show that any efficient and group strategy proof assignment rule can be represented as a TC-mechanism satisfying their conditions. We do not restate all these conditions here, but among them, the following is crucial for our results: for any  $\sigma \subseteq \sigma'$ , any unassigned agent in  $\sigma'$ ,  $i \in \bar{N}_{\sigma'}$ , and any unassigned object in  $\sigma$ ,  $x \in \bar{O}_\sigma$  we have that  $c_\sigma(x) = (i, o) \implies c_{\sigma'}(x) = (i, o)$ , i.e., ownership persists until an agent is matched eventually.

TC-mechanisms involving brokers may allow pairs of agents to jointly misrepresent their preferences and to thus be assigned different objects such that, if they were to exchange their assigned objects, both agents would weakly better off, at least one of them strictly. Ruling out such situations

<sup>15</sup>There must be at least one cycle. If there is more than one, one could equivalently clear cycles sequentially – it can be shown that the final allocation does not depend on the order in which they are selected (cf. footnote 20 in Pycia and Ünver (2017)).

<sup>16</sup>If there are multiple efficient matchings that assign an equal number of objects to their respective brokers, additional case distinctions apply, see Bade (2020) or the online appendix to Pycia and Ünver (2017).

by requiring the assignment rule to be *reallocation-proof*,<sup>17</sup> Pápai (2000) characterises *hierarchical exchange rules* as the set of all efficient, group-strategy-proof, and reallocation-proof assignment rules. They correspond to TC-mechanisms without brokers, i.e., where at each possible submatching, any agent controlling an object owns that object. Thus, we may think of hierarchical exchange rules, as TC-mechanisms where the control rights structure is a mapping  $c_\sigma : \bar{O}_\sigma \rightarrow \bar{N}_\sigma$  with persistent ownership.

Note that a given assignment rule may be represented by different, equivalent TC-mechanisms – or more precisely by different control right structures.<sup>18</sup>

## 5.2 Results

Our first observation concerns efficient (and strategy-proof) assignment rules. Necessarily, they will treat agents very differently in terms of their effective freedom of choice, at least at some preference profiles.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow A$  be an efficient and strategy-proof assignment rule. Then there exists a preference profile  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  and an ordering of agents  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  such that for any  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the size of  $i_k$ 's menu is  $k$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_{i_k|i_k}^\varphi(R_{-i_k}) = k$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a preference profile  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  where all agents have identical preferences, i.e.,  $R_i : o_n, o_{n-1}, \dots, o_1$  for all  $i \in N$ . Take any  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and consider the agent who is assigned object  $o_k$ , i.e.,  $i$  such that  $\varphi_i(R) = o_k$ . Denote that agent as  $i_k$ . We claim that the menu of  $i_k$  consist of all objects ranked weakly below  $o_k$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_{i_k|i_k}(R_{-i_k}) = \{o_k, \dots, o_1\}$ .

Towards a contradiction, suppose there is some higher ranked object  $o_l$ ,  $l > k$ , included in  $i_k$ 's menu. But then there exists some  $R'_{i_k}$  such that  $\varphi_{i_k}(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k}) = o_l$ , violating strategy proofness for  $i_k$  (at  $R$ ).

It remains to show that  $i_k$  can not only be assigned object  $o_k$  but any object  $o_l$ ,  $l < k$ , for some  $(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k})$ . Take any  $o_l$ ,  $l < k$ , and let  $R'_{i_k}$  be such that  $o_l$  is ranked first, while the ranking of other objects remains unchanged,  $R'_{i_k} : o_l, o_n, o_{n-1}, \dots, o_1$ . By strategy-proofness, we have  $\varphi_{i_k}(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k}) \in \{o_k, o_l\}$ . If  $\varphi_{i_k}(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k}) = o_k$ , there is some other agent  $j$  for whom  $\varphi_j(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k}) = o_l$ . But then there exists a Pareto improving trade between  $i_k$  and  $j$ , contradicting efficiency of  $\varphi$ . Thus we conclude that  $\varphi_{i_k}(R'_{i_k}, R_{-i_k}) = o_l$ .  $\square$

In other words, under an efficient and strategy-proof assignment rule, agents will, at times, enjoy very different degrees of freedom of choice. Note that if the rule is not only strategy-proof but group-strategy-proof, then that uneven distribution of freedom will also be reflected into an uneven distribution of power over others. Indeed, group-strategy-proof assignment rules are non-bossy (Pápai, 2000), and since we have defined assignment rules as having the same number of agents and

<sup>17</sup>Formally, an assignment rule  $\varphi$  violates reallocation proofness iff there exist  $i, j \in N$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , and  $R'_i \neq R_i$ ,  $R'_j \neq R_j$ , such that  $\varphi_j(R'_i, R'_j, R_{-\{i,j\}})R_i\varphi_i(R)$ ,  $\varphi_i(R'_i, R'_j, R_{-\{i,j\}})P_j\varphi_j(R)$ , and  $\varphi_h(R) = \varphi_h(R_h, R_{-h}) \neq \varphi_h(R'_i, R'_j, R_{-\{i,j\}})$  for  $h \in \{i, j\}$ .

<sup>18</sup>For example, to represent a serial dictatorship where agent 1 chooses first, we need to make 1 the owner of all objects at the empty submatching, but can choose control rights at a submatching where only agents other than 1 are matched in any arbitrary way since these will never be reached in the algorithmic procedure. Even for submatchings that can be reached, different assignments of control rights may be equivalent – for example, if only two unmatched agents are left, it does not matter whether one of them is a broker (while the other agent owns the remaining object) or whether the other agent owns both objects.

objects, they are all non-autarkic, so we can apply proposition 3 and each agent's cardinal freedom is equal to her cardinal power over all others taken together.

Since such inequality is unavoidable, one may ask whether on average some rules provide agents with more freedom than other rules. For this, our next proposition compares efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rules under the 'impartial culture' benchmark.

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow A$  be an efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rule. Suppose agents' preferences are drawn independently, with each  $R_i$  uniformly distributed on  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . Then the average expected cardinal index of freedom is given by:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \right] = \frac{n+1}{2}$$

*Proof.* When  $R_i$  is drawn uniformly among strict orderings of the elements of  $O$ , the most preferred object  $R_{i,1}$  is drawn uniformly in  $O$  so that corollary 7 applies – for given  $R_{-i}$ ,  $i$ 's freedom index coincides with her probability of getting her most preferred object:  $\Delta_{i,i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = n\mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) = 1 | R_{-i}]$  (recall from definition 7 that  $\rho_i^\phi(R)$  is the rank in  $R_i$  of  $i$ 's assignment). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \Delta_{i,i}^\phi(R_{-i}) | R_{-i} \right] \right] && \text{by the law of total expectation} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) = 1 | R_{-i}] \right] && \text{by corollary 7 (Appendix B)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) = 1] && \text{by the law of total expectation} \\ &= n\mathbb{P}[\rho_X^\phi(R) = 1] \end{aligned}$$

where  $X$  is an agent drawn uniformly in  $N$ , independently from all random variables introduced before. This allows us to use Bade (2020), who shows that given  $n$  agents and objects,  $R$  a given preference profile, and  $X$  a uniformly random agent, the probability distribution of  $\phi_X(\cdot)$ , the function that maps a preference profile into  $X$ 's assignment, is the same for any assignment mechanism  $\phi$  that is efficient, strategy-proof and non-bossy. But the event  $\{\rho_X^\phi(R) = 1\}$  can be rewritten as  $\{\phi_X(R) = R_{X,1}\}$ , so is a function of the function  $\phi_X(\cdot)$ , so has also the same probability for any  $\phi$ , and in particular is the same as under a serial dictatorship mechanism  $\psi$ . So  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,i}^\psi(R_{-i}) \right]$ .

Anticipating slightly on the formal definition of serial dictatorship, the following intuitive claim can already be made: under SD, the menu of the first agent is of size  $n$  (she can choose any object), of the second agent of size  $n-1$  (she can choose any object but the one picked by agent 1), ..., of the last agent of size 1. But SD is efficient and group-strategy-proof, so:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_{i,i}^\psi(R_{-i}) \right] = \frac{1}{n}(n + \dots + 1) = \frac{n+1}{2}$$

□

The next result establishes a connection between the influence that two agents may have on their own relevant outcome, comparing their freedom of choice, and whether one agent may have power over another.

**Lemma 4.** *Consider a strategy-proof assignment rule  $\phi$  for a set  $N$  of agents, a preference profile  $R$ , and two agents  $i, j \in N$ . If  $i$ 's menu is a superset of  $j$ 's, then  $i$  has power over  $j$ :*

$$\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}) \implies |\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i})| > 1.$$

*Proof.* Given  $R$ , suppose that  $j$  is assigned  $\phi_j(R) = x \in \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ . Since  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ , there exists  $R'_i$  s.t.  $x = \phi_i(R'_i, R_{-i}) \neq \phi_j(R'_i, R_{-i})$ . But then  $\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i}) = \{\phi_j(\tilde{R}_i, R_{-i}) | \tilde{R}_i \in \tilde{R}_i\} \supseteq \{\phi_j(R), \phi_j(R'_i, R_{-i})\}$ , hence  $|\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i})| > 1$ .  $\square$

One may consider the requirement that one agent's menu is a superset of another agent's menu to be exceptionally strong. Is it ever satisfied beyond explicitly hierarchical rules such as Serial Dictatorship or Piccione and Rubinstein (2007)'s "jungle" model, its counterpart for divisible goods? The next section answers in the affirmative: for many assignment rules it is satisfied whenever one agent is able to influence the outcome of the other agent in any way.

## Hierarchical exchange rules

As already mentioned, applying proposition 3 to group-strategy-proof and efficient mechanisms ensures that in such a mechanism, each agent has as much freedom, in the cardinal sense, as power over all others together. By further restricting our scope to hierarchical exchange mechanisms, i.e. by adding the reallocation-proofness condition to efficiency and group-strategy-proofness, we uncover a more precise link between freedom and power (this time power over another individual agent).

**Proposition 6.** *Consider a hierarchical exchange rule  $\phi$  for a set  $N$  of agents, a preference profile  $R$ , and two agents  $i, j \in N$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  *$i$ 's menu is a superset of  $j$ 's:  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j})$ ,*
- (ii)  *$i$  has power over  $j$ :  $|\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i})| > 1$ ,*

*Proof.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii): see Lemma 4 above.

