

# Influencer Cartels\*

Marit Hinnosaar<sup>†</sup>

Toomas Hinnosaar<sup>‡</sup>

May 17, 2024

## Abstract

Social media influencers account for a growing share of marketing worldwide. We demonstrate the existence of a novel form of market failure in this advertising market: influencer cartels, where groups of influencers collude to increase their advertising revenue by inflating their engagement. Our theoretical model shows that influencer cartels can improve consumer welfare if they expand social media engagement to the target audience, or reduce welfare if they divert engagement to less relevant audiences. We validate the model empirically using novel data on influencer cartels combined with machine learning tools, and derive policy implications for how to maximize consumer welfare.

JEL: L82, M31, D26, L14

Keywords: influencers, marketing, collusion, Natural Language Processing, Large Language Models, Latent Dirichlet Allocation

## 1 Introduction

Collusion between a group of market participants to improve their market outcomes is typically considered an anti-competitive behavior. While some forms of collusion,

---

\*We thank John Horton, Dina Mayzlin, Johanna Rickne, Stephen P. Ryan, Stephan Seiler, and seminar participants at University of East Anglia, University of Leicester, University of Nottingham, Collegio Carlo Alberto, Mannheim Virtual IO Seminar, UK Competition and Markets Authority, 12th Paris Conference on Digital Economics, IIOC, Munich Summer Institute, Baltic Economics Conference, Australasian Meeting of the Econometric Society, NBER Summer Institute on IT and Digitization, Econometric Society European Meeting, EARIE, NIE Annual Conference, 13th Workshop on the Economics of Advertising and Marketing, Bristol-Warwick Empirical IO Workshop, Berlin IO Day, 6th Monash-Warwick-Zurich Text-as-Data Workshop, and CESifo Economics of Digitization Conference for helpful comments and suggestions. First draft: February 12, 2021.

<sup>†</sup>University of Nottingham and CEPR, [marit.hinnosaar@gmail.com](mailto:marit.hinnosaar@gmail.com)

<sup>‡</sup>University of Nottingham and CEPR, [toomas@hinnosaar.net](mailto:toomas@hinnosaar.net)

such as price-fixing, are illegal in most countries, new industries provide new collusion opportunities for which regulation is not yet well-developed. In this paper, we study one such industry—influencer marketing. Influencer marketing combines paid endorsements and product placements by influencers. It allows advertisers fine targeting based on consumer interests by choosing a good product-influencer-consumer match. Influencer marketing is a large and growing industry, with 31 billion U.S. dollars in ad spending in 2023, it is almost as large as the print newspaper advertising.<sup>1</sup>

Many non-celebrity influencers are not paid based on the success of their marketing campaigns; instead, their compensation depends on past engagement.<sup>2</sup> This gives incentives for fraudulent behavior—for inflating their influence. Inflating one’s influence is a form of advertising fraud that leads to market inefficiencies by directing ads to the wrong eyeballs. An estimated 15% of influencer marketing spending was misused due to exaggerated influence.<sup>3</sup> To address this problem, the U.S. Federal Trade Commission in 2023 proposed a new rule that would prohibit selling and buying false indicators of social media influence, such as fake followers or views.<sup>4</sup> In this paper, we study a way of obtaining fake engagement that does not directly fall under the proposed rule, but is in the same spirit. We study influencer cartels where groups of influencers collude to increase each others’ indicators of social media influence. While there is substantial literature in economics on fake consumer reviews (Mayzlin et al., 2014; Luca and Zervas, 2016; He et al., 2022; Glazer et al., 2021; Smirnov and Starkov, 2022) and other forms of advertising fraud (Zinman and Zitzewitz, 2016; Rhodes and Wilson, 2018), the economics of this fraudulent behavior has not been studied.

We study how influencers collude to inflate engagement, and the conditions under which influencer cartels can be welfare-improving. Our research makes three key contributions. First, we develop a new theoretical framework for influencer cartels, a setting that has not been studied before. Second, we use a novel dataset of influencer cartels and machine learning tools to generate engagement quality measures from text and photos. Third, for each type of cartel, we estimate whether it is likely to be welfare-improving or not. We document that general interest cartels generate lower-quality engagement than

---

<sup>1</sup>Source: <https://www.statista.com/outlook/amo/advertising/worldwide>, accessed March 17, 2024.

<sup>2</sup>While influencers with large followings are typically paid based on campaign success (tracked through sales from personalized links or coupons), only 19% of firms employing influencer marketing tracked sales as of 2020 (ANA, 2020).

<sup>3</sup>Source: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Influencer\\_marketing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Influencer_marketing), accessed April 6, 2024.

<sup>4</sup>Source: Federal Trade Commission, June 30, 2023, “Federal Trade Commission Announces Proposed Rule Banning Fake Reviews and Testimonials”, <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/06/federal-trade-commission-announces-proposed-rule-banning-fake-reviews-testimonials>, accessed March 18, 2024.

topic-specific ones, which are closer to natural engagement. This suggests that narrow, topic cartels could improve welfare, while general interest cartels are detrimental to all involved.

In an influencer cartel, a group of influencers colludes to inflate their engagement, in order to increase the prices they can get from advertisers. Like in traditional industries, influencer cartels involve a formal agreement to manipulate the market for members' benefit. In traditional industries, the agreement typically involves price fixing or allocating markets.<sup>5</sup> Influencer cartels involve a formal agreement to inflate the engagement measures to increase their prices. Instead of smoky backroom deals, influencer cartels operate in online chat rooms or discussion boards, where members submit links to their content for additional engagement. In return, they must engage with other members' content by providing likes and comments. An algorithm enforces the cartel rules.

Our theoretical model focuses on the key market failure in this setting—the free-rider problem. Engaging with other influencers' content brings attention to someone else's content, creating a positive externality. Without cartels, influencers do not engage with each others' content enough, because they do not internalize the externality. A cartel could lessen the free-rider problem by internalizing the externality. By joining the cartel, influencers agree to engage more than the equilibrium engagement. They get compensated for this additional engagement by receiving similar engagement from other cartel members. If the cartel only brings new engagement from influencers with closely related interests, this could benefit cartel members but also consumers and advertisers.<sup>6</sup> However, the influencer cartel can also create new distortions. The cartel may overshoot and create too much low-quality engagement. The low-quality engagement may hurt all involved parties, consumers, advertisers, and indirectly, even the influencers themselves.

