Voting, Success, and Superstars

Last updated: 2025/12/15, 11:17:49 EST

Principles of Complex Systems,
Vols. 1, 2, 3D, 4 Fourever, V for Vendetta

Prof. Peter Sheridan Dodds

Computational Story Lab | Vermont Complex Systems Institute
University of Vermont | Santa Fe Institute

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
1 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Outline

Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab

References

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
2 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Where do superstars come from?

"The economics of superstars"
S. Rosen,
Am. Econ. Rev., **71**, 845–858, 1981. [5]

Examples:

- Full-time Comedians (≈ 200)
- Soloists in Classical Music
- Economic Textbooks (the usual myopic example)

- Highly skewed distributions again...

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
5 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Superstars

Rosen's theory:

- Individual quality q maps to reward $R(q)$.
- $R(q)$ is 'convex' ($\mathrm{d}^2 R/\mathrm{d}q^2 > 0$).
- Two reasons:
  1. **Imperfect substitution:**
     A very good surgeon is worth many mediocre ones
  2. **Technology:**
     Media spreads & technology reduces cost of reproduction of books, songs, etc.
- Joint consumption versus public good.
- No social element—success follows 'inherent quality'.

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
6 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Superstars

"Stardom and Talent"
Moshe Adler,
American Economic Review, **75**, 208–212, 1985. [1]

- "Consumption capital": "Appreciation [of music] increases with knowledge. But how does one know about music? By listening to it, *and discussing it with other persons who know about it.*"
- Assumes extreme case of equal 'inherent quality'
- Argues desire for coordination in knowledge and culture leads to differential success
- Success can be purely a social construction
- (How can we measure 'inherent quality'?)

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
7 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Voting

Evidence from the web suggests (Huberman et al.)

1. Easy decisions (yes/no) lead to bandwagoning
   - e.g. jyte.com
2. More costly evaluations lead to oppositional votes
   - e.g. amazon.com

- **Self-selection:** Costly voting may lower incentives for those who agree with the current assessment and increase incentives for those who disagree.

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
8 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Voting

Score-based voting versus rank-based voting:

"A theory of measuring, electing, and ranking"
Balinski and Laraki,
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., **104**, 8720–8725, 2007. [2]

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
9 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Voting

"Aggregating partial, local evaluations to achieve global ranking"
Laureti, Moret, and Zhang,
Physica A, **345**, 705–712, 2004. [4]

- Model: participants rank n objects based on underlying quality q
- Assume evaluation of object i is a random variable with mean q_i
- Choose objects based on votes:

$$p_i(t) \propto v_i(t)^\alpha \text{ or } p_i(t) \propto q_i v_i(t)^\alpha.$$

- If $\alpha < 1$, correct quality ordering is uncovered
- If $\alpha > 1$, some objects are never evaluated and mistakes are made...
- Related to Adler's approach
- Tragic reality: Laureti et al.'s paper has 7 citations ($\alpha > 1$)

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and Superstars
10 of 26
Winning: it's not for everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Dominance hierarchies

"Individual differences versus social dynamics in the formation of animal dominance hierarchies"
Chase et al.,
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., **99**, 5744-5749, 2002. [3]

- The aggressive female Metriaclima zebra:

- Pecking orders for fish...

Dominance hierarchies

Fish forget—changing of dominance hierarchies:

22 observations: about 3/4 of the time, hierarchy changed

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
12 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Dominance hierarchies

Methods of Forming Hierarchies

Group versus isolated interactions produce different hierarchies

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
13 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

48 songs
30,000 participants

multiple 'worlds'
Inter-world variability

How probable is the world?

Can we estimate variability?

Superstars dominate but are unpredictable. Why?

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
15 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

"An experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market" ⬀
Salganik, Dodds, and Watts,
Science, **311**, 854–856, 2006. [6]

Music Lab Experiment

Experiment 1   Experiments 2–4

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
16 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment


Variability in final rank.

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
17 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
18 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

Variability in final number of downloads.

Music Lab Experiment

Inequality as measured by Gini coefficient:

$$G = \frac{1}{(2N_s - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} |m_i - m_j|$$

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
19 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

Unpredictability

$$U = \frac{1}{N_s \binom{N_w}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^{N_w} \sum_{k=j+1}^{N_w} |m_{i,j} - m_{i,k}|$$

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
20 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
21 of 26

Winning: it's not for
everyone

Superstars

Musiclab

References

Music Lab Experiment

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
22 of 26
Winning: it's not for
everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

Sensible result:

- ♣ Stronger social signal leads to greater following and greater inequality.

Peculiar result:

- ♣ Stronger social signal leads to greater unpredictability.

Very peculiar observation:

- ♣ The most unequal distributions would suggest the greatest variation in underlying 'quality.'
- ♣ But success may be due to social construction through following. (so let's tell a story... [8, 9])

Music Lab Experiment—Sneakiness [7]

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
23 of 26
Winning: it's not for
everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

- ♣ Inversion of download count
- ♣ The pretend rich get richer ...
- ♣ ... but at a slower rate

References I

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
24 of 26
Winning: it's not for
everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

[1] M. Adler.
Stardom and talent.
American Economic Review, pages 208–212, 1985. pdf

[2] M. Balinski and R. Laraki.
A theory of measuring, electing, and ranking.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 104(21):8720–8725, 2007. pdf

[3] I. D. Chase, C. Tovey, D. Spangler-Martin, and
M. Manfredonia.
Individual differences versus social dynamics in the formation
of animal dominance hierarchies.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 99(8):5744–5749, 2002. pdf

[4] P. Laureti, L. Moret, and Y.-C. Zhang.
Aggregating partial, local evaluations to achieve global ranking.
Physica A, 345(3–4):705–712, 2004. pdf

References II

[5] S. Rosen.
The economics of superstars.
Am. Econ. Rev., 71:845–858, 1981. pdf

[6] M. J. Salganik, P. S. Dodds, and D. J. Watts.
An experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an
artificial cultural market.
Science, 311:854–856, 2006. pdf

[7] M. J. Salganik and D. J. Watts.
Leading the herd astray: An experimental study of
self-fulfilling prophecies in an artificial cultural market.
Social Psychology Quarterl, 71:338–355, 2008. pdf

[8] C. R. Sunstein.
Infotopia: How many minds produce knowledge.
Oxford University Press, New York, 2006.

References III

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
25 of 26
Winning: it's not for
everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References

[9] N. N. Taleb.
The Black Swan.
Random House, New York, 2007.

The PoCSverse
Voting, Success, and
Superstars
26 of 26
Winning: it's not for
everyone
Superstars
Musiclab
References