(ii)  $\implies$  (i): Since  $\phi$  is a hierarchical exchange rule, it can be represented as a TC-mechanism without brokers. Moreover, recall that the final matching under a TC-mechanism does not depend on the order in which trading cycles are resolved.<sup>19</sup> Hence, we can successively resolve all trading cycles that do not involve  $i$  or  $j$  (and which therefore do not depend on  $R_i$  or  $R_j$  but only on  $R_{N \setminus \{i, j\}}$ ) to eventually arrive at a submatching  $\sigma$ . Now, given  $\sigma$  and the associated assignment of ownership, consider the subgraph where all agents other than  $i$ , and  $j \in \bar{N}_\sigma \setminus \{i\}$ , point to the owner of their most preferred object. By construction of  $\sigma$ , there are no further cycles, so that the graph consist of two separate components, namely a tree with root  $i$  and a tree with root  $j$  (possibly with  $i$  or  $j$  as isolated vertex, i.e., as a degenerate tree). As  $\sigma$  before, this subgraph is independent of  $R_i$  and  $R_j$ , but depends only on  $R_{N \setminus \{i, j\}}$ . Now if  $R_j$  is such that  $j$ 's most preferred object is owned by an agent in the component that forms a tree with root  $j$  (possibly  $j$  herself), then regardless of  $\tilde{R}_i$ , there will be a trading cycle involving  $j$  where  $j$  receives her most preferred among all remaining

<sup>19</sup>See footnote 20 in Pycia and Ünver (2017).

objects in  $\overline{O}_\sigma$ . Hence,  $i$  would have no power over  $j$ . Instead we know that  $R_j$  must be such that  $j$ 's most preferred object is owned by an agent on the component that forms a tree with root in  $i$ . Now, for any  $R_i$ , if we consider the owner(s) to which  $i$  and  $j$  point, there is a cycle that can be cleared and in which  $i$  receives their most preferred among the remaining objects. Thus,  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}(R_{-i}) = \overline{O}_\sigma$ . Moreover, regardless of  $R_i$ , we know that  $j$  can receive at most any object in  $\overline{O}_\sigma$  by varying their own reported preferences. Thus,  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j})$ .  $\square$

Proposition 6 yields the following corollary (which follows from the fact that set-inclusion is a transitive relation):

**Corollary 2.** *Consider a hierarchical exchange rule  $\phi$  for a set  $N$  of agents, a preference profile  $R$ , and three agents  $i, j, k \in N$ . If  $i$  has power over  $j$ , and  $j$  has power over  $k$ , then  $i$  has power over  $k$ :*

$$|\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i})| > 1 \text{ and } |\mathcal{M}_{j|k}^\phi(R_{-j})| > 1 \implies |\mathcal{M}_{i|k}^\phi(R_{-i})| > 1.$$

The transitivity of power relations revealed in Corollary 2 is specific to hierarchical exchange rules but breaks down for general TC-mechanisms, that allow for brokers:

**Example 5.** Consider a TC-mechanism with at least three agents and objects. Let agent 1 be the broker for  $a$ , agent 2 the owner of  $b$ , and agent 3 the owner of  $c$ . If preferences  $R$  are such that 1 considers  $b$  most preferred, 2 prefers  $c$  the most and 3 prefers  $a$ , then all three agents are assigned their most preferred object. If instead 1 would report  $c$  as most preferred, they would be assigned  $c$  and 2 would be left with the (less-preferred) object  $b$ . Thus, 1 has power over 2. Similarly, 2 has power over 3, as they could change the assignment of 3 by instead reporting  $a$  as most preferred (thus trade their object with 1). However, 1 has no power over 3: regardless of whether they report  $b$  or  $c$  as most preferred, the resulting trading cycle leaves 3 with object  $a$  (recall that as a broker for  $a$ , agent 1 will be forced to trade it, given  $R_{-1}$ ).

Together, example 5 and corollary 2 characterise hierarchical exchange rules as the only efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rules where power over another forms a transitive relation. This is an alternative to Pápai (2000)'s original characterisation, which relies on group-strategy-proofness, efficiency, and reallocation-proofness. Our characterisation may offer a formal rationale for the name of this class of mechanisms, by identifying "hierarchy" with power transitivity.

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow A$  be an efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rule. Then  $\phi$  is a hierarchical exchange rule if and only if for all agents  $i, j, k \in N$  and at all preference profiles  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  where  $i$  has power over  $j$ , and  $j$  has power over  $k$ , we find that  $i$  has power over  $k$ .*

*Proof.* In light of corollary 2 we only need to show the other direction. So suppose that  $\phi$  is not a hierarchical exchange rule, thus cannot be represented by TC-mechanism without brokers. If it is represented by a TC-mechanism where at some submatching (that can be reached given some preference profile) we have a broker, say  $i$ , facing two owners, say  $j$  and  $k$ , a construction analogous to example 5 establishes that  $i$  has no power over  $k$ . Similarly, if  $i$  faces additional owners beyond  $j$  and  $k$  – we may then consider a preference profile where the additional owners consider one of their own objects to be most-preferred, while objects owned by them are least-preferred by  $i$ ,  $j$ , and  $k$ .

If  $\phi$  can be represented by a TC-mechanism where at some submatching a broker faces exactly one owner (but never more), consider a minimal submatching  $\sigma$  for which this is the case (i.e., such that at all submatchings  $\sigma' \subsetneq \sigma$ , there are no brokers). Then, the broker, say  $i$ , is forced to point to the owner, say  $j$ , regardless of their own preferences so that the owner will be assigned their most-preferred object regardless of their preferences. If instead we change control rights at

$\sigma$  and make  $j$  the owner of all unassigned objects (including the object previously brokered by  $i$ ), while keeping the control rights at all other submatchings unchanged, the new TC-mechanism is equivalent to the previous one. By iteratively removing brokers at any minimal submatching where they exist, we eventually arrive at an equivalent TC-mechanism without brokers – contradicting the initial assumption that  $\phi$  is not a hierarchical exchange rule.  $\square$

## Top trading cycle

As we saw above, all efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rules offer agents' on average the same expected size of individual menus' (Proposition 5), but will, at some profiles, allow only one of the agents to choose from a complete menu (and have maximal power over others) – while another agent has no influence on their own (or any other) relevant outcome at all (Proposition 4 combined with Proposition 3).

Such extreme inequity cannot be avoided, but it can take different forms. In the remainder of the paper, we contrast the patterns of power and freedom in two important subclasses of hierarchical exchange rules: Top Trading Cycles (TTC) on the one hand, and bipolar Serial Dictatorship (SD)—an extension of classical serial dictatorship—on the other. TTC is characterised, among TC rules, by universal possibility of complete freedom: every agent can, at some opposing preference profile, enjoy a position of unrestricted freedom. Bipolar SD, in contrast, is characterised among hierarchical exchange rules by minimal bilateral power: the size of an agent's menu for another agent never exceeds two. In other words, TTC grants each individual the potential for full freedom but allows situations in which one agent may exert full power over another. Bipolar SD, by contrast, ensures that no agent can determine another's outcome beyond what is necessary, yet it fully predetermines the hierarchy of who enjoys more and who enjoys less freedom.

**Definition 11** (Top Trading Cycle). For  $n$  agents and objects, an assignment rule is a Top Trading Cycle rule (TTC) iff it corresponds to a TC-mechanism where each agent is the initial owner of one of the objects.<sup>20</sup>

We refer to the object that an agent  $i \in N$  owns initially as their endowment and denote it as  $\omega_i \in O$ . When they introduced this rule, Shapley and Scarf (1974) already noticed that it is equivalent to a Walrasian market allocation.

**Definition 12** (Equilibrium prices). Consider a TTC-rule  $\phi$  with initial endowments  $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i \in N}$  and a preference profile  $R$ . Then a *price vector supporting the allocation*  $\phi(R)$  is a vector  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^{0n}$  such that for each  $i \in N$ ,  $\phi_i(R)$  is the  $R_i$  most preferred object in  $i$ 's associated budget set  $B_i(p) := \{x \in O \mid p_x \leq p_{\omega_i}\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}^\phi(R)$  denote the set of all price vectors supporting  $\phi(R)$ .

We may connect a price vector  $p$  supporting  $\phi(R)$  and the TTC-algorithm as follows: to allow agents within a cycle to trade, assign the same price to all objects within a cycle; to prevent agents within cycles that are formed later to demand objects that are in cycles formed earlier, assign to the former a lower price than to the latter. Thus, if there is a sequence of cycles  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  consistent with the TTC-algorithm<sup>21</sup> we may choose  $p$  such that

$$\forall i \in C_a, j \in C_b, p_{\omega_i} > p_{\omega_j} \Leftrightarrow a < b.$$

Conversely, if  $p_{\omega_i} \geq p_{\omega_j}$  for some supporting price vector, there is an order in which cycles can be cleared such that for  $i \in C_a, j \in C_b$  implies  $a \geq b$ .

<sup>20</sup>The algorithm was proven to be strategy-proof by Roth (1982).

<sup>21</sup>Recall that in general, there are multiple ordered sequence of cycles compatible with the TTC-algorithm, because of the indeterminacy that arises when multiple cycles arise simultaneously.

Because of this remarkable connection, before providing our characterisation of the TTC rule, it may be interesting to interpret our previous results on power and freedom in hierarchical exchange in terms of wealth, i.e. the equilibrium price of an agent's endowment.

**Proposition 7.** *If  $\phi$  is a TTC assignment rule and  $i, j$  are two agents, then:*

$$\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}) \Leftrightarrow \forall p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R), p_{\omega_i} \leq p_{\omega_j}$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}) &\Leftrightarrow \text{under } R_{-j}, j \text{ has power over } i && \text{by proposition 6} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{under } R, \text{ for any order of the removal} \\ &\quad \text{of cycles, } i \text{ is matched after } j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R), p_{\omega_i} \leq p_{\omega_j} && \text{as stated above} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 4.** *For any preference profile  $R$ ,*

$$\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = \cap_{p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R)} B_i(p).$$

*Proof.* Consider object  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$  and denote  $j$  the agent endowed with  $x$ , i.e.  $x = \omega_j$ . Then  $i$  has power over  $j$ , and  $j$  is always matched after  $i$ . So, considering  $p$  a price vector that supports the allocation  $\phi(R)$ , we have  $p_{\omega_j} \leq p_{\omega_i}$ . So  $\omega_j \in B_i(p)$ . So  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \subseteq \cap_{p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R)} B_i(p)$ .

