

# From One to Many When Groups—Not Czars— Make Decisions

**Charles E. Phelps, Ph.D.**

University of Rochester  
and

**Guru Madhavan, Ph.D.**

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine

## About Us



**Charles Phelps, Ph.D.**, a health economist, is University Professor and Provost Emeritus at the University of Rochester. He is a co-developer of SMART Vaccines and author of *Health Economics*, now in its 6th edition. He is a member of the National Academy of Medicine.

[charles.phelps@rochester.edu](mailto:charles.phelps@rochester.edu)



**Guru Madhavan, Ph.D.**, a biomedical engineer, is a Senior Program Officer at the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. He is a co-developer of SMART Vaccines, and has been named a distinguished young scientist by the World Economic Forum.

[gmadhavan@nas.edu](mailto:gmadhavan@nas.edu)

# Workshop Agenda

## 8:50 am: Primer: Social Choice Mechanisms

- *Review of voting methods*
- *Examples of how rules influence results.*

## 9:15 am: Hands-On Voting

- *Presenting six investment choices for decision.*
- *Prioritizing these choices using different voting methods.*

## 9:35 am: Discussion

- *Which would you choose for formal group decisions?*
- *What did you like and dislike about each?*

## 9:45 am: Adjourn

3

## Two bad ways for groups to choose

Designate a dictator



Unstructured debate



4

## A Better Way: Voting

- If  $K = 2$ , majority rule almost universally accepted.
- If  $K \geq 3$ , things get very messy.
- We will focus on voting systems for  $K \geq 3$  choices.

5

## Technical Factors in Social Choice

- **Kenneth Arrow's "Impossibility Theorem"**
  - *Always produces a winner.*
  - *No rank reversal.*
  - *Unanimity rule.*
  - *No dictator.*
- **Strategic Voting**
  - *Vulnerable to manipulation.*
- **Dueling Criteria**
  - *How often do they happen?*
  - *When do they matter?*



Nature, 12 January 2017,  
Vol 541, pages 151-153.

6

## Human Factors in Social Choice

- Ease of use.
- Frustrations.
- Ability to express one's viewpoint.
- Understanding how the method works.
- Ultimate effect on participation.

**None of these are considered in the literature or tested in reality!**

7

## Inputs and their Richness of Expression

| Inputs<br>(Voting Method)                   | Calculating the number<br>of expressions | Number of expressions<br>with K = 5 Candidates       |
|---|--|--|
| Choose<br>(Select 1 candidate)              | $K$                                      | 5  |
| Approve<br>(Select all whom you<br>approve) | $2^K$                                    | 32   |
| Rank<br>(1, 2,3..K)                         | $K!$                                     | 120  |
| Grade<br>(A, B, C, , E, F)                  | $N^K$<br>For N grades (A,B,C etc.)       | 7776 with N = 6 grades<br>(> 1 million allowing +/-) |
| Distribute<br>(Spread 100 points)           | $M!/[K! * (M-K)!]$                       | 73.5 million for M = 100                             |
| Score<br>(0 to 100)                         | $M^K$                                    | 10 billion if M = 99                                 |

## The Inputs

- **Choose**
  - Select 1 candidate
- **Approve**
  - Select all whom you approve
- **Rank**
  - 1,2,3...K
- **Grade**
  - Categorically, A, B, C, D, E, F
- **Distribute**
  - Spread 100 points
- **Score**
  - 0 to 100

## The Algorithms

- **Totals or means**
  - **Runoff**
  - **Score-summing**
- **Truncated means**
- **Medians**
- **Pairwise majority**
- **Other complex mathematical systems**

## Combining Inputs and Algorithms

- **Choose:** Plurality of votes or runoff election.
- **Approve:** Total approvals.
- **Rank:** Borda Count, Instant Runoff, Coombs, Nanson, Baldwin, and many others (score-summing), Condorcet (also Copeland), and Bucklin. Many other variants.
- **Grade:** Medians with tie-breaking rules.
- **Distribute:** Point summing.
- **Score:** Sums of 0 to 100 scores.

