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## Where do superstars come from?

## Rosen (1981): "The Economics of Superstars" ${ }^{[5]}$

## Examples:

- Full-time Comedians ( $\approx 200$ )
- Soloists in Classical Music
- Economic Textbooks (the usual myopic example)
- Highly skewed distributions again...


## 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'


## Superstars

## Adler (1985): "Stardom and Talent" ${ }^{[1]}$

- 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'?)


## Voting

## Evidence from the web suggestions (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.


## Voting

## Score-based voting versus rank-based voting:

- Balinski and Laraki ${ }^{[2]}$ "A theory of measuring, electing, and ranking" Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., pp. 8720-8725 (2007)

つQく 10 of 27

## Voting

Laureti et al. (2004): "Aggregating partial, local evaluations to achieve global ranking" ${ }^{[4]}$

- 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
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## Dominance hierarchies

## Chase et al. (2002): "Individual differences versus

 social dynamics in the formation of animal dominance hierarchies" ${ }^{[3]}$- The aggressive female Metriaclima zebra:

- Pecking orders for fish...


## Dominance hierarchies

Fish forget-changing of dominance hierarchies:

| 1st |
| :---: |
| Hierarchy |${ }^{2} \longrightarrow$| 2nd |
| :---: |
| Hierarchy |

$\mathrm{A} \longrightarrow \mathrm{A}$
(6)

(4)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(1)

- 22 observations: about $3 / 4$ of the time, hierarchy changed
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## Dominance hierarchies
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- Group versus isolated interactions produce different hierarchies


## Music Lab Experiment



FREE MUSIC DOWiLOATS
48 songs
30,000 participants

multiple 'worlds' Inter-world variability
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- How probable is the world?
- Can we estimate variability?
- Superstars dominate but are unpredictable. Why?

UNIVERSITY IV VERMONT

## Music Lab Experiment
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Salganik et al. (2006) "An experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market" ${ }^{[6]}$
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## Music Lab Experiment

Experiment 1


Experiments 2－4
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## Music Lab Experiment




- Variability in final rank.
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## Music Lab Experiment
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- Variability in final number of downloads.
$\left|\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 0\end{array}\right|$


## Music Lab Experiment



Experiment 2


- Inequality as measured by Gini coefficient:

$$
G=\frac{1}{\left(2 N_{\mathrm{s}}-1\right)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathrm{s}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\mathrm{s}}}\left|m_{i}-m_{j}\right|
$$

 VVERMONT

## Music Lab Experiment
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- Unpredictability

$$
U=\frac{1}{N_{\mathrm{s}}\binom{N_{\mathrm{w}}}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathrm{s}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\mathrm{w}}} \sum_{k=j+1}^{N_{\mathrm{w}}}\left|m_{i, j}-m_{i, k}\right|
$$
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## Music Lab Experiment

## 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... ${ }^{[7,8]}$ )
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## Music Lab Experiment-Sneakiness
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- Inversion of download count
- The pretend rich get richer ...
- ... but at a slower rate
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