The dimension that separates socially beneficial cooperation from welfare-reducing cartels is the quality of engagement. By high quality we mean engagement coming from influencers with similar interests. The idea is that influencers provide value to advertisers by promoting the product among people with similar interests, e.g., vegan burgers to vegans. If a cartel generates engagement from influencers with other interests (e.g., meat-lovers), this hurts consumers and advertisers. Consumers are hurt because the platform will show them irrelevant content, and advertisers are hurt because their ads are shown to the wrong consumers. Whether or not a particular cartel is welfare-reducing or welfare-improving is an empirical question.

In our empirical analysis, we combine data from two sources: cartel interactions from Telegram and data from Instagram. Our cartel data allows us to directly observe cartel

---

<sup>5</sup>Collusion in cartels doesn't always occur via fixing prices or output (Genesove and Mullin, 2001).

<sup>6</sup>Even in traditional industries, collusion can sometimes be socially desirable (Fershtman and Pakes, 2000; Deltas et al., 2012).

activity (not predict or estimate it). We observe which Instagram posts are included in the cartel and which engagement originates from the cartel (via cartel rules).<sup>7</sup> Our dataset includes two types of cartels differentiated by cartel entry rules: three topic cartels that only accept influencers posting on specific topics and six general cartels with unrestricted topics.

We use machine learning to analyze text and photos from Instagram to measure engagement (match) quality. Our goal is to compare the quality of natural engagement to that originating from the cartel. We measure the quality by the topic match between the cartel member and the Instagram user who engages. To quantify the similarity of Instagram users, first, we use a Large Language Model (Language-agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding) and an analogous large neural network for text and photos (Contrastive Language Image Pre-training model) to generate numeric vectors (embeddings) from the text and photos in Instagram posts. Then we calculate cosine similarity between the users based on these numeric vectors. To compare the quality of natural engagement to that originating from the cartel, we estimate a panel data fixed effects regression, where the outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the cartel member to the users engaging with their content. To further analyze the topic match of influencers and users who engage with their content, we use the Latent Dirichlet Allocation model to map each Instagrammer’s content to a probability distribution over topics.

We find that engagement from general cartels is significantly lower in quality compared to natural engagement. Specifically, the quality of engagement from these cartels is nearly as low as that from a counterfactual engagement from a random Instagram user. In contrast, engagement from topic cartels is much closer to the quality of natural engagement. Our back-of-the-envelope calculations show that if an advertiser pays for cartel engagement as if it is natural engagement, they only get 3–18% of the value in the case of general cartels and 60–85% in the case of topic cartels. Our results are robust to alternative ways to construct outcome variables and alternative samples. Our estimates also validate our outcome measures: advertisers are known to pay higher fees for more engagement, and we show that users with higher similarity are more likely to engage. This implies our similarity measures capture what advertisers value.

Our empirical and theoretical results have three policy implications. First, as general cartels are likely to be welfare-reducing, shutting these cartels down would be socially beneficial. Second, regulatory rules that prohibit buying and selling fake social media in-

---

<sup>7</sup>Ability to directly observe cartel activity is rather unique. Most studies of cartels in traditional industries have to rely on either historical data of known cartels from the time cartels were legal (Porter, 1983; Genesove and Mullin, 2001; Röller and Steen, 2006; Hyytinen et al., 2018, 2019) or data from the court cases (Igami and Sugaya, 2022), including of bidding-rings in auctions (for example, Porter and Zona (1993); Pesendorfer (2000); Asker (2010); Kawai et al. (2022)), for an overview see Marshall and Marx (2012).

dicators, should also prohibit obtaining these fake indicators via in-kind transfers. Third, the current practice of advertisers to reward past engagement encourages harmful collusion. A better approach would be to compensate influencers based on the actual value they add.<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, platforms could improve the outcomes by reporting match-quality-weighted engagement.

The trade-offs studied in this paper arise in other settings. Academics citing other works create a positive externality for the cited authors. Since the citing authors do not internalize this externality, there are not enough citations in equilibrium. Forming a group that agrees to cite each others' papers helps the participants of the group. Whether this is helpful to readers depends on how closely related the group members' topics are. If the group members work on similar issues, agreeing to cite each others' papers a bit more might be helpful even for the readers. However, agreeing to cite unrelated papers does not help readers to find relevant works. There is evidence of such agreements in academic journals (Franck, 1999; Van Noorden, 2013; Wilhite and Fong, 2012). Due to anomalous citation patterns, Thomson Reuters regularly excludes journals from the Impact Factor listings.<sup>9</sup> In contrast to journal citation cartels, where explicit agreement data is limited, the collusion and outcomes are directly observable in influencer cartels. The literature on patents documents similar trade-offs. Lampe (2012) shows that patent applications strategically withhold citations. To overcome the free-rider problem, firms have formed patent pools—agreements to cross-license their patents (Lerner and Tirole, 2004; Moser, 2013).

Our paper adds to the literature on social media and attention (for an overview, see Aridor et al. (2024)). While the literature on social media has extensively studied the consumption and production of social media content, there is less work on strategic engagement, which is the strategic choice of which content to engage with. Our paper is most closely related to Filippas et al. (2023), who uses Twitter data to study attention bartering. Similarly to our paper, they model social media users' decision to engage (in their setting, whether to follow other users). Our theoretical model of influencer engagement and advertisement builds on classic models of product differentiation (Salop, 1979) and models of attention and advertising (Anderson and Coate, 2005; Anderson and de Palma, 2012; Anderson and Peitz, 2023). Unlike all these papers, we focus on the users' agreement to collude when deciding whether to engage.

