

# Big Canoe Primary Voting Analysis

by ChatGPT 3o

## Background:

**A Question was asked by a Property Owner:** “In the upcoming primary, how many POA Board candidates may we vote for? “

**An Election Committee Member answered:** “4”

---

## ChatGPT Analysis:

**ChatGPT Followup Question:** if there are 6 candidates for a position, but only 4 can run in a final election, what issues arise when all voters are allowed 4 votes in the primary?

### **ChatGPT Answer:**

When the **primary whittles 6 candidates down to 4 but each voter may cast 4 votes (block voting)** several structural problems show up:

Issue	What happens in practice	Why it matters
<b>True support is hard to see</b>	A voter can mark four names—two they love and two they barely know—so totals blur enthusiasm with “fill-in” selections. Almost every candidate can rack up a large share of the available votes.	Margins between 4th and 5th place shrink; results are sensitive to random or name-order effects and invite recount disputes.
<b>Ties &amp; razor-thin eliminations</b>	Each voter is distributing $4 \times$ (number of voters) votes across only 6 candidates. With that much surplus, ties or one-vote differences at the cutoff become likely.	A coin-flip or ad-hoc tie-breaker could decide who’s eliminated, undermining legitimacy.
<b>Bullet-voting incentives</b>	Savvy voters may cast <b>only 1 or 2 votes</b> (for their favorites) to avoid helping rivals. Others still use all 4, giving strategic voters disproportionate impact.	Unequal voting strategies distort the outcome and punish less-informed voters who “use all their votes.”
<b>Majority slate sweep</b>	A well-organized faction can instruct supporters to vote the same 4-candidate slate. Because each ballot has four equal votes, that bloc can reliably push its entire slate into the top four, crowding out minority-preferred candidates.	Reduces diversity of viewpoints in the final; encourages slate politics over individual merit.
<b>Redundant primary</b>	Eliminating only two candidates after giving everyone four votes often changes little: the eventual winners were almost certain to be in the top four anyway.	Wastes time and money; creates voter fatigue without adding meaningful filtering.
<b>Perception of unfairness</b>	Voters who see their favorite drop from 5th to out-of-the-running—possibly by a handful of stray “extra” votes—may question the rules.	Damages confidence in the election and in the organization running it.

**Alternatives that avoid these pitfalls**

- **Single-vote primary** (each voter picks one; top 4 advance)
- **Approval or ranked-choice** with a sensible cutoff rule
- **Two-round plurality** (top 2 advance per seat, or skip primary altogether because only two candidates are being eliminated)

In short, allowing four votes in a six-person primary floods the tally with surplus marks, masks true preferences, and invites tactical behavior—often producing an outcome that feels arbitrary or slate-driven rather than representative.

---

### **Property Owner Conclusion:**

The 4 Vote Primary favors Insider Blocks. Insiders would know the rules, and would be in a better position to stack the deck. Dissemination of “Voter Strategy” such as in this document can help to even the playing field.

It is advisable that the “4 Vote Primary” be eliminated in the interest of best of fairness, and perception.