Conversely, consider  $\omega_j \in \cap_{p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R)} B_i(p)$ , i.e.  $\forall p \in \mathcal{P}^\phi(R), p_{\omega_j} \leq p_{\omega_i}$ . Then  $j$  is always matched after  $i$ , so  $i$  has power over  $j$ , so  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j})$ , so  $\omega_j \in \mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ . □

Corollary 4 connects two related concepts: the notion of menus and the notion of budget sets from which agents may choose in a preference maximising manner to arrive at the allocation  $\phi(R)$ . When choosing from budget sets, we implicitly assume that agents take prices as given and hence neglect the effect of changing their demand – akin to a change in (reported) preferences – on the price. In contrast, an agents' menu depends, by construction, only on others' reported preferences and is thus robust to changes of own reported preferences. To identify the analogously robust elements of agents' budget sets, we have to take the intersection of all possible budget sets that may support the allocation  $\phi(R)$ .

Thus, an agent  $j$  has more freedom to choose than another agent  $i$  if, at the given preference profile, *all* price vectors supporting the TTC-allocation ascribe a higher wealth to  $j$  than to  $i$ .

These results show that depending on the preference profile of the agents, a stark inequality of freedom can emerge under TTC-rules: an agent who controls an object that is highly desired by others (a object of high price, under the market interpretation of TTC) enjoys a large freedom, comparable to that of the first agents under serial dictatorship. While such inequality cannot be completely avoided according to Proposition 4, TTC-rules stand out in that they allow every agent to be in this fortunate position for at least some preference profiles.

**Theorem 2.** *Consider  $\phi$  an efficient and group strategy-proof assignment rule with at least four objects (and agents). Then the following two claims are equivalent:*

- $\phi$  is a TTC-rule

- for each agent  $i$ , there is a preference profile  $R$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = O$

*Proof.* If  $\phi$  is a TTC rule, consider a preference profile  $R$  where there is a single top trading cycle that includes all agents – say such that agents for all  $j < n$ , agent  $j$  considers the object owned by  $k = j + 1$  most-preferred while agent  $j = n$  considers 1’s object best. Then for  $i \in N$ , every object is in her menu: by pointing to any agent  $j$  (and their owned),  $i$  creates a cycle including herself where she is assigned the object she pointed to.

For the other direction, suppose  $\phi$  is not a TTC mechanism. Then, by Pycia and Ünver (2017),  $\phi$  must be a TC mechanism where initially some agent  $i$  does not own any object.

If  $i$  controls no object (neither as owner nor as broker), then for any possible opposing preference profile  $R_{-i}$  there will be a cycle among owner(s) and possibly a broker in which objects are removed in the first step – none of these objects are then in the menu of  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}(R_{-i})$ .

If instead  $i$  is the broker of some object  $x$ , i.e., if  $c_\emptyset(x) = (i, b)$  consider the subgraph of owners pointing to their most preferred object (and of objects pointing to their owner). If there is a cycle among owners and their objects, then the involved objects are again removed in the first step of the algorithm and none of the objects are in  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}(R_{-i})$ . If on the other hand, there is no cycle among owners and their objects, the subgraph involving owners and their controlled objects consists only of chains that originate at some owner and that end at in an edge where an owner points to  $i$ . Regardless of the object that  $i$  points to, there will then be a cycle involving  $i$  which implies that  $i$  trades away their brokered object, i.e.,  $x \notin \mathcal{M}_{i|i}(R_{-i})$ . Hence, we have  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}(R_{-i}) \neq O$  for all  $R_{-i}$ .  $\square$

Theorem 2 resembles Theorem 1 in Long and Velez (2021) who require assignment rules to be *balanced*, i.e., to yield each agent, for any  $k \leq n$ , equally often their  $k$ -most preferred object when considering all possible preference profiles. For 4 agents and more, TTC-rules are then the only efficient, balanced, and group-strategy-proof assignment rules.<sup>22</sup> While balancedness requires that, on average across the space of all preference profiles, agents are treated symmetrically, our requirement does not impose symmetric treatment – in particular, while we ask that each agent should be in the fortunate position of having unrestricted freedom of choice (so that they receive their most preferred object whatever that may be) at least once,<sup>23</sup> we do not impose that different agents should be equally often in this situation. Further, we do not place any restrictions on how often each agent should receive their  $k$ -most preferred object for  $k \geq 2$ .

Indeed, Long and Velez (2021)’s result can be obtained as a corollary of our theorem.

**Corollary 5.** *If an efficient and group-strategy-proof assignment rule  $\phi$  with four or more agents is balanced, then it is a TTC rule.*

*Proof.* Consider  $\phi$  an efficient, group-strategy-proof assignment rule with  $n$  agents and objects that is balanced. Because  $\phi$  is efficient and strategy-proof, by proposition 4 there is an agent  $i$  and an opposing profile  $R_{-i}^0$  where  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}^0) = n$ .

Now suppose that a preference profile is drawn following the impartial culture distribution. A profile  $R$  such that  $R_{-i} = R_{-i}^0$  has a positive probability, so  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i}) = n] > 0$ . Consider another agent  $j$ . Because  $\phi$  is balanced,  $\rho_j^\phi(R)$  has the same distribution as  $\rho_i^\phi(R)$ . But by lemma 7

<sup>22</sup>For 3 agents the 3-broker mechanism jointly satisfies these properties as well; Theorem 2 could be extended to 3 agents analogously.

<sup>23</sup>Recall that by Proposition 4 there is at least one agent who is in that situation at least once.

(Appendix B), this implies that  $\Delta_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j})$  also has the same distribution as  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ . In particular  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}) = n] = \mathbb{P}[\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) = n] > 0$ .

So there exists  $R^1$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{j|j}^\phi(R_{-j}^1) = O$ . This is true for any  $j$ , and we have assumed that  $\phi$  is efficient and group strategy-proof, so we can apply theorem 2 and  $\phi$  is a TTC rule.  $\square$

As TTC is non-autarkic and non-bossy, we know from Proposition 3 that inequality of freedom is also reflected into relations of power over others. It can be interesting to unbundle from that power over others as a group the various bilateral power relations. Actually, and perhaps surprisingly, the bilateral power of  $i$  over  $j$  can be maximally large under TTC: given two agents  $i$  and  $j$ , there is a preference profile such that  $i$  has full power over  $j$ .

**Observation.** *If  $\phi$  is a TTC mechanism,  $i$  and  $j$  are two agents, there is a preference profile  $R_{-i}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i}) = O$ .*

*Proof.* Wlog let us assume that  $i = 1$  and  $j = n$ . Consider the following preference profile. Agent 1:  $\omega_2\omega_3\dots\omega_n\omega_1$ ; agent 2:  $\omega_3\omega_4\dots\omega_1\omega_2$ ; ...; agent  $n$ :  $\omega_1\omega_2\dots\omega_{n-1}\omega_n$ .

Under this preference profile, one large cycle will form. Now suppose agent 1 points to agent  $i$ 's object. Then two cycles will form:  $\{1, 2, \dots, i\}$  and  $\{i + 1, \dots, n\}$ . In particular agent  $n$  will get object  $i + 1$ . So by varying agent 1's preferences, one can assign any object to agent  $n$ .  $\square$

Conceptually, these results display a paradox. Theorem 2 justifies the widespread intuition that TTC is a symmetric mechanism, since it awards everyone the opportunity for full freedom, for some combination of others' preferences. But our analysis of transitive power hierarchies in hierarchical exchange mechanisms (proposition 6 and its corollaries) also apply to TTC, showing that such a seemingly horizontal mechanism is in no way immune to freedom inequality and unbalanced power relations. Indeed, the Observation above shows that TTC does generate maximally imbalanced power relations.

That paradox has an additional interest given the Walrasian market interpretation of TTC: proposition 7 shows that the power and freedom privilege of those who are assigned earlier in the algorithmic interpretation of the mechanism can be equivalently understood, in the market interpretation, as a privilege of the agents whose endowment has the highest market value, i.e. of the richest. This suggests the existence of a form of power in markets that is based on property, not monopoly, and that persists in competitive markets where the price is set impersonally as a pure market-clearing device.

## (Bi-polar) Serial Dictatorship

Serially dictatorial assignment rules are arguably the simplest efficient and (group-)strategy-proof rules. An assignment rule  $\phi$  is a Serial Dictatorship if there exists an ordering of agents so that the first agent is assigned their most preferred object, while each subsequent agent in the order is assigned their most preferred among the remaining objects. Equivalently, we can define it as a hierarchical exchange rule corresponding to a TC-mechanism, where one agent is the initial owner of all objects and ownership of objects is inherited according to a pre-specified ordering of agents.

**Definition 13** (Serial dictatorship as a hierarchical exchange rule). An assignment rule  $\phi$  is a Serial Dictatorship iff it is equivalent to a hierarchical exchange rule for which there exists an ordering of

agents  $-i_1, \dots, i_n$  – so that, for any proper submatching  $\sigma$ , the first of all unmatched agents owns all unmatched objects:  $\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, x \in \overline{O}_\sigma, i_k \in \overline{N}_\sigma :$

$$(\forall i_l \in \overline{N}_\sigma : k \leq l) \iff c_\sigma(x) = i_k \in \overline{N}_\sigma$$

Bogomolnaia et al. (2005) introduce Bi-polar Serial Dictatorships as a slightly larger class of assignment rules: a Bi-polar Serial Dictatorship divides initial ownership between at most two agents, allows them to pick their most preferred object among their endowments, or trade with each other. After that, ownership passes on according to a pre-specified ordering of agents as under a Serial Dictatorship. Bogomolnaia et al. (2005) characterise these rules on the domain of weak preferences by strategy-proofness, Pareto-indifference (vacuously satisfied for strict preferences), non-bossiness, and essential single-valuedness.<sup>24</sup>

**Definition 14** (Bi-polar Serial dictatorship). An assignment rule  $\phi$  is a Bi-polar Serial Dictatorship iff it is equivalent to a hierarchical exchange rule for which there exists an ordering of agents  $-i_1, \dots, i_n$  – so that, for the initial, empty, submatching  $\sigma = \emptyset$ , agents  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  are the owners of all objects, i.e.,  $c_\emptyset(x) \in \{i_1, i_2\}$  for all  $x \in O$ . For any proper submatching  $\sigma \neq \emptyset$ , the first of all unmatched agents owns all unmatched objects:  $\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\emptyset\}, x \in \overline{O}_\sigma, i_k \in \overline{N}_\sigma :$

$$(\forall i_l \in \overline{N}_\sigma : k \leq l) \iff c_\sigma(x) = i_k \in \overline{N}_\sigma$$

It is straightforward to see that under a (Bi-polar) Serial Dictatorships, agents differ a lot in terms of the influence that they have on their own relevant outcome. However, perhaps surprisingly, and in stark contrast to observation 5.2 above on TTC, they uniformly *minimise* the influence that any agent may have over any other individual agent – by varying their own (reported) preferences, an agent can change the outcome of another agent to at most one other possible object.