Our paper adds to a small but growing literature in economics on influencer marketing. The empirical literature has analyzed advertising disclosure (Ershov and Mitchell, 2023; Ershov et al., 2023), while the theoretical literature has studied the benefits of mandatory

---

<sup>8</sup>In recent years, such contracts have become more common.

<sup>9</sup>Source: <https://jcr.help.clarivate.com/Content/title-suppressions.htm>, accessed April 6, 2024.

disclosure (Pei and Mayzlin, 2022; Mitchell, 2021; Fainmesser and Galeotti, 2021) and the prioritization of content (Szydlowski, 2023). In contrast to these papers, we study collusion between the influencers.

In our empirical analysis, we build on the recent literature in economics that uses text and photos as data.<sup>10</sup> In particular, we use Large Language Models and large neural networks to generate embeddings from text and photos. Large Language Models with social media data have been used in economics before, for example, by Ershov et al. (2023). We also use the Latent Dirichlet allocation model (Blei et al., 2003), which has been recently used in economics, for example, to extract information from Federal Open Market Committee meeting minutes (Hansen et al., 2018). We combine these tools with the use of the cosine similarity index. This and other similarity indexes have been used as quality measures in economics, for example, by Chen et al. (2023) and Hinnosaar et al. (2022). While many studies have made use of text as data, using photos is still rare in economics (examples include Adukia et al. (2023); Ash et al. (2021); Caprini (2023)).<sup>11</sup> As Instagram as a platform is primarily used to share photos, extracting information from photos is particularly important in our setting.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we provide some institutional details of influencer marketing and influencer cartels. Section 3 introduces the theoretical model and discusses the welfare implications of influencer cartels. Section 4 describes the dataset used in our analysis. Section 5 presents the empirical results. Section 6 discusses the policy implications. Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Influencer Marketing and Influencer Cartels

In influencer marketing, firms pay influencers for product placement and product endorsement. Compared to TV or newspaper advertising, influencer marketing allows fine targeting, generating a great product and influencer match, and hence, a great product and consumer match. Influencer marketing is a large industry: in 2023, influencer marketing ad spending was about \$31 billion, which is close to the ad spending for print newspaper ads. Instagram is one of the leading platforms for influencer marketing. It is a platform where users share photos and videos, engage with other users' content by liking and commenting on their posts, and follow other users to see more of their content.

Many influencers are not compensated based on the actual success of their current marketing campaigns but rather on past engagement, such as comments and likes from

---

<sup>10</sup>For recent surveys of the uses of text as data in economics, see Gentzkow et al. (2019); Ash and Hansen (2023).

<sup>11</sup>One exception is the use of satellite images mostly in development economics, and typically, to measure electricity use, air pollution, land use, or natural resources (Donaldson and Storeygard, 2016).

previous posts. This payment model encourages fraudulent behavior, including inflating one’s influence. An estimated 15% of influencer marketing spending is misused due to exaggerated influence. While influencers with large followings are typically paid based on campaign success (tracked through sales from personalized links or coupons), only 19% of firms employing influencer marketing tracked sales as of 2020 (ANA, 2020). Instead, most smaller influencers receive payment before a campaign begins based on their historical influence metrics. Originally, Instagram influencers were compensated based on follower count, which led to the acquisition of fake followers. The industry responded by starting to detect fake followers and measure genuine engagement through likes and comments. There are alternative ways of generating fake engagement. Some fake engagement is generated by automatic bots, which are relatively easy to detect. In this paper, we study a more challenging type of fraud: Instagram cartels, where real humans create real engagement that mimics natural interactions, making it difficult to distinguish from genuine engagement.

**Instagram influencer cartels.** In Instagram influencer cartels, influencers collude to inflate each other’s engagement in order to increase the prices they can get from advertisers. As the cartels’ activity of artificially increasing engagement is fraudulent, the groups are secret. Instagram considers these groups to be violating Instagram’s policies.<sup>12</sup>

How do the influencer cartels operate? They operate on other online platforms, either in a chat room or a discussion board (typically on Telegram or Reddit).<sup>13</sup> In the chat room, members of the cartels submit links to their Instagram content for which they would like to receive additional engagement. In order to receive that engagement, they themselves must engage with a fixed set of links submitted by other users. Specifically, before submitting a link themselves, they must like and write meaningful comments to previous  $N$  posts from other members. The rules of the cartel are enforced automatically by an algorithm.

The cartel increases engagement via both direct effect and indirect effects. The direct effect is the cartel members engaging with each other’s posts. This additional engagement generates two types of indirect effects. First, the Instagram algorithm gives higher exposure to posts with higher engagement, leading to even more engagement. Second, an influencer engaging with another user’s post increases the likelihood of it being shown

---

<sup>12</sup>Source: Devin Coldewey, Apr 29, 2020, “Instagram ‘pods’ game the algorithm by coordinating likes and comments on millions of posts”, TechCrunch. <https://techcrunch.com/2020/04/29/instagram-pods-game-the-algorithm-by-coordinating-likes-and-comments-on-millions-of-posts/>.

<sup>13</sup>For more details, see a computer science overview of Instagram cartels operating on Telegram (Weerasinghe et al., 2020) or for example: Apr 9, 2019 “Instagram Pods: What Joining One Could Do For Your Brand”, Influencer Marketing Hub. <https://influencermarketinghub.com/instagram-pods/>.

to its followers. This happens as the Instagram algorithm is more likely to show posts that the user’s social network has engaged with, that is, posts that the users who the user follows have commented on or liked.<sup>14</sup>

The cartels in our sample operate in Telegram chatrooms and advertise themselves as a way to ”attract lucrative brand partnerships” (see screenshots in Online Appendix A1). The cartels in our sample have the requirement that before submitting a post, the member must like and write comments to the last five posts submitted by other members. The process ensures that each post receives five likes and comments when submitted. Figures A1.3 and A1.4 in Online Appendix show an example of a post submitted to the cartel receiving the required comments. The rules are enforced by an algorithm that deletes submissions by users who don’t follow the rules. The cartels in our sample have entry requirements: either thresholds for the minimum number of followers (ranging from 1,000 to 100,000 followers) or restrictions on the topics of the posts.

