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Voting for c4l talks is like electing a parliament.

‘Majoritarian’: top-rated talks are chosen with no representation for small parties.

Each voter is given unlimited votes, and can assign them 0-3 for each talk.
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‘Majoritarian’: top-rated talks are chosen with no representation for small parties.

Each voter is given unlimited votes, and can assign them 0-3 for each talk.
This makes no sense.
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  - Each voter gets $n$ votes to divide among candidates, 1 per candidate.
  - Highest votes win.
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Strategy

- Choose your top 22 talks
- Given them each 3 votes
- Every other talk gets nothing
What now?

If everybody follows this strategy, c4l voting is reduced to plurality-at-large, because everybody will do this.
Fix

- Limit points users can assign (to number of candidates)
- and/or only allow users to give one vote (point) to each talk
- Or adopt a proportional representation system.
Further reading
