

Unless otherwise noted, the content of this course material is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution - Non-Commercial - Share Alike 3.0 License.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Copyright 2008, Jeffrey K. MacKie-Mason

You assume all responsibility for use and potential liability associated with any use of the material. Material contains copyrighted content, used in accordance with U.S. law. Copyright holders of content included in this material should contact open.michigan@umich.edu with any questions, corrections, or clarifications regarding the use of content. The Regents of the University of Michigan do not license the use of third party content posted to this site unless such a license is specifically granted in connection with particular content objects. Users of content are responsible for their compliance with applicable law. Mention of specific products in this recording solely represents the opinion of the speaker and does not represent an endorsement by the University of Michigan.

Case: Screening pollution at Digg.com

SI 680, ICD: Signaling and Contracting
Prof. Jeff MacKie-Mason

April 7, 2008

Read:

- Anthony Richard Hung. A brief history of the digg controversy, August 2006. URL <http://www.deepjiveinterests.com/2006/08/25/a-brief-history-of-digg-controversy>
- Silicon Valley Sleuth. Could digg be used for sun stock manipulation?, March 2006. URL http://www.siliconvalleysleuth.com/2006/03/digg_is_used_fo.html
- Michael Gray. Digg, sun, and google the tale of market manipulation, 2006. URL [threadwatch.org](http://www.threadwatch.org/node/5921), <http://www.threadwatch.org/node/5921>
- Annalee Newlitz. I bought votes on digg. *Wired*, March 2007. URL <http://www.wired.com/techbiz/people/news/2007/03/72832>
- Jeffrey K. MacKie-Mason. Tom sawyer production on the internet: Getting the good stuff in, keeping the bad stuff out. November 2007

Come prepared to discuss the following:

1. If you wanted to simplify and characterize Digg contributors as either “High” types or “Low” types, how would you describe the two types to distinguish them (from Digg’s point of view), in a sentence or two?
2. Why does Digg not want content from the “Low” types? Are there circumstances (in the current design of Digg) in which it might want such content?
3. In what way is the cost of signaling higher for the “Low” types than for the “High” in the mechanism described in [MacKie-Mason, 2007]?

4. In what way is the metadata (voting) in that mechanism essential for it to operate as an effective signal?
5. Suppose Digg decided that its main problem is not that people submit pollution-quality content, but that readers using the standard “Digg it” system (for selecting what is on the front page; not the MacKie-Mason [2007] hypothetical system) might manipulate the voting. What is the main problem you see with trying to apply the MacKie-Mason [2007] metadata mechanism to reader “Digging”?¹

¹There are two types of voting discussed in this case; keep them straight in your mind. Digg currently has voting (“Digging”) in which readers vote whether something should be on the front page. MacKie-Mason [2007] proposes a second system of voting on top concerning “truthfulness”.