## Exam 4 Review

## Example

Ted and Riva must split 8 items between the two of them. They decided to use the adjusted winner procedure. How should these items be divided?

Step 1

| Item | Ted | Riva |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Movies | 20 | 3 |
| CDs | 30 | 20 |
| Couch | 3 | 4 |
| Toaster | 10 | 16 |
| TV | 15 | 22 |
| Printer | 13 | 23 |
| Chair | 7 | 10 |
| Rug | 2 | 2 |

Step 2

Step 4

| Item | Point Ratio |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Step 3

The initial winner is

The initial loser is

## Example

Aiden, Beverley, Charlie, and Danielle have inherited a house and a car to share equally. They each submit sealed bids for both items. Describe a fair division of these items using the Knaster Inheritance procedure (tell who gets each item and how much money each person gets or pays).

House
Step 1 Aiden bid \$120,000
Beverley bid \$140,000
Charlie bid \$150,000
Danielle bid \$115,000
Step 2 $\qquad$ gets the house and places $\qquad$ in a holding account. Holding Acct:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Steps } & \text { Aiden } \\ \mathbf{3 - 4} & \text { Beverley }\end{array}$
Charlie
Danielle
Step 5 Aiden
Beverley
Charlie
Danielle

## Example

Four people were bidding for tickets to concert. Owen bid \$400, Madeline bid $\$ 350$, Sofia bid $\$ 420$, and Samuel bid $\$ 380$.
(a) Who wins the tickets?
(b) How much does he/she pay for the tickets?

## Example

People are bidding on a vacation package on eBay. The minimum bid was set at $\$ 500$, and the bid increment is $\$ 8$. Complete the following chart to show the progress of the auction before time ran out.
(a)

| Bidder | Bid | Current Winner | Current eBay bid |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Lily | $\$ 800$ | Lily | $\$ 500$ |
| Nora | $\$ 600$ |  |  |
| Devin | $\$ 650$ |  |  |
| Nora | $\$ 750$ |  |  |
| Samuel | $\$ 850$ |  |  |
| Lily | $\$ 1500$ |  |  |
| Samuel | $\$ 950$ |  |  |

(b) Who won the auction?
(c) How much did he/she pay for the vacation package?

## Example

A county has 11 representatives to apportion to the towns listed below.
(a) Apportion the representatives using the Hamilton method.

| Town | Pop. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | 1500 |  |
| B | 2200 |  |
| C | 1640 |  |
| D | 50 |  |

(b) Apportion the representatives using the Jefferson method.

| Town | Pop. | $q$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | 1500 | 3.061 |  |
| B | 2200 | 4.490 |  |
| C | 1640 | 3.347 |  |
| D | 50 | 0.102 |  |

$d=$
(c) Apportion the representatives using the Webster method.

| Town | Pop. | $q$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | 1500 | 3.061 |  |
| B | 2200 | 4.490 |  |
| C | 1640 | 3.347 |  |
| D | 50 | 0.102 |  |

$d=$
(d) Apportion the representatives using the Hill-Huntington method.

| Town | Pop. | $q$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | 1500 | 3.061 |  |
| B | 2200 | 4.490 |  |
| C | 1640 | 3.347 |  |
| D | 50 | 0.102 |  |

$d=$
The Jefferson method favors large states. The Hill-Huntington method favors small states.

## Example

Label each situation with one of the following five choices:
A. The Alabama paradox occurred.
B. The population paradox occurred.
C. The new states paradox occurred.
D. The quota condition was violated.
E. The quota condition was NOT violated, and no paradox occurred.
(a) A new state was added (along with a proportionate number of representatives) and yielded the following apportionments using the Hamilton method.

| State | Original <br> Apportionment | New <br> Apportionment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 8 | 8 |
| H | 5 | 5 |
| I | 3 | 3 |
| J |  | 2 |

(b) The seats were apportioned using the Jefferson method.

| State | quota | Jeff. App. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 124.05 | 124 |
| H | 43.27 | 43 |
| I | 5.94 | 6 |

(c) A new state was added (along with a proportionate number of representatives) and yielded the following apportionments using the Hamilton method.

| State | Original <br> Apportionment | New <br> Apportionment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 8 | 7 |
| H | 5 | 6 |
| I | 3 | 3 |
| J |  | 2 |

(d) The house size changed from 8 to 9 and yielded the following apportionments using the Hamilton method.

| State | House Size 8 | House Size 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 5 | 4 |
| H | 3 | 4 |
| I | 0 | 1 |

(e) As the population changes, the representation is reapportioned using the Hamilton method.

| State | Original <br> Apportionment | New <br> Apportionment | Absolute Pop <br> Change | Relative <br> Pop Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 14 | 14 | 1000 | $1.1 \%$ |
| H | 13 | 14 | 1200 | $3 \%$ |
| I | 16 | 15 | 1400 | $2 \%$ |

(f) As the population changes, the representation is reapportioned using the Hamilton method.

| State | Original <br> Apportionment | New <br> Apportionment | Absolute Pop <br> Change | Relative <br> Pop Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 14 | 14 | 1000 | $1.1 \%$ |
| H | 13 | 14 | 1200 | $1.5 \%$ |
| I | 16 | 15 | 1400 | $2 \%$ |

(g) The seats were apportioned using the Jefferson method.

| State | quota | Jeff. App. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | 124.95 | 126 |
| H | 43.27 | 43 |
| I | 5.34 | 5 |

