

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Have the option for users to use Single Transferable Voting for polls](#)

Tutelary - January 1, 2013, 3:48 pm

The following suggestion has been modified. Text that has been crossed out is no longer relevant.
Original Title: Change MOTM Voting System to Single Transferable Voting

Right now, the MOTM current Hackforums voting system is ran under [First Past the Post](#). This is a terribly flawed voting system and should be changed.

Why it is wrong

Here's a Youtube video explaining why it is wrong: [Video:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s7tWHJfhiyo>]

Author is [CGPGrey](#)

If you do not want to watch the video, then I will explain the problems with this particular voting system here, paraphrased from the video:

First, the system is simple, one vote per person, person with the most votes wins. Pretty simple, right? Absolutely. Terribly flawed? Absolutely true. To see why it's flawed, we can just take a look at one of the voting months, in this case, November 2012, look at the following image from MOTM elections:

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

Adampelletgun won, but only with 22.8% of the vote, leaving 77.2% of people voting for somebody else. That, my friends, is a very flawed voting system. But imagine if there were A LOT more candidates, he might've only gotten 10 or 8 percent, but still won. This is minority rule; the majority of people wanted somebody else, but he still won. This can be seen in other MOTM voting months, not just November. The rest of the video just explains what else can happen; gerrymandering and a two party system, I don't think this will happen to HF since we're not running a country here, just voting to give somebody some award. Though this is still a problem for countries who still use First Past the Post, like the United States. That's not the point of this thread, though. I'd like to have the ability for users to use Single Transferable Voting for polls, while still having the option to use First Past the Post. (Though it would be discouraged.)

How we can fix improve it

Right now, I think of only one solution: Single Transferable Voting

It is explained in the following Youtube video.

[Video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WfingO_mvLw]

Author is [uwesuvideo](#).

Again, I will paraphrase the video to text here: Each person gets several votes, marking their candidates in order of preference. If one person gets more than half the votes right off the bat, that person gets the award. But if there is no clear winner, the candidate with the least amount of votes gets eliminated. In First Past the Post, the person who voted for the losing candidate basically wasted their vote. Using Single Transferable Voting, if you voted for the losing candidate, that candidate is eliminated and your vote gets transferred to your second vote. If there is a majority at this point, that candidate wins the award. If not, it continues until a candidate receives the majority.

This system is fair and logical since No person wastes their vote.

Candidates have to be favorable to all voters.

Majority actually rules.

This could be very useful in the MOTM awards, though I've realized and been told by members that it's basically a "Popularity Contest", so this suggestion has been modified to account for ALL HF polls. (People will still have the option to use First Past the Post)

But wait, what about the people who have already been given the award?

It will not be taken away or the user penalized for not having won the award in this system.

Implementation

I admit, Omniscient would have to write up entirely new code to establish the voting system in this way, though it would make it a lot more fair in MOTM elections. general users' polls. Of course, any implementation of this is entirely up to him.

Flaws

I admit, this system does have some flaws: For example, if the person doesn't care enough to vote in their order of preference and just pick random candidates polls to do so, they could sway the election. Though this is also true with First Past the Post. People could just select somebody just to select somebody. As well, if the voter doesn't select enough candidates choices in the poll in order of preference, the people who did are able to influence the election. This is not the problem with the system itself, but with the voter. One last flaw: Since this system will keep eliminating the candidate option with the least votes, the number of "votes" a person has is the same number of candidates choices.

Conclusion

Changing the HF voting system will allow for actual majority rule, candidates will try to appeal to more people, and if a person is not favorable to as many people, they will lose their chance at the award.

If anybody has any questions or concerns and would like for me to address them on this thread, please don't hesitate to PM me.

Claptrap™ - January 1, 2013, 3:52 pm

Completely agree with this even tho i am a regular. This should be changed to how Laki has described it. ^^

Moralitas - January 1, 2013, 3:52 pm

Bro it's just another popularity contest, doesn't matter if you got the majority or not. And other methods have their flaws as well. I've been nominated a shit load of times and came close to winning a few times, but mostly when it happened, I was inactive for most of the month, but because I've been part of this community for such a long time people randomly tend to nominate me. It would be different if the nominees actually were chosen because of more than just mere suggestions.