**Lemma 5.** Consider a serial dictatorship  $\phi$ , two agents  $i_k$  and  $i_l$  with  $k < l$  and a preference profile  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then  $\Delta_{i_l, i_k}^\phi(R_{-i_l}) = 1$  and  $\Delta_{i_k, i_l}^\phi(R_{-i_k}) = 2$ .

When agent  $i_1$ , instead of picking her most-preferred preferred object under profile  $R$ , chooses another object by reporting  $R'_{i_1}$ , it has two effects. On the one hand, it removes the object that would have been chosen by another agent, who may in turn be forced to choose and thus remove another object, etc. On the other hand, it makes the object previously obtained by agent  $i_1$  available to other agents; it may then be chosen by another agent making available their previously chosen object, etc. Given the finite number of agents, both chains necessarily meet and form a cycle that describes which agents will be affected by the different choice of  $i_1$ . Moreover, comparing different choices of  $i_1$ , and the corresponding cycles that form, we find that whenever a given agent  $i_k \neq i_1$  is included in a cycle, their assignment changes in the same way (while there is no change to their assignment whenever they are not included in such a cycle). Thus, it is the analysis of such chains and corresponding cycles that allows to describe how each agent's assignment varies with a change in agent 1's report. A proof along these lines is provided in Appendix D.

In fact, Bi-polar Serial Dictatorships are the only Hierarchical Exchange Rules where no agent has a greater influence on the outcome of any other agent.

**Theorem 3.** Consider a hierarchical exchange rule  $\phi$ . The following statements are equivalent:

1. For all preference profiles  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  and all  $i, j \in N$ , we have  $\Delta_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i}) \leq 2$ .
2.  $\phi$  is a Bi-polar Serial Dictatorship.

---

<sup>24</sup>For single valued rules, selections from Bi-polar serially dictatorial rules are characterised by strategy-proofness, Pareto-efficiency and weak non-bossiness.

The theorem is proven in Appendix E. While the direction (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) derives from lemma 5, the other direction proceeds as follows. We consider a hierarchical exchange mechanism such that  $\forall i, j, \Delta_{i|j} \leq 2$  and assume it is not a Bipolar SD, so that it satisfies at least one of the following properties at some submatching: (i) more than two agents own objects, or (ii) there are two owners, as well as two owners at some further reachable submatching, or (iii) there is one owner, but two owners at some further reachable submatching, or (iv) there are at most owners, but their preferences can influence the order at which further agents become owners. We then derive a contradiction for each of these cases.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed to measure an agent’s influence in a strategy-proof mechanism by their menu, the set of possible outcomes that they can bring about by varying their strategy, i.e., their (reported) preferences. Further, the approach allows to disaggregate influence into freedom – an agent’s influence on her own relevant outcome – and power over others – influence on their relevant outcome – and encompasses as special cases the ranking of opportunity sets from the freedom of choice literature and power indices from the literature on binary voting.

As our first main result, we uncover a subtle connection between welfare and freedom: while the two notions do not coincide (an agent may find their preferences satisfied because of “luck” while lacking any influence), we show that, under a mild richness condition on preferences, a mechanism Pareto-dominates another mechanism if and *only if* it awards each agent with more freedom, i.e., larger menus in a set inclusion sense. Hence, the set of constrained efficient mechanisms coincides with the set of mechanisms that offer a maximal degree of freedom. In the same vein, when the outcome set is finite, we show that under the “impartial culture” benchmark, a mechanism that offers an agent a higher probability for a larger menu in the cardinal sense also offers her a higher probability of obtaining an outcome ranked higher in her preferences.

Second, we fruitfully apply our approach to assignment rules. We describe power and freedom in group-strategy-proof and efficient rules and, within that class, uncover a stark trade-off between two (arguably normatively appealing) properties: first, universal possibility of complete freedom, i.e., allowing everyone to choose among all objects at some opposing preference profile; second, minimal bilateral power, i.e., ensuring that no one can influence another individual’s outcome beyond what is necessary. The top trading cycle possesses the first property (and indeed, is characterised by it among group-strategy-proof and efficient rules), but generates situations where an agent has *maximal* bilateral power on another. Bipolar serial dictatorship mechanisms possess the second property (and indeed, are characterised by it among hierarchical exchange rules), but rigidly predetermine a freedom hierarchy.

We hope that our framework can serve as a first step towards a unified game-theoretic analysis of power and freedom in economic environments, meeting the challenge from political philosophers. In particular, we would hope to see our approach extended beyond direct, dominant-strategy mechanisms, taking into account other players’ equilibrium strategy adaptation to a player’s change in strategy. Among other things, this would allow applications to many industrial organisation models, and thus the analysis of monopoly power.

## References

- Abdou, J. and Keiding, H. (1991). *Effectivity functions in social choice*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Anderson, E. S. (1999). What is the point of equality? *Ethics*, 109(2):287–337.
- Bade, S. (2020). Random serial dictatorship: the one and only. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 45(1):353–368.
- Banzhaf, J. F. (1965). Weighted voting doesn’t work: A mathematical analysis. *Rutgers Law Review*, 19:317.
- Barberà, S., Berga, D., and Moreno, B. (2016). Group strategy-proofness in private good economies. *American Economic Review*, 106(4):1073–1099.
- Barberà, S., Massó, J., and Neme, A. (1999). Maximal domains of preferences preserving strategy-proofness for generalized median voter schemes. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 16(2):321–336.
- Barberà, S., Sonnenschein, H., and Zhou, L. (1991). Voting by committees. *Econometrica*, pages 595–609.
- Barry, B. (1980). Is it better to be powerful or lucky?: Part i. *Political Studies*, 28(2):183–194.
- Bogomolnaia, A., Deb, R., and Ehlers, L. (2005). Strategy-proof assignment on the full preference domain. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 123(2):161–186.
- Braham, M. and Holler, M. J. (2005a). The impossibility of a preference-based power index. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 17(1):137–157.
- Braham, M. and Holler, M. J. (2005b). Power and preferences again: A reply to napel and widgrén. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 17(3):389–395.
- Chatterji, S. and Sen, A. (2011). Tops-only domains. *Economic Theory*, 46(2):255–282.
- Chatterji, S. and Zeng, H. (2018). On random social choice functions with the tops-only property. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 109:413–435.
- Dowding, K. and Van Hees, M. (2008). Freedom, coercion, and ability. In *Power, Freedom, and Voting*, pages 307–323. Springer.
- Felsenthal, D. S. and Machover, M. (1998). The measurement of voting power. *Books*.
- Felsenthal, D. S. and Machover, M. (2004). A priori voting power: what is it all about? *Political Studies Review*, 2(1):1–23.
- Gonczarowski, Y. A., Heffetz, O., and Thomas, C. (2023). Strategyproofness-exposing mechanism descriptions. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Görlach, J.-S. and Motz, N. (2024). A general measure of bargaining power for non-cooperative games. Technical report, IZA Discussion Papers.
- Hammond, P. J. (1979). Straightforward individual incentive compatibility in large economies. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 46(2):263–282.
- Hu, X. and Zhang, J. (2025). Local unanimity in shapley-scarf housing markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.22027*.

- Karos, D. and Peters, H. (2018). Effectivity and power. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 108:363–378.
- Katuščák, P. and Kittsteiner, T. (2025). Strategy-proofness made simpler. *Management Science*, 71(9):7560–7578.
- Kurz, S., Mayer, A., and Napel, S. (2021). Influence in weighted committees. *European Economic Review*, 132:103634.
- Leshno, J. D. and Lo, I. (2021). The cutoff structure of top trading cycles in school choice. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(4):1582–1623.
- Long, X. and Velez, R. A. (2021). Balanced house allocation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01992*.
- Moulin, H. and Peleg, B. (1982). Cores of effectivity functions and implementation theory. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 10(1):115–145.
- Napel, S. and Widgren, M. (2004). Power measurement as sensitivity analysis: A unified approach. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 16(4):517–538.
- Napel, S. and Widgrén, M. (2005). The possibility of a preference-based power index. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 17(3):377–387.
- Nehring, K. and Puppe, C. (2002). A theory of diversity. *Econometrica*, 70(3):1155–1198.
- Nehring, K. and Puppe, C. (2008). Diversity and the metric of opportunity. *Unpublished Manuscript, University of Karlsruhe*.
- Pápai, S. (2000). Strategyproof assignment by hierarchical exchange. *Econometrica*, 68(6):1403–1433.
- Pattanaik, P. K. and Xu, Y. (1990). On ranking opportunity sets in terms of freedom of choice. *Recherches Économiques de Louvain/Louvain Economic Review*, 56(3-4):383–390.
- Pattanaik, P. K. and Xu, Y. (1998). On preference and freedom. *Theory and Decision*, 44(2):173–198.
- Pattanaik, P. K. and Xu, Y. (2000). On diversity and freedom of choice. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 40(2):123–130.
- Pettit, P. (2006). Freedom in the market. *Politics, philosophy & economics*, 5(2):131–149.
- Piccione, M. and Rubinstein, A. (2007). Equilibrium in the jungle. *The Economic Journal*, 117(522):883–896.
- Pycia, M. and Ünver, M. U. (2017). Incentive compatible allocation and exchange of discrete resources. *Theoretical Economics*, 12(1):287–329.
- Rommeswinkel, H. (2014). Measuring freedom in games. *U. of St. Gallen Law & Economics Working Paper*, (2011-08).
- Roth, A. E. (1982). Incentive compatibility in a market with indivisible goods. *Economics letters*, 9(2):127–132.
- Serizawa, S. (1995). Power of voters and domain of preferences where voting by committees is strategy-proof. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 67(2):599–608.