### 3 Theoretical Model

To build intuition, we present the theoretical results in three steps. We start with a basic model of influencer engagement without collusion and the advertising market. We then add collusion and, finally, the advertising market. Our focus is solely on engagement between influencers, we abstract away from all other aspects of influencer marketing, including content creation. All proofs are in appendix A2.

#### 3.1 Basic Model

We assume that there is an infinite sequence of players (influencers), indexed by  $t \in \{-\infty, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$ . Player  $t$  is characterized by two-dimensional type  $(\alpha_t, R_t)$ .<sup>15</sup> The first parameter  $\alpha_t$  captures the topic, which we model as Salop (1979) circle, it is an angle from  $0^\circ$  to  $360^\circ$  on the circle. The second parameter is the player’s reach  $R_t \geq 1$ , which measures how many people the player’s content regularly reaches (number of followers and typical search traffic). The distribution of topics is assumed to be uniform and reach has a power law distribution with mean 2. That is, the probability density

---

<sup>14</sup>Figure A1.5 in Appendix A1 shows a screenshot of an Instagram post that was suggested to the user because the user’s friend has liked it.

<sup>15</sup>Our treatment of player types is inspired by conventional wisdom in influencer marketing practice (Burns, 2020), which emphasizes the importance of “three R’s”: (1) Relevance: how relevant is the content to the audience, (2) Reach: the number of people the content could potentially reach, and (3) Resonance: how engaged is the audience. We model the first one as  $\alpha_t$  and combine the latter two into  $R_t$ , which we call reach for brevity.



function is  $f(R_t) = 2R_t^{-3}$ .<sup>16</sup> Both parameters are independent draws from corresponding distributions.

In this analysis, we focus on engagement. Player  $t$  has a piece of content and chooses between two actions  $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$ : to engage with the previous player’s content  $a_t = 1$  or not to engage  $a_t = 0$ . This can be thought of as a wall of content and the choice is whether to like and comment the previous post or not. We normalize all payoffs without engagement to zero.

Player  $t$ ’s choice to engage creates a social benefit and a social cost. We think of the benefit as providing information and entertainment to the audience and the cost as attention by the audience. The cost and benefit are both proportional to reach  $R_t$ , which measures the size of the audience. Both are also function of the topic difference of the influencer and the content she is engaging with. If the topics are similar, then the benefit is high and cost is low. If the topics are different, then the cost is high and the benefit is low.<sup>17</sup> We model the cost and benefit separately, because we need to model the externality.<sup>18</sup>

Specifically, we assume that the social benefit is  $R_t \cos(\Delta_t)$ , where  $\Delta_t = |\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1}|$  is the difference between players’  $t$  and  $t - 1$  topics.<sup>19</sup> If  $\Delta_t$  is close to  $0^\circ$  (so that  $\cos(\Delta_t) = 1$ ), the players’ content is on similar topics, whereas if the difference is close to  $90^\circ$  their content is unrelated ( $\cos(\Delta_t) = 0$ ), and if it is close to  $180^\circ$  the content is contradictory (e.g. political content, then we can have  $\cos(\Delta_t) = -1$ ). The engagement generates also a social cost  $R_t C(\Delta_t)$ , where  $C(\Delta) = \sin(\Delta)$  for all  $\Delta \leq 90^\circ$  and 1 otherwise.<sup>20</sup> Formally, the social welfare generated by action  $a_t$  by player  $t$  with reach  $R_t$

---

<sup>16</sup>The uniform assumption for the topic is the standard in literature since Salop (1979). Power law distribution is a natural assumption for reach as it is the prevalent distribution for the number of readers, followers, comments (Gabaix, 2016). The mean 2 assumption is for tractability.

<sup>17</sup>We do not explicitly model the mechanisms that generate these costs and benefits. For example, Figure A1.5 in Appendix A1 shows that Instagram suggests posts to users based on their friends’ likes. Therefore, liking a post (1) increases the likelihood that followers are shown the same post, and (2) if the followers don’t appreciate the post (for example, from the opposite political party), there is a chance they can stop following the influencer.

<sup>18</sup>Our modeling assumptions regarding the costs and benefits of attention are similar to models of attention and advertising (Anderson and Coate, 2005; Anderson and de Palma, 2012; Anderson and Peitz, 2023), who also model the cost of attention as a difference between consumers preferences and the content they consume. This literature does not differentiate the costs and benefits as they don’t consider the externality that is our main focus.

<sup>19</sup>Distance  $|\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1}| \in [0^\circ, 180^\circ]$  denotes the shortest angle difference on a circle. Formally,  $|\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1}| = \min \{\text{abs}(\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1}), 360^\circ - \text{abs}(\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1})\}$ , where  $\text{abs}(x)$  is the absolute value.

<sup>20</sup>The assumption that the cost function is 1 beyond the  $90^\circ$  threshold simply accounts for the fact that  $\sin(\Delta)$  function would be decreasing. Any weakly increasing function in this region would give similar results.

and topic difference  $\Delta_t$  with the previous player  $t - 1$ , is

$$W_t(a_t) = a_t \underbrace{R_t \cos(\Delta_t)}_{\text{Benefit}} - a_t \underbrace{R_t C(\Delta_t)}_{\text{Cost}}. \quad (1)$$

The costs and benefits of engagement are divided asymmetrically between players. We assume that players capture a constant fraction  $\beta$  of social costs and benefits. As factor  $\beta$  multiplies all payoffs related to engagement, without loss in generality we normalize  $\beta$  to one. If a player engages with previous content, then only she pays the cost, but the benefits are divided between the creator of the content and the one who engages. These assumptions capture the long-term relationships with the audience. If the influencer engages with content that her audience is not interested in, she incurs the full cost of misdirected attention. It captures the idea that her followers will pay less attention to her future content, they may even stop following her. On the other hand, the influencer who engages gets only a fixed fraction  $\gamma < 1$  of the benefit, the remaining  $1 - \gamma$  goes to the content creator. Thus, engagement creates a positive externality to the content creator.

