

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [QL/POP Contests Are Fucking Stupid](#)

Dehyped | ?? - July 3, 2022, 7:57 pm

Allowing contests that require you to leave a +rating and QL are fucking stupid as shit. It's the HF version of pay-to-win gaming. People are just buying good social standing and that severely undermines the value and credibility of social currency as a system.

Whoa, this guy has a lot of +rep he must be trusted part of the community right? Oh, wait, no, he just did a \$50 ETH giveaway.

This should legitimately be removed and be a bannable offense.

Stanley - July 4, 2022, 6:53 am

I'm Stanley HF's helper bot. The OP (original poster) of this thread wants everyone to see this page and has elected to bump it to the top of the showthread listing. Since HF doesn't want a ton of LQP (Low Quality Posts) this is the best method of bumping your content. There is a small ?yte fee for each bump. Any OP can bump any of their threads on HF from the linked icon on the top of their first post.

If you haven't already read the first post of this thread we encourage you to do so.

Thanks,
Stanley

Murda_Mook - July 4, 2022, 6:58 am

(Jul 3, 2022 07:57 PM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Allowing contests that require you to leave a +rating and QL are fucking stupid as shit. It's the HF version of pay-to-win gaming. People are just buying good social standing and that severely undermines the value and credibility of social currency as a system.

Whoa, this guy has a lot of +rep he must be trusted part of the community right? Oh, wait, no, he just did a \$50 ETH giveaway.

This should legitimately be removed and be a bannable offense.

I agree with you on this, it call rep farming(Havesting)

Dehyped | ?? - July 4, 2022, 7:01 am

(Jul 4, 2022 06:58 AM)Murda_Mook Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I agree with you on this, it call rep farming(Havesting)

Exactly. This is a bannable offense on every other forum. Why is it allowed here, one of the stricter online communities I still visit?

Inb4 Omni's response: "We don't do what other forums do blah blah." Not the main argument, see the original post.

SoulHarvester - July 4, 2022, 7:19 am

I really miss old school reputation. There was honestly nothing wrong with it. I enjoyed seeing posts linked to the reputations, I enjoyed the context behind every single one. I also enjoyed how serious

negative rep would be at the time because it came with context.

Yin Yang - July 4, 2022, 7:21 am

It's just not that serious anymore, I agree.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 7:29 am

The issue the old rep system had was it was even more abused.

Dehyped | ?? - July 4, 2022, 7:31 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:29 AM)Laughing Man Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The issue the old rep system had was it was even more abused.

Not really relevant.

No system is perfect, but the current state of reputation basically nullifies its own existence. It needs to be changed.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 7:37 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:31 AM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not really relevant.

No system is perfect, but the current state of reputation basically nullifies its own existence. It needs to be changed.

How do you figure, contracts have their own setup which is well done.

Dehyped | ?? - July 4, 2022, 7:39 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:37 AM)Laughing Man Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) How do you figure, contracts have their own setup which is well done.

Literally read the OP.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 7:41 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:39 AM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Literally read the OP.

I read it, contracts are how you measure trust, not rep anymore and QL you don't see. It gives an award that's it.

Dehyped | ?? - July 4, 2022, 7:44 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:41 AM)Laughing Man Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I read it, contracts are how you measure trust That's fine as long as they are closed monitored (which they seem to be currently.)

(Jul 4, 2022 07:41 AM)Laughing Man Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) not rep anymore Exactly, because it no longer matters, because you can just buy it. Fix the problem -- a VERY EASY FIX -- and it becomes a legitimate part of the site again.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 7:47 am

Why would Omni want rep over contracts? Popularity just shows how much you interact with someone.

Trust with sales comes from contracts.

Gary - July 4, 2022, 7:50 am

You're not wrong as someone who was here for the old system. However people should not confuse reputation with popularity. B Rating should be the way to go about it.

Dehyped | ?? - July 4, 2022, 7:51 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:47 AM)Laughing Man Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Why would Omni want rep over contracts?

Popularity just shows how much you interact with someone.

Trust with sales comes from contracts.

I never said rep over contracts, my dude. This thread ain't about contracts it's about the glaring issue with the popularity system. It's real simple, I don't know why you keep shoving contracts into the middle. Popularity system has a problem that basically makes it redundant. If a system is redundant, by definition, there is no need for it. This leaves us with two logical courses of action: BAN buying rep/QL through "Giveaways" or remove the system altogether. The former is a 5 minute fix. That's all I'm suggesting.

Not to mention if someone has low contracts because they're just beginning their marketplace interactions what do you think is the next metric someone will use to gauge how trustworthy someone is? Probably reputation because post count is completely irrelevant.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 8:00 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:51 AM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I never said rep over contracts, my dude. This thread ain't about contracts it's about the glaring issue with the popularity system. It's real simple, I don't know why you keep shoving contracts into the middle. Popularity system has a problem that basically makes it redundant. If a system is redundant, by definition, there is no need for it. This leaves us with two logical courses of action: BAN buying rep/QL through "Giveaways" or remove the system altogether. The former is a 5 minute fix. That's all I'm suggesting.

