

## 9.1 Majority Rule and Condorcet's Method

- 1. In a few sentences, explain why minority rule (the voting procedure for two alternatives that is described on page 287) satisfies conditions (1) and (2) on page 287, but not (3).
- 2. In a few sentences, explain why imposed rule (the voting procedure for two alternatives that is described on page 287) satisfies conditions (1) and (3) on page 287, but not (2).
- 3. In a few sentences, explain why a dictatorship (the voting procedure for two alternatives that is described on page 287) satisfies conditions (2) and (3) on page 287, but not (1).
- 4. Find (or invent) a voting rule for two alternatives that satisfies
- (a) condition (1) on page 287, but neither (2) nor (3).
- (b) condition (2) on page 287, but neither (1) nor (3).
- (c) condition (3) on page 287, but neither (1) nor (2).
- 5. In a sentence or two, explain why it's impossible, with an odd number of voters, to have two distinct candidates win the same election using Condorcet's method.
- **6.** Construct a real-world example (perhaps involving yourself and two friends) where the individual preference lists for three alternatives are as in the voting paradox of Condorcet.
- 7. Condorcet's voting paradox shows that with three voters (or three equal-size groups of voters) and the three alternatives A, B, and C, it is possible to have two-thirds prefer A to B, two-thirds prefer B to C, and two-thirds prefer C to A. Find four preference lists that show that with four voters and the four alternatives A, B, C, and D, it is possible to have three-fourths prefer A to B, three-fourths prefer B to C, three-fourths prefer C to D, and three-fourths prefer D to A.
- 8. Generalize the result in Exercise 7 from four alternatives to n alternatives:  $A_1, ..., A_n$ .

## 9.2 Other Voting Systems for Three or More Candidates

9. Plurality voting is illustrated by the 1980 U.S. Senate race in New York among Alfonse D'Amato (*D*, a conservative), Elizabeth Holtzman (*H*, a liberal), and Jacob Javits (*J*, also a liberal). Reasonable estimates

Challenge

Discussion

(based largely on exit polls) suggest that voters ranked the candidates according to the following table:

22%	23%	15%	29%	7%	4%
D	D	$H_{z}$	Н	J	I
H	I	D	J	Н	D
J	Н	J	D	D	• Н

- (a) Is there a Condorcet winner?
- (b) Who won using plurality voting?
- 10. (Everyone wins.) Consider the following set of preference lists:

Rank		Number of Voters (9)							
	3	1	1	1	1	_1	1		
First	A	A	В	В	C	С	D		
Second	D	В	C	C	B	D	C		
Third	В	C	D	A	D	В	В		
Fourth	CC	D	A	D	A	A	A		

Note that the first list is held by three voters, not just one. Calculate the winner using

- (a) plurality voting.
- (b) the Borda count.
- (c) the Hare system.
- (d) sequential pairwise voting with the agenda A, B, C, D.
- 11. Consider the following set of preference lists:

	Number of Voters (7)						
Rank	2	2	1	,1	1		
First	C	D	C	В	A		
Second	A	A	D	D	D		
Third	B	C	A	A	В		
Fourth	D	B	В	C	C		

Calculate the winner using

- (a) plurality voting
- (b) the Borda count.
- (c) the Hare system.
- (d) sequential pairwise voting with the agenda B, D, C, A.