In summary, the payoff of player  $t$  depends only on actions  $a_t$  and  $a_{t+1}$  as follows:

$$u_t(a_t, a_{t+1}) = a_t \underbrace{\gamma R_t \cos(\Delta_t)}_{\text{Internalized benefit}} - a_t \underbrace{R_t C(\Delta_t)}_{\text{Cost}} + a_{t+1} \underbrace{(1 - \gamma) R_{t+1} \cos(\Delta_{t+1})}_{\text{Externality}}. \quad (2)$$

We assume that players' actions are not observable to the following players.<sup>21</sup> We also assume that player  $t$  observes the topic  $\alpha_{t-1}$  of preceding player  $t - 1$ , but does not know the follower's type. We consider Bayes-Nash equilibria, where players choose optimal action  $a_t$ , observing their own and previous player's type, and taking an expectation over the follower's type.

**The free-riding problem.** The positive externality of engagement creates a free-riding problem and therefore in equilibrium, there is less engagement than socially optimal. Specifically, in equilibrium player engages only with players whose topic is sufficiently similar ( $\Delta_t$  is small enough). We can therefore say that only high quality engagement (in terms of match value) occurs in equilibrium. On the other hand, when taking into account the positive externality, it would be socially optimal to also engage with players whose topic is less similar. We can therefore say that in equilibrium there is too little engagement and even somewhat lower-quality engagement is socially optimal. The following proposition formalizes this intuition.

---

<sup>21</sup>This assumption eliminates equilibria, where players engage conditional on past engagement.

**Proposition 1.** *There is more engagement in social optimum than in non-cooperative equilibrium, but the additional engagement is of lower quality. In particular,*

1. *in non-cooperative equilibrium,  $a_t = \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_t \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)}$ ,*
2. *in social optimum,  $a_t = \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_t \leq 45^\circ}$ .*

The comparison between socially optimal and equilibrium engagement shows that there is room for improvement from cooperation. If players could commit to engage somewhat more and get more engagement in return, they would be happy to do so.

### 3.2 Influencer Cartels

Our model of influencer cartels is simple, as the rules in those cartels are enforced by an algorithm. Therefore, we do not need to model the incentives of the cartel members to follow the rules as tacit collusion or repeated game. Instead, we model a cartel as an entry game, where they choose whether to enter a given cartel agreement. After learning their own types  $(\alpha_t, R_t)$ , but before learning other players' types, players simultaneously choose whether to join the cartel. A player who does not join the cartel gets outside option, which we normalize to 0. Players who join, form a subsequence  $(\dots, s_{-1}, s_0, s_1, s_2, \dots)$ , where  $s_t$  is the  $t$ 'th member of the cartel.

We model cartel as a simple agreement defined by a single parameter  $\Lambda$ . The cartel member  $s_t$  must engage with the content of previous member  $s_{t-1}$  whenever their topic difference is less or equal than  $\Lambda$ , that is  $\Delta_{s_t} = |\alpha_{s_t} - \alpha_{s_{t-1}}| \leq \Lambda$ . The topic-difference parameter  $\Lambda$  is a convenient way to model how topic specific is the cartel. In a cartel that is not topic-specific, the parameter  $\Lambda = 180^\circ$ , while in a narrowly topic specific cartel the topic difference is small.

The payoff from joining the cartel are the similar to the payoff without cartels, but instead of choice whether to engage, now the engagement is defined by the cartel agreement. When deciding whether to join the cartel, players take an expectation over other cartel members' types. A player with type  $(\alpha_{s_t}, R_{s_t})$ , who joins the cartel, gets the expected payoff:

$$u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{s_t} \leq \Lambda} (\gamma R_{s_t} \cos(\Delta_{s_t}) - R_{s_t} C(\Delta_{s_t})) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{s_{t+1}} \leq \Lambda} (1 - \gamma) R_{s_{t+1}} \cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}}) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta_{s_t}$  and  $\Delta_{s_{t+1}}$  are the topic differences with previous and next member of the cartel respectively, and the expectations over  $\Delta_{s_t}$ ,  $\Delta_{s_{t+1}}$ , and  $R_{s_{t+1}}$  are taken over the distribution of cartel members.

**Equilibria.** We focus on symmetric equilibria, where players join the cartel independently of topic  $\alpha_t$ . Therefore, the distributions of  $\Delta_{s_t}$  and  $\Delta_{s_{t+1}}$  are still uniform. Let us first focus on the case where  $\Lambda \leq 90^\circ$ , so that the cost function  $C(\Delta_{s_t}) = \sin(\Delta_{s_t})$ . Then the cartel benefit from equation (3) is

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t}) &= R_{s_t} 2 \int_0^\Lambda [\gamma \cos(\Delta_{s_t}) - \sin(\Delta_{s_t})] d\Delta_t \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}} 2 \int_0^\Lambda \cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}}) d\Delta_{s_{t+1}} \\ &= \frac{4\lambda(\lambda - \gamma)}{\lambda^2 + 1} \left( \frac{1 - \gamma}{\lambda - \gamma} \mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}} - R_{s_t} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we simplified the expressions by using a monotonic transformation  $\lambda = \tan\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2}\right)$ .<sup>22</sup>

Using this expression, we can study the entry to the cartel and formalize it with proposition 2 below. There are three cases depending on the engagement requirement  $\Lambda$ . If the engagement requirement is low, then all players join the cartel. It is easy to see this when  $\Lambda \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)$  as then the direct benefits exceed the costs. But even if the engagement requirement is slightly larger, benefits the player expects from the cartel are larger than the costs of fulfilling the engagement requirement. If engagement requirement is moderate, only players with smaller reach join the cartel. This is because the benefit of the engagement from the cartel depends on the average reach of a cartel member,  $\mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}}$ , but the cost depends on the player's own reach  $R_{s_t}$ . Hence, the first players to stay out of the cartel are with the highest reach. Therefore the equilibrium is described by a threshold  $\bar{R}$ , so that only players with reach  $R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}$  join the cartel. Finally, if the engagement requirement is  $\Lambda = 90^\circ$ , nobody joins the cartel. Furthermore, if  $\Lambda > 90^\circ$ , then equation (4) is an upper bound for the cartel payoff, and it is strictly negative, so in this case also nobody joins the cartel.