- Shapley, L. and Scarf, H. (1974). On cores and indivisibility. *Journal of mathematical economics*, 1(1):23–37.
- Shapley, L. S. and Shubik, M. (1954). A method for evaluating the distribution of power in a committee system. *The American Political Science Review*, 48(3):787–792.
- Sher, I. (2018). Evaluating allocations of freedom. *The Economic Journal*, 128(612):F65–F94.
- Straffin, P. D. (1988). The shapley—shubik and banzhaf power indices as probabilities. *The Shapley value: essays in honor of Lloyd S. Shapley*, page 71.
- Thomson, W. (2016). Non-bossiness. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 47(3):665–696.

## A Power and preferences

In our framework, the players' preferences come into play at two distinct levels when defining the menu of agent  $i$ . On the one hand, one needs to take the actual preferences of all other players as given; on the other hand, to test the effect of various counterfactual possibilities for  $i$ 's own preferences. So  $i$ 's power depends on the other players' preference profile, and on  $i$ 's preference domain. It is worthwhile to review in this light some existing debates in game theory on the relation between preferences, power and freedom.

**Actual versus *a priori* voting power** Felsenthal and Machover (1998, 2004) proposed two influential distinctions. The first is between I-power (power as influence, or “a voter’s potential influence over the outcome” (Felsenthal and Machover, 2004, p. 9)) and P-power (power as payoff, or “a voter’s expected relative share in a fixed prize”). The framework proposed here, which generalises the notion of decisiveness, belongs to the first category: it measures the influence of an agent over the outcome, not her welfare.

The second distinction proposed by Felsenthal and Machover contrasts *a priori* (“the component of the [players]’ voting power that derives solely from the decision rule itself”, *ibid.*, p.13) from *actual* voting power (which “depends on a complex interaction of real-world factors” (*ibid.*), esp. “diplomacy, political pressures, members’ specific interests and preferences”, *ibid.*, p.14). They argue that the complexity of factors affecting actual voting power makes its analysis impracticable, especially for normative purpose, and hence they choose to focus on *a priori* power, i.e. power indices derived from the voting procedure alone, independently of strategic interactions and of players’ preferences.

They go even further, arguing that when trying to take all actual forces into account, “we arguably move away from considering power altogether: we move from ‘who can get what’ to ‘who does get what’” (*ibid.*:14), i.e. from I to P-power. We believe that our framework is able to meet precisely this challenge. It allows for actual power measurement, taking into account how other players’ preferences and strategic interactions shape an agent’s opportunities, while also preserving a dimension of potentiality or causality. As argued above, the key step to analyse an agent’s power in that way is to take only the other players’ preferences as given, while varying her own preferences. This variation preserves a counterfactual element in the analysis of actual power, hence preventing a confusion between “who can get what” and “who gets what”.

Note, furthermore, that the interest in actual power does not mean the abandonment of *a priori* power. Instead, what Felsenthal and Machover call *a priori* power can be obtained as the expected cardinality of the menu’s size, under some assumption for the probability distribution of the preferences of the other agents. In particular, in binary voting games (Appendix C), an agent’s menu is either of size 2 or 1, depending on whether she is decisive or not; the classic *a priori* power indices then obtain as expectations of that menu’s cardinality under natural assumptions for the distribution of preferences for the other players.

**Game versus game-form** A similar rivalry between *a priori* and actual power analysis has expressed itself forcefully in the debate between Napel and Widgren (2004); Braham and Holler (2005a); Napel and Widgrén (2005); Braham and Holler (2005b). In the introduction, we mentioned Napel and Widgren’s framework, which is one of the inspirations for this paper. Braham and Holler objected to it. Their argument is that the meaning of power is an “ability to affect outcomes”, not the effect itself. Therefore, according to them, the measurement of power can not refer to the

preferences of the agents themselves. Power is a property of a game form (the rules of the game), not the game itself (which includes the preferences of the agents).

Braham and Holler (2005a)'s main argument is semantic: they claim that power is a causal or potential category and hence should be deduced from the analysis of the game form, and not be conflated with a claim about actual outcomes that are derived from the preferences of the agents. But in the framework presented here, the power of an agent depends on the preferences of others, not her own. By varying her own preferences in her preference domain, the principle of causality or potentiality is preserved; while at the same time, by taking the preferences of others as given, one makes sure that real as opposed to formal power is analysed, and takes into account the effective constraints that shape an agent's environment.

## B Proof and corollaries of proposition 2

To prove the proposition, we start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *Consider an environment  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$ , an agent  $i \in N$  such that  $|A_i| = m$  and  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is the set of strict orderings of  $A_i$ , and a strategy-proof mechanism  $\phi$ . Suppose that the preference profile  $R$  is drawn at random so that  $R_i$  is uniform in  $\mathcal{R}_i$  and independent from  $R_{-i}$ . Then for all  $(r, s) \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}^2$ :*

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) > r | \Delta_{i|i}(R_{-i}) = s] = \begin{cases} \frac{(m-r)!(m-s)!}{m!(m-r-s)!} & \text{if } r+s \leq m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Write  $\mathcal{M}_i$ ,  $\Delta_i$  and  $\rho_i$  for  $\mathcal{M}_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$ ,  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$  and  $\rho_i^\phi(R_i, R_{-i})$ .  $R_i$  is a strict ordering; let  $R_{i,1}$  denote its top-ranked element,  $R_{i,2}$  the element it ranks second, etc.

There are  $\Delta_i$  elements of  $A_i$  available to  $i$ , so  $m - \Delta_i$  elements not available. By strategy-proofness, all elements of rank less than  $\rho_i$  in  $i$ 's preference list are not available to  $i$ , so  $\rho_i \leq m - \Delta_i$ . So when  $r + s > m$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r | \Delta_i = s] = 0$ .

Now suppose  $r + s \leq m$ .  $R_i$  is independent from  $R_{-i}$ , so independent from  $\Delta_i(R_{-i})$ , and the law of  $R_i$  conditional on  $\{\Delta_i = s\}$  is the same as its unconditional law, i.e., the uniform distribution in  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . Under that distribution,  $R_{i,1}$  is uniform in  $A_i$ ; conditional on  $R_{i,1}$ ,  $R_{i,2}$  is uniform in  $A_i \setminus \{R_{i,1}\}$ ; etc.

Then we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r | \Delta_i = s] &= \mathbb{P}[R_{i,1} \notin \mathcal{M}_i, R_{i,2} \notin \mathcal{M}_i, \dots, R_{i,r} \notin \mathcal{M}_i | \Delta_i = s] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[R_{i,1} \notin \mathcal{M}_i | \Delta_i = s] \times \mathbb{P}[R_{i,2} \notin \mathcal{M}_i | R_{i,1} \notin \mathcal{M}_i, \Delta_i = s] \\ &\quad \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}[R_{i,r} \notin \mathcal{M}_i | R_{i,1} \notin \mathcal{M}_i, \dots, R_{i,r-1} \notin \mathcal{M}_i, \Delta_i = s] \\ &= \frac{m-s}{m} \frac{m-s-1}{m-1} \dots \frac{m-s-r+1}{m-r+1} \\ &= \frac{(m-r)!(m-s)!}{m!(m-r-s)!} \end{aligned}$$

□

This allows us to prove proposition 2.

Indeed, the case where  $R_{-i}$  is deterministically given is a special case of when it is random. Thus, by lemma 6 we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) > r] = \begin{cases} \frac{m-s}{m} \frac{m-s-1}{m-1} \dots \frac{m-s-r+1}{m-r+1} & \text{if } r+s \leq m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for  $\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i}) = s$  and  $|A_i| = m$ . Now suppose  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \geq \Delta_{j|j}^\psi(R'_{-j})$  and  $|A_i| = m = |A_j|$ . Then because the right hand side is weakly decreasing in  $s$ , for all  $r \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r] \leq \mathbb{P}[\rho_j > r]$ , i.e.,  $\rho_j$  first-order stochastically dominates  $\rho_i$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\rho_j$  first-order stochastically dominates  $\rho_i$ . Thus  $\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > 1] \leq \mathbb{P}[\rho_j > 1]$ . But for  $r = 1$ , lemma 6 implies  $\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > 1] = 1 - \frac{\Delta_i}{m}$  and likewise for  $j$ . So  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i}) \geq \Delta_{j|j}^\psi(R'_{-j})$ .  $\square$

Can this result be generalised when others' preferences are random too? Elements of an answer are provided by the following two corollaries, both under the assumption of  $R_i$  (resp.  $R'_j$ ) uniformly random and independent from  $R_{-i}$  (resp.  $R'_{-j}$ ) – the “impartial culture” assumption often invoked in voting theory.

**Corollary 6.** *If  $\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})$  first-order stochastically dominates  $\Delta_{j|j}^\psi(R'_{-j})$ , then  $\rho_j^\psi(R')$  first-order stochastically dominates  $\rho_i^\phi(R)$ .*

**Corollary 7.**

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i|i}^\phi(R_{-i})] = |A_i| \times \mathbb{P}[\rho_i^\phi(R) = 1]$$

*Proof.* Applying lemma 6 with  $r = 1$  gives:

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > 1 | \Delta_i = s] = \frac{m-s}{m}$$

Averaging over  $s$  gives the desired result.  $\square$

Finally, another technical corollary derives from lemma 6.

**Lemma 7.** *Consider  $(A, N, \mathcal{R})$  an environment,  $\phi$  a mechanism,  $i$  an agent such that  $|A_i| = m$  and  $\mathcal{R}_i$  the set of strict orderings of  $A_i$ . Suppose that  $R$  is randomly drawn, so that  $R_i$  is uniform in  $\mathcal{R}_i$  and independent from  $R_{-i}$ . Then the following linear, bijective relation holds between the probability distribution of  $\rho_i$  and that of  $\Delta_i$ :*

$$(\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r])_{1 \leq r \leq m-1} = M(\mathbb{P}[\Delta_i = s])_{1 \leq s \leq m-1}$$

where  $M$  is the  $(m-1) \times (m-1)$  matrix defined by  $M_{r,s} = \frac{(m-r)!(m-s)!}{m!(m-r-s)!}$  when  $r+s \leq m$ , 0 otherwise.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r] &= \sum_{s=1}^m \mathbb{P}[\Delta_i = s] \mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r | \Delta_i = s] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{m-r} \mathbb{P}[\Delta_i = s] \frac{(m-r)!(m-s)!}{m!(m-r-s)!} \end{aligned} \quad \text{by lemma 6}$$

That matrix is triangular, so invertible, so the relation is bijective and  $(\mathbb{P}[\Delta_i = s])_{1 \leq s \leq m-1} = M^{-1}(\mathbb{P}[\rho_i > r])_{1 \leq r \leq m-1}$ .  $\square$

## C Binary games

In the following,  $\phi$  is a mechanism with two possible outcomes  $A = \{0, 1\}$ , and such that all  $n$  agents share the same preference domain of two strict orderings, the preference of 0 over 1, denoted 0, and the opposite one, denoted 1.