-?Divine- - January 1, 2013, 3:56 pm

(Jan 1, 2013 04:52 PM)Moralitas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Bro it's just another popularity contest, doesn't matter if you got the majority or not. And other methods have their flaws as well. I've been nominated a shit load of times and came close to winning a few times, but mostly when it happened, I was inactive for

most of the month, but because I've been part of this community for such a long time people randomly tend to nominate me. It would be different if the nominees actually were chosen with more than just mere suggestions.

This. Members who are actually contributing never end up on the list.

Tutelary - January 1, 2013, 4:00 pm

Moralitas Wrote:Bro it's just another popularity contest, doesn't matter if you got the majority or not. And other methods have their flaws as well. I've been nominated a shit load of times and came close to winning a few times, but mostly when it happened, I was inactive for most of the month, but because I've been part of this community for such a long time people randomly tend to nominate me. It would be different if the nominees actually were chosen because of more than just mere suggestions. With this new voting system, the votes are actually fair and based on who most users actually want to receive the award.

-?Divine- Wrote:This. Members who are actually contributing never end up on the list. I thought upgraded members could nominate anybody they saw fit? L33ts could nominate one person, Ub3r's could nominate two? Or am I wrong?

'Cody - January 1, 2013, 4:03 pm

I love the suggestion, but in the end it doesn't matter much. The contest comes down to who at the time is most popular or has the most friends. It's unfortunate it's like this but it's how it has been for a while. People will vote for friends just because they're friends, rather than vote for someone who has worked hard to even get on the list.

Makaveli The Don - January 1, 2013, 4:05 pm

Not to talk about how to get in that list first....

Tutelary - January 1, 2013, 4:22 pm

Cody? Wrote:I love the suggestion, but in the end it doesn't matter much. The contest comes down to who at the time is most popular or has the most friends. It's unfortunate it's like this but it's how it has been for a while. People will vote for friends just because they're friends, rather than vote for someone who has worked hard to even get on the list.

Let's say that happens. One person gets all their friends to vote for him, look at the amount of votes in November 2012. Let's use Adampelletgun (Nothing against the guy, he just has a cool name.) as an example, as he won because he got "the most votes". 83. 364 votes total. He probably would've gotten eliminated in this voting system if people voted with Single Transferable Voting. If he wasn't as popular with most people, he would've lost. It's harder to rig this system since in First Past the Post, if ANY candidate receives the majority, no matter how small, that person takes all, or in this case, the award.

Makaveli The Don Wrote:Not to talk about how to get in that list first....

Can someone explain how to get on that list? I thought Ub3r's could nominate two people and L33ts could nominate one. How many people have to nominate you to be on that list?

EDIT: Some really simple research led me to that admins select the nominees. Still, this voting system is still useful in the case that the candidate who favors more voters actually wins.

Racialz - January 1, 2013, 5:36 pm

I totally support this, I think this is a great idea.

Positive - January 1, 2013, 6:18 pm

The thing is, they get an award and not "king." I'd say let it go.

Nyonic - January 1, 2013, 6:21 pm

I love this, a lot of people are getting votes because they have friends.

Tutelary - January 1, 2013, 6:29 pm

(Jan 1, 2013 07:18 PM)Positive Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The thing is, they get an award and not "king." I'd say let it go.

Still, it's a voting system that is internally flawed and shouldn't be used. People are winning because it's a terrible concept and it won't work mathematically. Plus, just the awful side effect of "Minority Rule" should be reason enough to change it. It's broken, we should fix it.

Zack Fair - January 1, 2013, 6:32 pm

I feel like MOTM should be removed completely then if people are going to base it off of "popularity" Either that or have the staff pick who deserves it every month.

I see many people on the forums who are very HQ and don't even make it on the list and if they do, they don't get many votes because they aren't popular.

The system is flawed overall.

Also, one post on the topic really caught my attention:

(Jan 1, 2013 04:25 PM)+Entity Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There are only 2 different people on this list from last month. This is perverting the entire spirit of the contest.

What Entity said proves that MOTM is ridiculous.