**Proposition 2.** *Depending on cartel agreement, we can have three possible types of equilibria in the entry game to the cartel:*

1. *If  $\lambda \leq \gamma$ , all players join the cartel.*
2. *If  $\gamma < \lambda < 1$ , all players with  $R_t \leq \bar{R} = \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{\lambda-\gamma}$  join the cartel.*
3. *If  $\lambda \geq 1$ , nobody joins the cartel.*

**Welfare.** The proposition implies that only cartels with engagement requirement less than  $90^\circ$  are sustainable. Within this range, all cartels are welfare-improving. In ap-

<sup>22</sup>Note that  $\frac{1+\cos(\Lambda)}{\sin(\Lambda)} = \tan\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2}\right) = \lambda$  and  $\sin(\Lambda) = \sin(2 \tan^{-1}(\lambda)) = \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda^2+1}$ .

pendix A3, we derive welfare-maximizing cartels and show that the engagement requirement is always weakly less than 45°. In other words, based on this model of influencer cartels, we would only expect to see cartels with some restrictions on topics.<sup>23</sup>

### 3.3 Advertising Market

We model the advertising market as a competitive market, where a continuum of advertisers each has an ideal target topic  $\alpha$ . The target topic captures the audience the advertiser tries to reach rather than the characteristics of the product. For example, an advertiser of vegan burgers instead of choosing vegan food, could choose animal rights or diabetes as the target topic. Each influencer  $t$  is matched with an advertiser with the same target topic  $\alpha = \alpha_t$ .

We study how the existence and type of cartel affects the price that advertisers pay to influencers. The key aspect of the analysis is that the advertiser cannot observe the quality of engagement and hence the price that the advertiser offers reflects the expected quality of such engagement instead of its true value. In other words, the advertiser *pays for the quantity* of engagement.

The realized value of engagement from the follower  $t + 1$  to the advertiser is

$$\underbrace{a_{t+1}(1-\gamma)R_{t+1}}_{\text{quantity of engagement}} \times \underbrace{\cos(\Delta_{t+1})}_{\text{match quality}} \times \underbrace{v}_{\text{marginal value}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $v$  is the value of a marginal unit of engagement. This expression captures the idea that advertisers can measure the quantity of engagement quite accurately (number of views, clicks, likes, comments), but it is much harder to determine whether the engagement comes from the target audience. The product of the last two terms,  $\cos(\Delta_{t+1})v$ , is the unit value of engagement to the advertiser and its expectation determines the price of engagement.<sup>24</sup>

As we assume that the advertising market is competitive, the price of engagement is equal to the expected unit value of engagement to the advertiser,

$$p^{\text{engagement}} = \mathbb{E}[\cos(\Delta_{t+1})]v, \quad (6)$$

where the expectation is taken over the distribution of the influencers who engage, con-

---

<sup>23</sup>In appendix A3 we also show that having a minimal reach requirement could be beneficial for the cartel. This can explain why some cartels have a minimum reach requirement in practice.

<sup>24</sup>A good way to think of this assumption is that if the engagement occurs, then  $(1-\gamma)R_{t+1}$  more people see the advertisement by influencer  $t$ , and each of them will buy the product with probability  $\cos(\Delta_{t+1})$ . This is analogous to the way the attention literature models the benefits of advertising (Anderson and Coate, 2005).

ditional on their equilibrium behavior.<sup>25</sup>

**Benchmark: only natural engagement.** Before studying the impact of cartels, let us consider the case when all engagement comes from natural equilibrium behavior, as discussed in section 3.1. Adding the advertising value to the influencer's payoff function, we get

$$u_t^{ad}(a_t, a_{t+1}) = u_t(a_t, a_{t+1}) + a_{t+1}(1 - \gamma)R_{t+1}p^{\text{natural}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $u_t(a_t, a_{t+1})$  is the payoff defined by (2) and price of engagement is the price of natural engagement  $p^{\text{natural}} = v\mathbb{E}[\cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}})|\text{Natural}]$ .

Notice that the new term  $a_{t+1}(1 - \gamma)R_{t+1}p^{\text{natural}}$  is independent of player  $t$ 's action  $a_t$ , therefore equilibrium behavior is unchanged. By proposition 1, player  $t$  engages if and only if  $\Delta_t \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)$ . Hence, the price of natural engagement is

$$p^{\text{natural}} = v\mathbb{E}[\cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}}) | \Delta_{s_{t+1}} \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)] = v \frac{\gamma}{\tan^{-1}(\gamma)\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 1}} \in (0.9v, v). \quad (8)$$

**Cartels with advertising market.** We assume that the advertiser is unable to distinguish cartel engagement from natural engagement. In particular, we assume that with probability  $1 - \varepsilon$ , the engagement is natural, i.e., comes from equilibrium behavior discussed above, and with the remaining probability  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  the engagement comes from a cartel. The price of engagement is therefore

$$p^{\text{engagement}} = (1 - \varepsilon)p^{\text{natural}} + \varepsilon p^{\text{cartel}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $p^{\text{natural}}$  is the price of natural engagement from (8) and  $p^{\text{cartel}} = v\mathbb{E}[\cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}})|\text{Cartel}]$  is the price of engagement coming from cartels.

To determine the equilibrium price of engagement, we need to study how the advertising market affects the engagement within a cartel. The payoff function of a player joining the cartel with the added value from advertising is

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\text{cartel+ad}}(R_{s_t}) &= u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t}) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{s_{t+1}} \leq \Lambda} (1 - \gamma) R_{s_{t+1}} p^{\text{engagement}} \right] \\ &= u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t}) + \frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ} (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}} | \text{Cartel}] p^{\text{engagement}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t})$  is defined by (3) and  $\mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}} | \text{Cartel}]$  is the expected reach of a cartel member.