Not to mention if someone has low contracts because they're just beginning their marketplace interactions what do you think is the next metric someone will use to gauge how trustworthy someone is? Probably reputation because post count is completely irrelevant.

I think your expected to have a brain, it's called popularity not reputation.

You just want the old way back and sorry it's dead.

Athr - July 4, 2022, 8:20 am

(Jul 4, 2022 07:51 AM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I never said rep over contracts, my dude. This thread ain't about contracts it's about the glaring issue with the popularity system. It's real simple, I don't know why you keep shoving contracts into the middle. Popularity system has a problem that basically makes it redundant. If a system is redundant, by definition, there is no need for it. This leaves us with two logical courses of action: BAN buying rep/QL through "Giveaways" or remove the system altogether. The former is a 5 minute fix. That's all I'm suggesting.

I agree with the sentiment, but its not that easy.

It took a lot of energy from staff and admins to enforce the reputation system.

People were participating in rep4rep through Skype groups/ off the forum.

People complained to the admins/staff if they got a rep which they thought was unjustified.

Omni has decided that the hassle is simply not worth it.

Laughing Man - July 4, 2022, 8:31 am

(Jul 4, 2022 08:20 AM)Athr Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I agree with the sentiment, but its not that easy.

It took a lot of energy from staff and admins to enforce the reputation system.

People were participating in rep4rep through Skype groups/ off the forum.

People complained to the admins/staff if they got a rep which they though was unjustified.

Omni has decided that the hassle is simply not worth it.

THIS!

Gary - July 4, 2022, 8:34 am

(Jul 4, 2022 08:20 AM)Athr Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I agree with the sentiment, but its not that easy. It took a lot of energy from staff and admins to enforce the reputation system. People were participating in rep4rep through Skype groups/ off the forum. People complained to the admins/staff if they got a rep which they though was unjustified.

Omni has decided that the hassle is simply not worth it.
lol I have a PM from Omni saying stop asking for rep in skype

Lyrice - July 4, 2022, 5:05 pm

(Jul 3, 2022 07:57 PM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Allowing contests that require you to leave a +rating and QL are fucking stupid as shit. It's the HF version of pay-to-win gaming. People are just buying good social standing and that severely undermines the value and credibility of social currency as a system.

Whoa, this guy has a lot of +rep he must be trusted part of the community right? Oh, wait, no, he just did a \$50 ETH giveaway.

This should legitimately be removed and be a bannable offense.
It used to be like this, a bannable offense. I guess forum died out too much to not allow it.

Raymond Reddington - July 5, 2022, 5:57 am

I think the people who still use reputation/popularity/QL (haven't heard of anyone using QLs) as a metric for measuring the trust of a user is wrong. B-Ratings is what should be used to assess if the user you're dealing with is trusted or not, because they define the users past Marketplace history & deals. (since 2018 at least, which is 4 years ago so that's a considerable time to build up your own deals)

The main reason why Reputation was renamed to Popularity was just to reduce its relevance even further when you look for factors that indicate a member's trust. It doesn't matter as much as it used to anymore, any user who still considers it as a metric to measure "trust" is severely mistaken because it's fairly easy to farm popularity, not just from contests, but just from members directly.

As [Gary](#) mentioned above issues like rep abuse, rep4rep, gang rep were rampant prior to the Contract System. You couldn't recognize if a user gained rep as a result of several smooth Marketplace deals, farmed those reps from giveaways, or engaged in rep4reps to build their profile (to eventually scam, as some people would do). With B-Ratings in the mix, the user would have to conduct several hundred deals as opposed to just simply farming reputation like they did in the past.

Zexi - July 5, 2022, 6:33 am

Who cares? Popularity doesn't mean shit and you can't see how many QLs he got in total. If you were to go first with someone based on popularity amount, especially considering the popularity comments are canned and none of them have anything to do with market place, you are a idiot.

The contest/giveaways that were held with the requirement of +rep or QLs are just attempts to get the Member of the Month Award. Simple as that.

edwofm - July 5, 2022, 7:23 am

(Jul 3, 2022 07:57 PM)Dehyped | ?? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Allowing contests that require you to leave a +rating and QL are fucking stupid as shit. It's the HF version of pay-to-win gaming. People are just buying good social standing and that severely undermines the value and credibility of social currency as a system.

Whoa, this guy has a lot of +rep he must be trusted part of the community right? Oh, wait, no, he

just did a \$50 ETH giveaway.

This should legitimately be removed and be a bannable offense.

Im literally agree with this i mean why would you trust an guy who can probably get himself some bots and make an discord channel and then just create an channel with reps and every rep is +rep cause if someone puts -rep he will definety ban them so i would never do that like most of these kids use the "rep" thing to make you trust them but nah dawg.

Lilith - July 5, 2022, 11:33 am

The popularity system, ever since it go reintroduced as such, is for vanity. Plain and simple.

Rionxee - July 5, 2022, 11:35 am

It got me the two awards I wanted, it works for what you need it for.

SoulHarvester - July 5, 2022, 11:36 am

Had no clue this all still played a role in MOTM. Not that I have ever seriously pursued this award but I suppose buying you way up to it is.. rather interesting.