Given  $R_{-i}$ , agent  $i$  is said *decisive* if the outcome varies with her report:  $\phi(R_i = 0, R_{-i}) \neq \phi(R_i = 1, R_{-i})$ . Then it is clear that given  $R_{-i}$ , agent  $i$  is decisive if and only if she has two possible outcomes in her menu, i.e.  $\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i}) = 2$ ; otherwise  $\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i}) = 1$ .

Let us denote  $\mathcal{B}_i^\phi := \{R_{-i} \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} | i \text{ is decisive when others have preferences } R_{-i}\}$  the set of others' preferences that make  $i$  decisive.

**Definition 15** (Banzhaf index (Banzhaf, 1965)). An agent's Banzhaf index  $b_i^\phi$  is the proportion of preference profiles for the other players under which  $i$  is decisive:

$$b_i^\phi = \frac{|\mathcal{B}_i^\phi|}{2^{n-1}}$$

If  $\mathcal{R}_{-i} \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1}$ , let us denote  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_{-i}) = \sum_{j \neq i} R_j$ , the number of others which prefer 1 over 0. Then we can define the other famous power index.

**Definition 16** (Shapley-Shubik index (Shapley and Shubik, 1954)). Under mechanism  $\phi$ ,  $i$ 's Shapley-Shubik index  $s_i^\phi$  is defined as:

$$s_i^\phi = \sum_{R_{-i} \in \mathcal{B}_i^\phi} \frac{(\sigma(R_{-i}) - 1)!(n - \sigma(R_{-i}))!}{n!}$$

**Proposition 8** (Expected power (Straffin, 1988)). If the  $R_j$ s ( $j \neq i$ ) are i.i.d. Bernoulli variables of parameter  $1/2$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}[i \text{ is decisive under } \phi \text{ when others have preferences } R_{-i}] = b_i^\phi$$

If  $p$  is a random variable uniformly drawn in  $[0, 1]$  and, conditional on  $p$ ,  $R_{-i}$  are i.i.d. Bernoulli variables of parameter  $p$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}[i \text{ is decisive under } \phi \text{ when others have preferences } R_{-i}] = s_i^\phi$$

But we also know that

$$E[\Delta_i^\phi(R_{-i})] = \mathbb{P}[i \text{ is decisive under } \phi \text{ when others have preferences } R_{-i}] + 1.$$

So under the probability distributions for others' preferences suggested by Straffin, there is a direct relation between the expectation of an agent's  $\Delta$  freedom index and her Banzhaf, or her Shapley-Shubik index.

## D Proof of lemma 5

When  $\phi$  is an SD mechanism,  $i < j$  two agents and  $R$  a given preference profile, we want to prove that  $\Delta_{j,i}^\phi(R_{-j}) = 1$  and  $\Delta_{i,j}^\phi(R_{-i}) = 2$ .

The first part of the claim is obvious. Let us prove the second. Without loss of generality we can assume  $i = 1$ ; we then want to prove  $\Delta_{1,j}^\phi(R_{-1}) = 2$ . We denote  $\mu = \phi(R)$  the original allocation, i.e.  $\mu_i = [\phi(R)]_i$  agent  $i$ 's original object.

The spirit of the proof is as follows. Suppose that agent 1 picks another object, say  $\mu_m$ , instead of her original object  $\mu_1$ . This triggers two distinct effects. On the one hand, an upgrading chain: it frees object  $\mu_1$ , which will upgrade the situation of an agent which desired it and will now gain access to it, this agent will in her turn free her original object and upgrade the lot of someone else ranked after her, etc. On the other hand, a downgrading chain: by selecting  $\mu_m$ , agent 1 displaces agent  $m$  to a object that is worse for him; by selecting that object, agent  $m$  in turn downgrades the situation of someone else ranked after her, etc. The two chains meet and form a cycle; agents outside the cycle keep their original object. The key intuition is then the following:  $m$  determines only where these chains start, not their structure, so that a variation in agent 1's preferences determines only whether or not agent  $j$  will change object, but if she does, she will always move to the same one.

To formalise this reasoning, let us first describe the upgrading and the downgrading effects, and then make explicit the new allocation depending on 1's preferences, before proving it by recursion.

Let us define the upgrading chain by  $w_0 = 1$  and then, when that set is not empty:

$$w_{t+1} = \min\{i > w_t, i \text{ prefers } \mu_{w_t} \text{ to } \mu_i\}$$

As for the downgrading chain, when  $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$  is an agent, we consider the object she prefers among the original objects of the agents ranked below her  $\{\mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_n\}$ , and denote  $v(i)$  that object's original owner.

We are then able to describe how the upgrading and the downgrading chains interlock to form a cycle, by defining, for any  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $W(i) = \max\{w_s, w_s < i\}$  and then:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(i) &= W(i) & \text{if } \forall k > i, i \text{ prefers } \mu_{W(i)} \text{ to } \mu_k \\ v(i) & & \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the sequence  $m, \gamma(m), \gamma \circ \gamma(m), \dots, \gamma^{(t)}(m), \dots$  is first strictly increasing, then strictly decreasing. To prove it, first observe that for any  $i$ ,  $W(i) < i < v(i)$ , so that  $\gamma(i) \neq i$ . Also note that the sequence is bounded, so is not ever strictly increasing, so there is a  $t \geq 0$  such that  $\gamma^{(t+1)}(m) < \gamma^{(t)}(m)$ .

This means that  $\gamma(\gamma^{(t)}(m)) = W(\gamma^{(t)}(m))$ , so that there is  $s \geq 0$  such that  $\gamma^{(t+1)}(m) = w_s$ . If  $s = 0$ , this is the end of the sequence. Otherwise, by definition of the sequence  $w$ ,  $w_s$  prefers  $\mu_{w_{s-1}}$  to  $\mu_{w_s}$ . But by construction of the original allocation  $\mu$ ,  $w_s$  prefers her own original object  $\mu_{w_s}$  to all the original objects of those ranked below her. So by transitivity of preferences, for any  $k > i$ ,  $w_s$  prefers  $\mu_{w_{s-1}}$  to  $\mu_k$ . By construction of  $\gamma(\cdot)$ , this implies that  $\gamma(w_s) = W(w_s) = w_{s-1} < w_s$ . So  $\gamma(\gamma^{(t+1)}(m)) < \gamma^{(t+1)}(s)$ , so once the sequence  $(\gamma^{(t)}(m))_{t \geq m}$  starts to decrease, it continues to do so until it reaches some  $T$  such that  $\gamma^{(T)}(m) = 1$ .

We are now equipped to describe the new allocation.

**Claim.** *The allocation  $\mu'$  resulting from agent 1 preferring object  $m$  instead of her original object,*

all other agents keeping their original preferences, is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mu'_i = m & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \mu_{\gamma(i)} & \text{if } \exists t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}, i = \gamma^{(t)}(m) \\ \mu_i & \text{otherwise} \end{array}$$

Let us prove it by recursion. Consider  $k < n$  and suppose the claim true for any  $i \leq k$ . Denote  $O_{k+1} = O \setminus \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k\}$  the set of objects that were available to  $k+1$  in the original situation, and  $O'_{k+1} = O \setminus \{\mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_k\}$  the set of objects available to her in the new situation.

**Case 1.**  $k+1 > \max\{(\gamma^{(t)}(m))_{1 \leq t \leq T}\}$ . Then  $O'_{k+1} = O_{k+1}$ , so  $\mu'_{k+1} = \mu_{k+1}$ .

**Case 2.** Denote  $t_1$  the index of the last element smaller than  $k+1$  in the increasing part of the  $(\gamma^{(t)}(m))_t$  sequence, i.e.  $t_1 = \max\{t \geq 0, \forall t' \leq t, \gamma^{(t')}(m) < k+1\}$  if that set is not empty, i.e. if  $k+1 > m$ , and  $t_1 = -1$  otherwise. Similarly, denote  $t_2$  the index of the first element smaller than  $k+1$  in the decreasing part of the same sequence, i.e.  $t_2 = \min\{t \geq 0, \forall t' \geq t, \gamma^{(t')}(m) < k+1\}$  (that set is never empty, since the final index  $T$  is always in it). Because  $t_2$  is in the decreasing part of the sequence, there is  $s$  such that  $\gamma^{(t_2)}(m) = w_s$ .

We want to describe  $O'_{k+1} = O \setminus \{\mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_k\}$ . But using the recursion assumption, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mu'_i, i < k+1\} &= \{\mu'_1\} \cup \{\mu'_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid 0 \leq t \leq t_1\} \cup \{\mu'_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid t_2 \leq t < T\} \\ &\cup \{\mu_i \mid 1 < i < k+1, i \notin \{\gamma^{(0)}(m), \dots, \gamma^{(T)}(m)\}\} \end{aligned}$$

But, still using the recursion assumption, note that  $\mu'_1 = \mu_{\gamma^{(0)}(m)}$ ,  $\mu'_{\gamma^{(0)}(m)} = \mu_{\gamma^{(1)}(m)}$ , ...,  $\mu'_{\gamma^{(t_1)}(m)} = \mu_{\gamma^{(t_1+1)}(m)}$ , and similarly,  $\mu'_{\gamma^{(t_2)}(m)} = \mu_{\gamma^{(t_2+1)}(m)}$ , ...,  $\mu'_{\gamma^{(T-1)}(m)} = \mu_{\gamma^{(T)}(m)} = \mu_1$ . So that:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mu'_1\} \cup \{\mu'_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid 0 \leq t \leq t_1\} &= \{\mu_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid 0 \leq t \leq t_1+1\} \\ \{\mu'_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid t_2 \leq t < T\} &= \{\mu_{\gamma^{(t)}(m)} \mid t_2+1 \leq t < T\} \cup \{\mu_1\} \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to describe how  $O'_{k+1}$  differs from  $O_{k+1}$ :

$$O'_{k+1} = O_{k+1} \cup \{\mu_{\gamma^{(t_2)}(m)}\} \setminus \{\mu_{\gamma^{(t_1+1)}(m)}\}$$

**Case 2.i:**  $\gamma^{(t_1+1)}(m) = k+1$ . Agent  $k+1$  cannot keep her original object. She will select newly available object  $\gamma^{(t_2)}(m) = w_s$ . if she prefers it to all other originally available objects  $\mu_{k+2}, \dots, \mu_n$ , and the preferred one among these objects otherwise. This coincides with  $\mu_{\gamma(i)}$ .