For clarity, let us focus on the case when the advertising market incentives are large,

---

<sup>25</sup>Our results remain unchanged if players are able to capture a constant fraction of the value the advertiser gets from the engagement, for example via Nash bargaining.

i.e., the marginal value of engagement,  $v$  is large enough. Then also  $p^{\text{engagement}}$  is large, because by (8) and (9),  $p^{\text{engagement}} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)0.9v$ . For any fixed reach  $R_{s_t}$ , the first term  $u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t})$  in equation (10) is bounded, so with sufficiently large  $p^{\text{engagement}}$ , the second part of the expression dominates. This means that for any  $\Lambda > 0$  there is  $v > 0$ , such that the payoff from joining the cartel is positive for players with reach below some threshold  $\bar{R} > 1$ . This implies the following result.

**Proposition 3.** *With advertising market, for all  $\Lambda > 0$  and any  $\bar{R} > 1$ , there exists  $v > 0$ , such that all players with  $R_t \leq \bar{R}$  join the cartel.*

We can conclude that if the incentives from the advertising market are large, then a cartel with  $\Lambda = 180^\circ$  is sustainable. In fact, it is even in some sense desirable for cartel members, as joining such a cartel brings more engagement than a cartel that limits engagement to a narrower topic. Thus, we would expect to see such general cartels in practice. Indeed, most of the cartels in our sample are non-specific cartels that require engagement regardless of the topic and do not put any restrictions on the topics of the posts.

**Welfare impact of general cartels.** Such general cartels reduce the welfare of consumers and influencers outside cartels, and can also be undesirable for the advertisers and some influencers within the cartel. In particular, as the following corollary 1 states, they unambiguously reduce the welfare of consumers and influencers outside the cartel. Such cartels provide no social value in expectation, but create substantial cost due to the attention cost for the audience. They always hurt influencers who do not belong to the cartel, because these influencers get a lower price of engagement from their advertisers.

The effect on other parties is subtler. The advertising market is competitive, so that their expected value is always zero. General cartels drive down the price of engagement, so that the advertisers who happen to be matched with an influencer involved in natural engagement, actually benefit from the cartel by paying a lower price, whereas the advertisers who are matched with cartel members, pay for worthless engagement. The expectation over the two possibilities is zero, just the outcomes are more uncertain, and the uncertainty itself could be undesirable for advertisers.

Finally, let's consider the members of the cartel. They receive a positive expected benefit from belonging to the cartel; otherwise, they would not have joined. However, when the share of engagement coming from cartels becomes large enough (with  $\varepsilon > 1/2$ ), even members of general cartels would prefer that these cartels would have a stricter engagement requirement  $\Lambda < 180^\circ$ . This is because the reduction in the quantity of engagement is offset by the increase in the price.

**Corollary 1.** *With sufficiently large  $v$ , general cartels with  $\Lambda = 180^\circ$  are sustainable.*

1. *General cartels strictly reduce consumer welfare.*
2. *General cartels strictly reduce the welfare of influencers outside the cartel.*
3. *General cartels create uncertainty for the advertisers.*
4. *If  $\varepsilon > 1/2$ , then all members of general cartels would prefer that these cartels would have slightly lower  $\Lambda$ .*

## 4 Data and Measures of Engagement Quality

### 4.1 Data Sources

We combine data from two sources: first, the detailed cartel communications from Telegram, and second, Instagram posts and engagement data. A detailed description of our data collection is in Online Appendix A4.

**Telegram cartel history.** From Telegram, we collected the communication history of nine cartels: six general interest cartels and three topic-specific cartels: fitness & health, fashion & beauty, travel & food. This history provided us with three relevant pieces of information for each submission: the Telegram username, Instagram post shortcode, and the time of submission. According to the rules of these cartels, a user must comment on and like the five posts preceding their own submission before submitting a post to the cartel for engagement. This rule allows us to clearly identify which cartel members were bound to engage with which Instagram posts. In other words, we directly observe, instead of having to infer, which posts are included in the cartel. Similarly, we observe, instead of having to infer, which engagement originates from the cartel according to the cartel rules. The Telegram cartels include 220,893 unique Instagram posts that we were able to map to 21,068 Instagram users.

**Instagram data.** Our goal is to compare natural engagement to that acquired via cartels. In engagement, we focus on comments instead of likes or views because information on who views the post is not available, and data on who likes the post is more difficult to collect than comments. We already know which cartel members have to comment according to the cartel rules. For comparison, we needed to collect information on natural engagement.

We define natural engagement as comments from users who don't belong to any of the cartels in our data. To obtain information on natural engagement, we focus on each



cartel member’s first post in any of the nine cartels. For each cartel member’s first post in cartels, we collected information on who commented on the post. Then, we used a random number generator and picked a random non-cartel user who had commented on the post. The randomly chosen commenting Instagram users who don’t belong to any of our cartels form our control group. Since these are from the earliest post in the cartel, they are less likely to be indirectly affected by the cartel activity.

We collected the text of all public Instagram posts and a photo for cartel members and for the randomly picked non-cartel users. We were unable to collect the content if the initial post had been deleted or made private. We were also unable to collect information on the non-cartel commenters if the initial post had no non-cartel commenters, or if the commenting user’s account was private. We also didn’t collect information on non-cartel commenting users if they had less than ten Instagram posts. Additionally, we excluded about 5% of the non-cartel commenting users who had associated posts with cartel members.<sup>26</sup>

## 4.2 Measuring Engagement Quality

Our goal is to compare engagement that originates from cartels to that of natural engagement. Motivated by our model, we consider engagement to be of high quality if it comes from Instagram users whose own Instagram content has similar topics.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, we measure the similarity of the posts of commenting users to those of the post author. To analyze similarity, we use text and/or photos in Instagram posts and three alternative methods.