## Rules Matter: A Demonstration

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

- **A**, most-liked and most-disliked.
- **B**, generally well-liked, disliked by few.
- **C**, neither liked a lot nor heavily disliked.
- **D**, similar to A, either liked or disliked a lot, but not as much as A.

Source: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/voting-methods/>

11

## Vote for One

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

Plurality: A wins (7 votes)

Run-off: A defeats B (10 votes to 9)

Final Ranking: A > B > D > C

**What happens if 3 voters drop out of the runoff election due to disgust for choice?  
(Winner: B not A!)**

12

## Plurality vs. Runoff: Gore vs. Bush in US 2000 Presidential Election

- Florida's outcome determined the final Electoral College winner
- The actual vote totals:
  - Bush 2,912,790 (48.84682%) **> 537 votes (of 5.9 million)**
  - Gore 2,912,253 (43.83782%)
  - Nader 97,488
  - All others 40,579 (split approximately evenly between far left and far right)
- Presence of Ralph Nader tipped Florida to Bush
- If runoff had been used, Gore almost certain winner
  - and hence, US President

13

## Using Ranks: Borda Count

$$\mathbf{A's\ total: } 7 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 9 = 24$$

$$\mathbf{B's\ total: } 5 \cdot 3 + 11 \cdot 2 + 0 \cdot 1 + 3 \cdot 0 = \mathbf{37}$$

$$\mathbf{C's\ total: } 3 \cdot 3 + 5 \cdot 2 + 11 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 0 = 30$$

$$\mathbf{D's\ total: } 4 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 2 + 5 \cdot 1 + 7 \cdot 0 = 23$$

**Final Ranking: B > C > A > D**

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

14

## Using Ranks: Condorcet Rule

- No Condorcet winner exists with this voter profile (10 votes needed to win)
  - A vs. B: **A wins** 10-9
  - A vs. C: **C wins** 12-7
  - A vs. D: **D wins** 12-7
  - B vs. C: **B wins** 16-3
  - B vs. D: **B wins** 12-7
  - C vs. D: **C wins** 15-4
- A wins against B but loses to C and D
- B wins vs. C and D but loses to A
- C wins against A and D, but loses to B
- D wins against A but loses to B and C

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

15

## Duncan Black Rule

- Use Condorcet first
- If no Condorcet winner, use Borda Count
- **Factoid: Duncan Black (1908-1991)**
  - Born in Motherwell, Scotland (near here).
  - Undergraduate (physics and economics) and PhD (economics) degrees Univ. of Glasgow.
  - Major figure in social choice theory.

16



## Serial Elimination with Ranks

- **Instant Runoff**
  - Drop candidate with fewest first place votes.
- **Coombs Method**
  - Drop candidate with most last place votes.
- **Nanson's Rule**
  - Drop candidates with below average Borda count.
- **Baldwin's Rule**
  - Drop candidate with lowest Borda count.

Very similar rules → very different winners!

17

## Methods Absolutely Matter!

- **Plurality Voting:**  $A > B > D > C$
- **Runoff Voting:**  $A > B > D > C$
- **Borda Count:**  $B > C > A > D$
- **Condorcet Voting:** No winner
  - **Duncan Black Rule:** If no winner, use Borda

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

- **Instant Runoff:**  $D > A > B > C$
- **Coombs Rule:**  $B > C > D > A$
- **Nanson Method:**  $B > C > A > D$
- **Baldwin Voting:**  $A > B > C > D$

18

## “Phelps Rule”

- Use Borda Count, but make last place = -3, not zero

$$\text{A's total: } 7 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 1 + -3 \cdot 9 = -3$$

$$\text{B's total: } 5 \cdot 3 + 11 \cdot 2 + 0 \cdot 1 + -3 \cdot 3 = 28$$

$$\text{C's total: } 3 \cdot 3 + 5 \cdot 2 + 11 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 0 = \mathbf{30}$$

$$\text{D's total: } 4 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 2 + 5 \cdot 1 - 3 \cdot 7 = 2$$