**Case 2.ii.** Agent  $k+1$  can keep her own object, or opt for the newly available  $\mu_{\gamma^{(t_2)}(m)} = \mu_{w_s}$ .

**Case 2.ii.a.**  $k+1$  prefers  $\mu_{w_s}$  to  $\mu_k$  Because  $t_2$  was chosen so that there is no  $w_{s'}$  in between  $w_s$  and  $k+1$ , this implies that  $k+1 = w_{s+1}$ . But have treated in the disjoint case 1 the possibility that  $k+1$  is above the maximum of the  $(\gamma^{(t)}(m))_t$  sequence, and all  $w_r$  below that maximum are part of the decreasing part of the sequence. So there is  $t$  such that  $k+1 = \gamma^{(t)}(m)$ .

**Case 2.ii.b.**  $k+1$  is not part of the  $(\gamma^{(t)}(m))_t$  sequence, and  $\mu'_{k+1} = \mu_{k+1}$ .

This concludes the proof of the claim. An immediate consequence is that for any  $j$  different from 1, the menu of 1 for  $j$  is  $\mathcal{M}_{1|j}^\phi(R_{-1}) = \{\mu_j, \mu_{\gamma(j)}\}$ , which has cardinal 2. That concludes the proof of the proposition.

## E Proof of theorem 3

(2)  $\implies$  (1): Consider a Bi-polar serial dictatorship  $\phi$  with an ordering of agents from  $i_1$  to  $i_n$ .

Consider first the power of  $i_1$  over  $i_2$  at some preference profile  $R$ . Let us denote  $i_2$ 's most- and second-most-preferred objects by  $a$  and  $b$  respectively. Then if  $i_2$  initially owns  $a$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{i_1|i_2}^\phi(R_{-i_1}) = \{a\}$ , while if  $a$  is initially owned by  $i_1$  we have  $\mathcal{M}_{i_1|i_2}^\phi(R_{-i_1}) = \{a, b\}$ . Similarly,  $i_2$ 's power over  $i_1$  is bounded  $|\mathcal{M}_{i_2|i_1}^\phi(R_{-i_2})| \leq 2$ .

Next, consider the power of  $i_1$  over  $i_l$ , with  $l > 2$ . Suppose that  $i_1$  initially owns  $a$ , the most-preferred object of  $i_2$ . Then  $i_1$  can pick any object by reporting it as her most-preferred, while  $i_2$  receives her most-preferred among the remaining objects. Hence, whatever  $i_1$ 's preferences, under opposing preferences  $R_{-i_1}$  the resulting allocation will coincide with that of a standard, unipolar serial dictatorship. Thus, by lemma 5,  $|\mathcal{M}_{i_1|i_l}^\phi(R_{-i_1})| \leq 2$ . If instead,  $a$  is owned by  $i_2$  herself,  $i_2$  receives  $a$  while  $i_1$  receives her most-preferred among the remaining objects. Hence,  $i_1$  is in the same position as the second ranked agent in a (unipolar) serial dictatorship – again, by lemma 5, her power over subsequent agents is bounded by  $|\mathcal{M}_{i_1|i_l}^\phi(R_{-i_1})| \leq 2$ . Analogously, we find that  $i_2$ 's power over any  $i_l$ ,  $l > 2$ , is bounded in the same way.

Last, consider the power of agent  $i_k$  over  $i_l$  for  $k > 2$ . If  $l < k$ , the assignment of  $i_l$  does not depend on  $R_{i_k}$  while if  $l > k$ , the situation is again analogous to a serial dictatorship – thus  $|\Delta_{i_k|i_l}^\phi(R_{-k})| \leq 2$  according to lemma 5.

(1)  $\implies$  (2): For the other direction, suppose that  $\phi$  cannot be represented as a Bi-polar Serial Dictatorship. Thus, there must be a submatching  $\sigma$ , reached for some preference profile  $R$ , where (i) more than two agents own objects, or where (ii) there are two owners at some (reachable) submatching  $\sigma$  as well as two owners at some submatching  $\sigma' \supset \sigma$  that can be reached for some profile of preferences of owners in  $\sigma$ , or (iii) there is only one owner at some (reachable) submatching  $\sigma$  but two owners at some submatching  $\sigma' \supset \sigma$  that can be reached from  $\sigma$ , or (iv), there are at most two owners at some (reachable) submatching  $\sigma$  and only one owner at any subsequently reached submatching  $\sigma' \supset \sigma$ , *but* the order in which these agents become owners depends on the preferences of owners at  $\sigma$ .

For each of the three cases, we will derive a contradiction to (1), i.e., show that  $\Delta_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i}) > 2$  for some  $i, j$ , and  $R_{-i}$ .

Case (i). Consider a submatching  $\sigma$ , reached for some preference profile of assigned agents  $R_{N_\sigma}$ , such that there are (at least) three remaining unassigned objects  $a, b, c$  with three distinct owners  $c_\sigma(a) = 1, c_\sigma(b) = 2, c_\sigma(c) = 3$ . If their preferences are given as 1 :  $a...$ , 2 :  $acb...$ , and 3 :  $abc...$ , then 1 keeps  $a$  while 2 and 3 trade – in particular, 3 is assigned  $b$ . If instead agent 1's preferences are given as 1 :  $b...$ , 1 trades with 2 and 3 keeps their object  $c$ . Last, if 1's preferences are given as 1 :  $c...$ , 1 and 3 trade and 3 is assigned  $a$ . Thus, depending on the preferences of 1, 3 may be assigned at least three different objects,  $a, b$ , or  $c$ , i.e.  $\Delta_{i|j}^\phi(R_{-i}) > 2$  (for  $i = 1$  and  $j = 3$ ).

Case (ii). Next, we show that if there are 2 owners,  $i, j \in N$ , at some submatching  $\sigma$ , then for any preference profile  $(R_i, R_j)$ , there will be only one owner at the subsequently reached submatching  $\sigma'$ . For this, we consider three possible subcases differentiating the ways in which the subsequent submatching is reached: either (only)  $i$  picks an object she owns at  $\sigma$ , or both  $i$  and  $j$  pick on of the objects they own, or both trade so that each is assigned an object owned by the other at  $\sigma$ .

Case (ii.1). Suppose that at  $\sigma$ , both  $i$  and  $j$  own object(s). Moreover suppose that  $j$  considers one of  $i$ 's objects to be most preferred while  $i$ , by reporting one of their own objects to be most preferred, say  $a$ , is assigned  $a$  and brings about a subsequent submatching  $\sigma^a$  where there are again two owners.

One of the owners at  $\sigma^a$  must be  $j$  who owns (at least) one object they already owned at  $\sigma$ , say  $b$ . Let  $k$  be the other owner and  $c$  an object owned by  $k$ . Moreover,  $c$  was owned by  $i$  at  $\sigma$  (as otherwise it would still be owned by  $j$  at  $\sigma^a$ ). Thus  $\sigma^a$  is reached from  $\sigma$  for preferences  $R_i : a...$  and  $R_j : cab...$ . For  $k$ , suppose we have  $R_k : cb...a$ , i.e.,  $a$  ranked last, while all other unmatched agents  $l \in \bar{N}_\sigma \setminus \{i, j, k\}$ , also rank  $a$  last.

Now consider different objects that  $j$  may be assigned based on  $i$ 's reported preferences, keeping the preferences of other agents constant as specified above. For  $R_i : a...$ , we reach  $\sigma^a$  and  $j$  owns  $b$  while  $k$  owns  $c$  – given  $R_j : cab...$  and  $R_k : cb...a$ ,  $k$  is assigned  $c$  so that  $j$  will be assigned  $b$  (their most-preferred among the remaining object and an object that they already own at  $\sigma$ ). For  $R'_i : b...$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  trade objects they own at  $\sigma$  so that  $j$  is assigned  $c$ . For  $R''_i : c...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$  and we reach  $\sigma^c$ . Regardless of who owns  $a$  at  $\sigma^c$ ,  $j$  will be assigned  $a$  as she considers it most preferred among the remaining objects while everyone else ranks  $a$  last. Thus, depending on  $i$ 's preferences,  $j$  is assigned at least three different objects,  $a$ ,  $b$ , or  $c$ .

Case (ii.2). Suppose that at  $\sigma$ ,  $i$  owns object  $a$  and  $j$  owns object  $b$ . Moreover suppose that if  $R_i : a...$  and  $R_j : b...$ , the resulting submatching  $\sigma^a$  where  $i$  and  $j$  have been assigned their most preferred objects  $a$  and  $b$  awards ownership rights to two of the remaining agents – say,  $k$  owns  $c$  and  $l$  owns  $d$  at  $\sigma^a$ .

First observe that, by Case (ii.1), if  $i$  would report  $R'_i : b...$ , there can be only one owner at the subsequent submatching  $\sigma^b$  where  $j$  is matched to  $b$ . Moreover, as  $i$  remains the owner of  $a$ ,  $i$  owns all objects at  $\sigma^b$ . Thus,  $i$  can be assigned any object  $x \neq b$  by reporting  $R'_i : bx...$ .

Suppose  $i$  reports  $R'_i : bc...$ . Then at the subsequent submatching  $\sigma^{bc}$  where  $j$  has been matched to  $b$  and  $i$  to  $c$ , some agent  $h$  owns  $d$ . Suppose  $h \neq l$ , i.e., suppose that  $d$  is owned by someone else in  $\sigma^{bc}$  than in  $\sigma^a$ . Now if  $R_l : dc...$  while any other agent who is unmatched at  $\sigma^{bc}$ , including  $k$ , ranks  $d$  first and  $c$  last, we get the following: if  $i$  reports  $R_i : a...$ , we arrive at  $\sigma^a$  and  $l$  picks  $d$ ; if  $i$  reports  $R''_i : bd...$ , then  $i$  is assigned  $d$ ,  $l$  ranks  $c$  highest among the remaining objects and everyone else ranks it last – thus  $l$  is assigned  $c$ ; if  $i$  reports  $R'_i : bc...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$ , we arrive at  $\sigma^{bc}$  and  $h \neq l$  picks  $d$  – thus  $l$  is assigned some other object  $x \neq c, d$ . Again, we find that depending on  $i$ 's preferences there would be three possible objects assigned to  $l$ , a contradiction.

