## DO VOTING SCHEMES

 MATTER?INTRODUCTION


 issue in social choice, especially corporate governance where the voting scheme used to e a company soard of directors influencus
responsiveness to sharefolder concers

THE EXPERIMENT
Students vole to telect 5 members fan Extra Creair Commintee. Als students are included on
ballot. Three votes are thken
ona
voles 1 or the candaas fom firsto tast with no ties or
omissions
voters allocate
they choose
Voting results are confidential On the test, a question is randomly selected as the extra credit
question One point is added to the score of everyone in the class for cach member of the elected question. One point is adeded to the score of
commitec that answers the question corectly.
Afer the test results are tabulated, the results of best performing committee on the extra credit
question detemuit

 sclected by the different votings chemes. The composition of fhe commitees remains
because members a re identified only $y$ y randomly asigned alphanumeric codes.
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RESULTS OF FIRST ELECTION

| Voting <br> SCHEME | COMMITTEE <br> ELECTED | EXTRA <br> CREDIT <br> SCORE | TEST <br> AVERAGE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| APPROVAL | ACDE (GH) | $3 / 5$ | $85 \%$ |
| BORDA | ACDEF | $3 / 5$ | $90 \%$ |
| CUMULATIVE | ABCDE | $3 / 5$ | $89 \%$ |

The schemes elect differennt committes and those committes perform differently While both the APPROVAL and CUMULATIVE committese earned hhe maximum extra cedif for the class, the BRRDA commitee might have been a beter chocice because that committee had the highest average esest sore and the extra credit tuestion was
ndomly selected It was also noted that a different committee would have generated a 5 extra credit poinst for the
 the chances of earning points with a randomly sclectecd question

After presenting the test results in class, students are surveyed to determine if they would change their vote and, is so hoo , heresults of this survey is presented in the following

After reviewing the experimental results, 2 of the APPROVAL sutdents swithed 3 to CUMULATIVE voting as their
riefered methoo, one of the studens two sudents who initially prefered CUMULATVE voting switched, one to APRROVAL and one to BORDA.

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-
EXPERIMENT VOTING PREFERENCES

| PREFERRED <br> POST-EXPERIMENT | Aproval | borda | cumulative | тоtal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ferred |  |  |  |  |
| Expt |  |  |  |  |
| APRROVAL | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| Borda | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| conluative | 1 | 1 | ${ }^{2}$ | 4 |
| total |  |  |  |  |

MULTIPLE ITERATIONS, NO CLEAR WINNERS This exerise was repated twice. After the first trial, mosts tudents chose Borda as their
prefered method. When the results for the commite e elected for the second test were simile preferred method. When the result for the committee elected for the second dest were simin
to those of the first, students again became more divesse in their prefered voting methods.

This provided a jumping off place to discuss Arows Theorem and the inpossibility of making
a universally correct choice. Sutdents can then discover that none of the voting schemes alvwys a unverataly correct choic
produces the best result.
Borda may require more information than the voters have. Full rankings may not be possible Cumulative voting allows people to indicate strenght of preference. Approval and Cumulative eoting allow voters to use incomplet
able to valuate all candidates.

This is anatural segue to an introduction to Arrow's Impossibility Theorem, one of the
cornestones of social choice theory.