**Final Ranking: C > B > D > A**

**We finally have a rule where C wins!**

| # Voters |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 7        | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| A        | B | D | C |
| B        | C | B | D |
| C        | D | C | A |
| D        | A | A | B |

19

## Other Voting Methods

- **Four new voting methods that different inputs**
  - **Approval voting** – indicate all of which you approve
  - **Dotmocracy** – assign 100 points across the candidates
  - **Range voting** – assign 0 – 100 points to each candidate
  - **Majority judgment** – grade each candidate (A,B,... F)
- **Probably novel to you.**
- **Not influenced by Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem**
  - Arrow’s theorem presumes rank order inputs

20

## PART III: Putting it in Practice

We will now ask you to prioritize 6 hypothetical interventions using the following voting methods:

1. Vote for One (choosing)
2. Approval Voting (approving)
3. Rank Order (ranking)
4. Dotmocracy (assigning)
5. Range voting (scoring)
6. Majority Judgment (grading)

21

## Implied Consent

- We plan on using these voting results to analyze how people feel about human factors in voting methods.
- By completing the ballots in this workshop, you consent to our using your data in our analyses.
- Any results reported will be completely anonymous.

22

## A Realistic Scenario

- You are a deciding authority in the U.K. National Health Services.
- Your fixed budget will cover one or more, but not all of the options under consideration.
- Your priority order will determine final investments for the public programs.

23

## Critical Investment Choices in your Portfolio

1. **Imaging Technology** (e.g., new PET, CT, MRI scanners) across the health system.
2. **Drug R&D** to delay **Alzheimer's** onset by 5 years.
3. **Public health program** for weight loss and smoking cessation.
4. Priority funding for **research** on Huntington's disease gene therapy through Medical Research Council.
5. **Vaccines** to prevent Ebola.
6. Increase clinical **staffing** by 10 percent.

24

## First Ballot: Vote For One

### Instructions

Mark your ballot with an X beside your favorite.

### Algorithm

Priority will be determined by the number of votes received by each option.

## Second Ballot: Approval Voting

### Instructions

- Mark your ballot with an X beside each that you approve of (from one to six).
- In your own words, describe what “approve” means to you.

### Algorithm

Priority to be determined by total number of approvals for each option.

## Third Ballot: Rank Order

### Instructions

- Rank the choices from 1,.... 6 on your ballot
- No ties are allowed.

### Algorithm

Priority to be determined using Borda count.

## Fourth Ballot: Dotmocracy

### Instructions

- Allocate a total of 100 points across the available choices.
- If you add wrong, we'll correct the total using same proportions.

### Algorithm

Ranking to be determined by total points assigned to each choice across all voters.

## Fifth Ballot: Range Voting

### Instructions

- Assign a score (0 to 100) for each choice (If you assign no score, we will assume it is zero).
- In your own words, tell us what 0 and 100 mean.

### Algorithm

Ranking will be determined by total points assigned to each choice.

## Sixth Ballot: Majority Judgment

### Instructions

- Grade every choice using the following grades

A = Excellent

D = Fair

B = Very Good

E = Poor

C = Good

F = Unacceptable

(You need not use every grade. You may assign same grade to multiple choices. If you wish, you may add +/- designations to any grade).

### Algorithm

Ranking to be determined by median grades, using standard “teeter-totter” methods to break ties when two or more choices have same median grade.

## Survey: Human Factors Feedback

- **Ease of use**
- **Ability to express preferences.**
- **Understanding how the method works.**
- **Which would you use (and recommend to others) in practice?**

31

## Take Home Message

- **Choice of voting method can alter the outcome.**
- **Human factors need more attention.**
- **Homework: How do you pick a voting method to choose among voting methods?**  
**(Answer: Out of thin air!)**



32



**Thank you for your participation!**



## **Contact Information**



**Charles Phelps:** [charles.phelps@rochester.edu](mailto:charles.phelps@rochester.edu)

**Guru Madhavan:** [gmadhavan@nas.edu](mailto:gmadhavan@nas.edu)