Pred?tor - January 1, 2013, 6:36 pm

On a forum this big it can't be that hard to win MoTM if you're a very popular user.

Baghead - January 1, 2013, 6:37 pm

I don't think MOTM is important enough to implement this. Sure it's more fair but in the end MOTM is just, like said before, a popularity contest. The same members are on the list every month. Sure they're great members, but there are others that do a ton for the community who never make it up there.

Positive - January 1, 2013, 6:38 pm

(Jan 1, 2013 07:29 PM)Lakai™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Still, it's a voting system that is internally flawed and shouldn't be used. People are winning because it's a terrible concept and it won't work mathematically. Plus, just the awful side effect of "Minority Rule" should be reason enough to change it. It's broken, we should fix it.

It's an award on a forum... why do you care so much?

I am not trying to be a dick, but I want you to see it like I see it.

Tutelary - January 1, 2013, 6:44 pm

(Jan 1, 2013 07:38 PM)Positive Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's an award on a forum... why do you care so much? I am not trying to be a dick, but I want you to see it like I see it.

I see it your way. I understand it's a popularity contest. It's not the importance of the award, because it's really just pixels. It's about how terrible a voting system First Past the Post is and why it's so widely used. I'd like to change that.

Pred?tor - January 1, 2013, 6:45 pm

It's broke but not important. If you win its because people like you. If you want MoTM then become popular.

Possibly make it so you cant be re-nominated for 3 months.

Ove?lo?d - January 1, 2013, 8:05 pm

I think this is a great idea.

And people please stop commenting how MOTM is a popularity contest, that is not the point.

I support 100 %!

?Cloud - January 2, 2013, 10:35 am

(Jan 1, 2013 07:29 PM)Lakai™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Still, it's a voting system that is internally flawed and shouldn't be used. People are winning because it's a terrible concept and it won't work mathematically. Plus, just the awful side effect of "Minority Rule" should be reason enough to change it. It's broken, we should fix it.

Who cares, it's a waste of time. Whoever wins does NOT rule anything, they only get an award. No one cares who gets the award.

Tutelary - January 2, 2013, 11:46 am

(Jan 2, 2013 12:44 PM)Valderino Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) However, think about what would happen if this was used across the entire forum, not just in MOTM. :)

Exactly. That's why I've changed the thread to account for this. Not just for MOTM, not even MOTM if that's what it takes. I just want people to have the option to use STV in polls, that's it. If it's in MOTM, that's fine, but if it's not, I couldn't care less. My original idea was to change it just for MOTM, but I've changed it to account for all of the forum.

Sir - January 2, 2013, 4:30 pm

(Jan 1, 2013 04:48 PM)Lakai™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) First, the system is simple, one vote per person, person with the most votes wins. Pretty simple, right? Absolutely. Terribly flawed? Absolutely true. To see why it's flawed, we can just take a look at one of the voting months, in this case, November 2012, look at the following image from MOTM elections:

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Adampelletgun won, but only with 22.8% of the vote, leaving 77.2% of people voting for somebody else. That, my friends, is a very flawed voting system.

Correction:

Here's how it would be solved;
364 people voted.
He won with 22.80% of the votes.

$364 \times 22.80\% = 82.992 = 83$ votes.

It's not a flawed system.

Tutelary - January 2, 2013, 5:38 pm

(Jan 2, 2013 05:30 PM)Starstruck Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Correction:

Here's how it would be solved;
364 people voted.
He won with 22.80% of the votes.

$364 \times 22.80\% = 82.992 = 83$ votes.

It's not a flawed system. The majority of people, 77.2% of people, wanted somebody different. That is not a good system since the most people--the majority, wanted somebody else to win the award but adampelletgun still won. Still, I edited the suggestion to just allow for users to use Single

Transferable Voting for their polls or First Past the Post. (Though I think it would be discouraged to use FPTP, IMO.) It's not just about MOTM award elections, that "popularity contest" as members have described.

(Jan 2, 2013 06:11 PM)Valderino Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The president of the United States was elected.

Population of the US: 315,100,601 (Source: <http://www.census.gov/main/www/popclock.html>)
Let's assume only 70% of the population can vote, since I couldn't find a statistic readily, and it doesn't really matter.

