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Ranked-choice voting (RCV) is great improvement over ordinary plurality rule

| $\frac{40 \%}{A}$ | $\frac{25 \%}{B}$ | $\frac{35 \%}{C}$ |  | three candidates: $A, B$, and $C$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $B$ | $C$ | $B$ |  |  |
| $C$ | $A$ | $A$ |  |  |

- in example, $60 \%$ of voters prefer both $B$ and $C$ to $A$
- but under plurality rule, $B$ and $C$ split anti- $A$ vote and so $A$ wins with 40\%

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{A} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
B & C & B \\
C & A & A
\end{array}
$$

- RCV solves this problem
- because $60 \%$ of voters rank both $B$ and $C$ above $A, A$ will not win
- instead,
- since no candidate gets majority of first-place votes, $B$ is dropped
- $C$ then defeats $A$ in the instant runoff

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{A} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
B & C & B \\
C & A & A
\end{array}
$$

- but notice that $65 \%$ of voters prefer $B$ to $C$
- and $60 \%$ prefer $B$ to $A$
- so if want to respect will of the majority, $B$ (not $C$ ) should be winner
- $B$ is called Condorcet winner
- majority of voters (65\%) prefer $B$ to $C$
- majority of voters (60\%) prefer $B$ to $A$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{A} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
B & C & B \\
C & A & A
\end{array}
$$

- can make small change to RCV to ensure that Condorcet winner like $B$ won't lose election
- instead of dropping candidate with fewest first-place votes (as in regular RCV), drop candidate with fewest total votes

| $\frac{40 \%}{A}$ | $\frac{25 \%}{B}$ | $\frac{35 \%}{C}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $B$ | $C$ | $B$ |
| $C$ | $A$ | $A$ |

- if a voter ranks candidate $C$ above two other candidates, $C$ gets two total votes from that voter
- so each voter in $35 \%$ group contributes two total votes to $C$
- if a voter ranks candidate $C$ above one other candidate, $C$ gets one total vote from that voter
- so each voter in $25 \%$ group contributes one total vote to $C$
- if a voter ranks candidate last (i.e., above no other candidates), $C$ gets zero total votes from that voter
- so each voter in $40 \%$ group contributes zero total votes to $C$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{A} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
B & C & B \\
C & A & A
\end{array}
$$

in example

- $C$ gets $35 \times 2+25 \times 1=95$ total votes
- $A$ gets $40 \times 2=80$ total votes
- $B$ gets $25 \times 2+75 \times 1=125$ total votes
- so candidate $A$ dropped

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{A} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
B & C & B \\
C & A & A
\end{array}
$$

- but when $A$ is dropped, the $A$-supporters (the $40 \%$ group) have their second choice elevated into first place (as in ordinary RCV)
- so rankings now look like this:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{40 \%}{B} & \frac{25 \%}{B} & \frac{35 \%}{C} \\
C & C & B
\end{array}
$$

$-65 \%$ of voters rank $B$ first

- Thus, $B$ (the Condorcet winner) is elected
- if a candidate is a Condorcet winner, there is a strong argument (based on democratic principles) that she should be elected
- by tweaking the rules of RCV so that the candidate with fewest total votes (rather than the fewest first-place votes) is dropped, we ensure that Condorcet winner will be elected