Hence, we conclude that after  $i$  reports  $R'_i : bc...$ , and is assigned  $c$ ,  $l$  must own  $d$ , same as in  $\sigma^a$ . By a symmetric argument, after  $i$  reports  $R''_i : bd...$ ,  $k$  must own  $c$ . But then consider preferences  $R_k : dca...$  and  $R_l : cd...a$  and assume that every other unassigned agent  $h \neq i, l, k$  ranks  $a$  last. Then, after  $i$  chooses  $a$  and  $k$  owns  $c$  while  $l$  owns  $d$ ,  $k$  and  $l$  will trade and  $k$  will be assigned  $d$ . If  $i$  reports  $R'_i : bc...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$  and  $l$  owns  $d$ . Then  $l$  will choose  $d$  and, by efficiency,  $k$  is assigned  $a$  as she ranks it first among all remaining objects while everyone else ranks  $a$  last. Finally, if  $i$  reports  $R''_i : bd...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $d$  and  $k$  owns  $c$ . Then  $k$  will choose  $c$ , as it is the most preferred among the remaining objects. Thus, depending on the choice of  $i$ ,  $k$  receives one of three possible objects.

Case (ii.3) Suppose that at  $\sigma$ ,  $i$  owns object  $a$  and  $j$  owns object  $b$ . Moreover suppose that if  $R_i : b...$  and  $R_j : a...$ , the resulting submatching  $\sigma^b$  where  $i$  and  $j$  have been assigned their most preferred objects  $b$  and  $a$  after trading among themselves, awards ownership rights to two of the remaining agents – say,  $k$  owns  $c$  and  $l$  owns  $d$  at  $\sigma^b$ .

First observe that, since  $j$  considers one of  $i$ 's objects most preferred,  $i$  can be assigned any object  $x$  by reporting  $R'_i : x...$  – either  $x$  is already owned by  $i$  at  $\sigma$  in which case the subsequent submatching  $\sigma^x$  assigns  $x$  to  $i$  (and leaves  $j$  still unassigned), or  $x$  is owned by  $j$  so that  $i$  and  $j$  trade to arrive at  $\sigma^x$ .

In particular, suppose  $i$  reports  $R'_i : c...$ . If  $i$  owns  $c$  at  $\sigma$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$  while  $j$  remains unmatched. Thus, at  $\sigma^c$ , there is only one owner (by Case (ii.1)) and, since  $j$  remains the owner of  $b$ , that single owner is  $j$ . But then  $j$  is assigned their most preferred object  $a$  in the next step, leading to submatching  $\sigma'$  where some agent  $h$  owns  $d$ . If instead  $j$  owns  $c$  at  $\sigma$ , then  $i$  and  $j$  trade, each is assigned their most preferred object ( $c$  for  $i$  and  $a$  for  $j$ ) and we are at a submatching where some agent  $h$  owns  $d$ . Refer to that submatching also as  $\sigma'$ .

We want to show that  $d$  needs to be assigned to the same agent in  $\sigma'$  as in  $\sigma^b$ , i.e., that  $h = l$ . For that, suppose that the preferences of remaining agents are given as  $R_l : dc...$  while any other unmatched agent at  $\sigma'$ , ranks  $d$  first and  $c$  last. Moreover, suppose that  $j$  ranks  $c$  last (this does not matter for determining  $\sigma'$ ). Then if  $i$  reports  $R_i : b...$ , we arrive at  $\sigma^b$  and  $l$  picks  $d$ ; if  $i$  reports  $R''_i : d...$ , then  $i$  is assigned  $d$ ,  $l$  ranks  $c$  highest among the remaining objects and everyone else ranks it last – thus  $l$  is assigned  $c$ . Third, if  $i$  reports  $R'_i : c...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$ ,  $j$  is assigned  $a$  and we arrive at  $\sigma'$  where  $h \neq l$  picks  $d$  – thus  $l$  is assigned some other object  $x \neq c, d$ . Again, we find that depending on  $i$ 's preferences there would be three possible objects assigned to  $l$ , a contradiction.

Hence, we conclude that after  $i$  reports  $R'_i : c...$ , and is assigned  $c$ ,  $l$  must own  $d$  at  $\sigma'$ , same as in  $\sigma^a$ . By a symmetric argument, after  $i$  reports  $R''_i : d...$ ,  $k$  must own  $c$  at the next submatching where  $i$  and  $j$  have been assigned. But then consider preferences  $R_k : dc...$  and  $R_l : cd...b$  and assume that every other unassigned agent  $h \neq i, j, l, k$  ranks  $b$  last. Then, after  $i$  chooses  $b$  and  $k$  owns  $c$  while  $l$  owns  $d$ ,  $k$  and  $l$  will trade and  $k$  will be assigned  $d$ . If  $i$  reports  $R'_i : c...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $c$  ( $j$  is assigned  $a$ ) and  $l$  owns  $d$  at  $\sigma'$ . Then  $l$  will choose  $d$  and, by efficiency,  $k$  is assigned  $b$  as she ranks it first among all remaining objects while everyone else ranks  $b$  last. Finally, if  $i$  reports  $R''_i : d...$ ,  $i$  is assigned  $d$  ( $j$  is assigned  $a$ ) and  $k$  owns  $c$ . Then  $k$  will choose  $c$ , as it is the most preferred among the remaining objects. Thus, depending on the choice of  $i$ ,  $k$  receives one of three possible objects.

Case (iii) Suppose that at  $\sigma$ ,  $i$  owns all remaining objects and that depending on  $R_i$ , two agents,  $k$  and  $l$ , may simultaneously become owners of some object(s) at a subsequent submatching  $\sigma'$ ,  $N_{\sigma'} = N_{\sigma} \cup \{i\}$ .

Thus, at  $\sigma$  there are at least three unassigned agents and objects. Suppose w.l.o.g that when  $i$  chooses  $a$ ,  $k$  owns object  $c$  while  $l$  owns object  $d$ . Moreover, note that  $i$  may pick  $c$  or  $d$  by reporting them as most preferred. But then the situation between  $i$ ,  $k$ , and  $l$  is the same as in case (ii.2) above, where  $i$  would be assigned  $c$  when reporting  $R'_i : bc...$  and  $d$  when reporting  $R''_i : bd...$  – beyond that the argument is analogous.

Taken together, the case (i)-(iii) establish that there can be at most two owners at the initial (empty) submatching and exactly one owner at each subsequent (proper) submatching that can be reached for some preference profile. What remains to show, is that the sequence of owners is unaffected by the choice of previously matched agents. First, we show that a single owner at some submatching  $\sigma$  cannot affect the sequence of subsequent owners. Then, we show that the same is true for the case of two owners at the initial empty submatching.

Case (iv.1). Consider a submatching  $\sigma$ , reached for some preference profile of assigned agents  $R_{N_{\sigma}}$ , where unassigned agent  $i \in \bar{N}_{\sigma}$  owns all objects. To gain some intuition, suppose that depending on  $R_i$ , i.e., depending on  $i$ 's choice among the remaining objects, either  $k$  or  $l$  becomes

the next owner. Thus, at  $\sigma$  there are at least three unassigned agents and objects. Suppose, w.l.o.g., that  $k$  owns all remaining objects (at least two) if  $i$  chooses object  $a$ , while  $l$  owns all remaining objects if  $i$  chooses  $b$ . In either case there is at least one more unassigned object, say  $c$ . If  $i$  chooses  $c$ , someone becomes the owner of the remaining objects and it since  $k \neq l$ , at most one of the two is an owner. W.l.o.g., assume it that  $k$  does not own all remaining objects. Now, if  $R_k : bc...$  while any other agent, including  $l$  ranks  $b$  first and  $c$  last we get the following: if  $i$  chooses  $a$ ,  $k$  owns  $b$  and chooses it; if  $i$  chooses  $b$ ,  $k$  ranks  $c$  highest among all remaining objects while everyone else ranks it last so that efficiency implies that  $k$  receives  $c$ ; if  $i$  chooses  $c$ , the owner of the remaining objects (not  $k$ ) chooses  $b$  so that  $k$  receives an objects other than  $b$  and  $c$ . Thus, depending on the choice of  $i$ ,  $k$  receives one of three possible objects.

Now, it may be that  $i$  influences not the immediately subsequent owner of objects but changes the ordering of owners further down the line. In particular, there may be agents  $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_h$  who inherit objects in a fixed order following  $i$ 's choice but that the choice of  $i$  influences who among the remaining agents after  $j_h$  becomes an owner. This is meaningful only if there are at least two agents  $k, l$  that remain unassigned after  $j_h$  has chosen – and we can apply the same argument as above to show that, for any given  $R_{j_1}, \dots, R_{j_h}$ ,  $i$  cannot influence whether  $k$  or  $l$  owns the remaining objects.

Case (iv.2) Consider a submatching  $\sigma$  reached for some preference profile of assigned agents, where exactly two unassigned agents  $i, j \in \overline{N}_\sigma$  are owners. To prove that a change in their joint preferences cannot change the order of subsequent agents, it is sufficient to show it from a change in the preferences of one of them, say  $i$ .

If  $j$  prefers an object owned by  $i$  at  $\sigma$ , then  $i$  can choose whatever object she prefers, then  $j$  can among the remaining objects, then a subsequent agent, etc. In other words, for any preferences of  $i$  and of subsequent agents, the assignment for  $\overline{N}_\sigma$  will coincide with that of an assignment rule  $\psi$  with agents  $\overline{N}_\sigma$ , objects  $\overline{O}_\sigma$  and exactly one owner at each reachable submatching, starting with  $i$ , then  $j$ . But we can apply the reasoning from case (iv.1) to  $\psi$ , so that  $i$ 's preferences cannot alter the order of subsequent agents under  $\psi$ , so neither can it in the original mechanism. So, when  $j$  prefers an object owned by  $i$  at  $\sigma$ ,  $i$  cannot change the order of subsequent agents.

If  $j$  prefers an object she owns at  $\sigma$ , the same argument allows to conclude, with the only difference that first  $j$ , then  $i$  will be an owner under  $\psi$ .