Population of US voters: ~220,570,421.

Someone wins with 22.80% of the votes.

Someone wins with ~50,290,056 votes.

Someone wins with only the number of people in California and Pennsylvania combined.

That person is supposedly representative as the best leader of all 56 states and territories.

Seems completely flawed to me.

I know in the US that they use the Electoral College, a system that has allowed for a president to lose the popular vote, but still be elected as the leader of the country. For an example, In the 2000 election, Al Gore lost to George Bush 50.5% to 49.5%. He had the clear majority, (Though by the slightest bit) but still won. That's a problem with the Electoral College, not with FPTP. For individual states, they still use FPTP and it has evolved into a two-party system, and that's a side effect of FPTP. Who knows when they'll change it? Probably never, as Republicans and Democrats like having their parties in 99% of all US offices, due to this ineffective voting system. (Except for the President, as the Electoral College is used.)

bandors - January 2, 2013, 6:15 pm

I support this suggestion.

Good luck Lakai!

Moralitas - January 2, 2013, 7:24 pm

Actually there's no need to add a plugin or modify existing code. There's an option in MyBB that allows users of a certain group to remove their vote and re-vote. I think as a Staff I was able to do that, but then again as Staff I could rig the results lol.

Maybe just edit OP and say ability to remove existing vote?

Tutelary - January 2, 2013, 7:56 pm

(Jan 2, 2013 08:26 PM)Valderino Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The problem with removing your existing vote is that you have to constantly be paying attention to the MOTM section, that's something that, apart from those who actually participate, and a handful of others, very few people follow closely enough to remove and resubmit their vote.

I was thinking of what it could possibly look like, I mean, the new format. I know for FPTP, you just select your candidate and you're good to go. For STV, you have to select them in order of preference. It could possibly look like this: (The 1-10 stand for 1 being your first choice, 10th is your last. You do not have to fill in each box.) Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

10 votes in total for each person, though the idea is that the person can stop filling out their preference after choice 1, or after choice 10. It's their choice. But, it's basically "Insurance" if they picked the losing choice, and obviously, if the poll only has 2-4 options, it would not be advisable to use STV, but FPTP. So, I suggest that people still have the option to use FPTP for polls, but are encouraged to use STV for larger polls, ones with 6+ options.

Sir - January 3, 2013, 3:21 am

(Jan 2, 2013 06:11 PM)Valderino Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The president of the United States was elected.

Population of the US: 315,100,601 (Source: <http://www.census.gov/main/www/popclock.html>)

Let's assume only 70% of the population can vote, since I couldn't find a statistic readily, and it doesn't really matter.

Population of US voters: ~220,570,421.

Someone wins with 22.80% of the votes.

Someone wins with ~50,290,056 votes.

Someone wins with only the number of people in California and Pennsylvania combined.

That person is supposedly representative as the best leader of all 56 states and territories.

Seems completely flawed to me.

To compare polls like MOTM to Presidential Elections and members of HF as states of the USA shows no relevance.

Tutelary - January 3, 2013, 12:34 pm

(Jan 3, 2013 04:21 AM)Starstruck Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) To compare polls like MOTM to Presidential Elections and members of HF as states of the USA shows no relevance.

Let's completely disregard that, then. Take a look at the original image in original post, again:

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Let's disregard the fact that it's a reward and therefore should be invalid. If people voted for - Sam -, they voted for a losing choice. Their vote is wasted since - Sam - only got 6.87% of the vote. (This is why these systems tend to lean to a 2 party system) People abandon their preferred choice to back the one they think have the most chance of winning. With STV, no one has to back a losing choice and waste their vote, it accounts for that. With FPTP, it's inevitable that people will do so. Would you watch the video explaining STV again? I don't think you did, my text paraphrasing was a bit lacking and does not compare to the video.

Grin - September 4, 2013, 3:15 pm

I like the way this suggestion is executed. Hopefully action will be taken.

The Doctor - September 5, 2013, 5:36 pm

I like the idea. However I think the poll system is part of the core MyBB code. I think Omni said he wants to refrain from modifying the core MyBB code as much as possible. I'm not sure though.