### 4.2.1 Text Embeddings and Cosine Similarity of Users

First, we use a large language model named Language-agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding (LaBSE) to construct embeddings of text in Instagram posts (Feng et al., 2022). An embedding represents text as a numerical vector in a multidimensional vector space. The vector representation of text is useful, allowing quantitative similarity comparison of texts via cosine similarity. Cosine similarity is a standard measure of text similarity. This measure is defined as the cosine of the angle between two vectors, providing a similarity score between -1 and 1, where close to 1 means that the texts (vectors) are highly similar. LaBSE builds upon one of the first large language models, Bidirectional Encoder

---

<sup>26</sup>The association can happen as Instagram allows posts to be associated with multiple users (this is different from tagging a user), or it can happen when the user changes usernames.

<sup>27</sup>In the Online Appendix (Table A5.1), we look at the engagement quality in its literal sense: whether the comment is substantial and relevant to the post. We find that cartel comments are longer and more related to the post, while non-cartel comments are more likely to include only emoticons. This demonstrates that cartel participants follow the cartel rules in writing the required substantial comments.

Representations from Transformers (BERT), which was developed by Google researchers (Devlin et al., 2019). While BERT was originally implemented for the English language, LaBSE extends it to more than 100 languages. The multilingual effectiveness is necessary for us because our sample is multilingual. The LaBSE model transforms each post into a vector of length 768. It does so using a large neural network with approximately 470 million parameters. This enables the model to capture a large range of semantic features in multiple languages.

To create the input for the embedding, we restrict the sample in the following way. First, we restrict the sample to users who have at least ten posts. In the main analysis, we focus on 100 posts per user closest in the symmetric time window to the first post for the cartel member and to the post they commented on for the non-cartel users. Results are qualitatively similar when using a random sample or all posts from 2017 to 2020 (presented in Online Appendix A5). In our main analysis, we create an embedding of each post using hashtags in the post. We focus on hashtags because they typically informatively capture the essence of Instagram posts. Online Appendix A5 presents results where the embeddings are created using the whole text of the posts.

To create the input for the embedding, we pre-process the text: (i) transform to lower case; (ii) replace all characters that are not letters, numbers, underscores, or hashtags with a space (these are the only characters allowed in Instagram hashtags); (iii) add a space before each hashtag; (iv) keep only words that start with a hashtag; (v) keep only the first 30 hashtags in each post because Instagram allows only up to 30 hashtags per post; (vi) drop all hashtags that have only a single character because these tend to be uninformative; (vii) drop all hashtags that don't include any letters because these tend to be uninformative. Before creating embeddings, we replace the hashtag and underscore symbols with a space.

Using the embeddings we calculate the cosine similarity of users. To do that, first, we create an embedding for each Instagram post separately. After obtaining embeddings of each separate post, we generate a single measure for each user by taking the average of the post embeddings for each user. Online Appendix A5 presents results where instead of post embeddings, we first combine all user's posts for each month, and obtain one embedding per user and month pair, and then take the average over the months for each user. Using the average embeddings, we calculate the cosine similarity of user pairs. How do we interpret the cosine similarity of average embeddings of users? Since cosine similarity is a linear transformation, the cosine similarity of average embeddings is essentially equivalent to calculating cosine similarity separately of all the posts of the two users and then taking the average of the cosine similarities of all these post pairs.

### 4.2.2 Photo and Text Embeddings and Cosine Similarity of Posts

We also construct embeddings of photos and text. As the above LaBSE model can encode only text, we have to use a different model for processing photos alongside text. We use the Contrastive Language Image Pre-training (CLIP) model, developed by OpenAI (Radford et al., 2021). CLIP maps the contents of photos and text into a shared embedding space. Because CLIP generates embeddings for photos and text that are directly comparable, it allows us to calculate similarity by combining both forms of information. The CLIP model transforms the text and photos into a vector of length 512. It does so using a neural network with approximately 86 million parameters. The advantage of the CLIP model is that it allows combining photos and text. On the other hand, the LaBSE model more precisely captures text.

We use a photo and the text from a single Instagram post for each user. For cartel members, we use the first post each cartel member posted to the cartels. For non-cartel members, we select their closest post within a symmetric time window to the cartel member’s post they commented on. To create the text input for the CLIP embedding, we first pre-process the text keeping the entire text, not just the hashtags: (i) transform it to lower case; (ii) replace question marks, exclamation marks, and new line breaks with a full stop; (iii) replace all characters that are not letters, numbers, full stops, underscores, hashtags, at symbols, or apostrophes with a space; (iv) drop separate groups of characters that don’t include any letters or numbers; (v) add a space before each hashtag; (vi) discard posts that are shorter than three characters. Since the CLIP model has a binding limit of 77 for the number of tokens (text units such as words or subwords), we have to split the text. Specifically, we split the text into sentences. In a small share of cases where the sentence is longer than 77 tokens, we further split it at the 77-token mark. Then, we generate the embedding for each sentence and take the average over all sentences in that post. We also generate an embedding for each photo. Then we take the average of text and photo embeddings of each post. Finally, using the average embeddings, we calculate the cosine similarity for each author and commenter pair.

### 4.2.3 Determining Users’ Topics Using Latent Dirichlet Allocation

The models that generate embeddings allow us to measure similarity, but they are somewhat black boxes. To shed some light on the comparison of users’ topics, we use a Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) model. The LDA algorithm estimates a probability distribution of topics for each user based on the words used in their posts, and a probability distribution over the words for each topic.

We train the LDA model using hashtags from the same sample of posts with the same

text pre-processing as in the LaBSE model used above. To improve learning from the underlying content, we reduce the set of hashtags using standard thresholds following a common approach in text analysis. Specifically, we exclude hashtags that fewer than 50 users use or more than 33% of the sample uses. This reduces the number of unique hashtags from about 1.5 million to 19,032, giving us a typical medium-sized dictionary suitable for LDA models. To improve the model’s performance and avoid giving more weight to users with longer content, we homogenize the length of content over the users. To do that, for each user, we cap the length of content at 1000 hashtags, which is about the 75th percentile and slightly less than three times the median length. Finally, we exclude users with less than 15 unique hashtags because there is not enough information to learn their topics. This reduces the number of users by 17 percent. We fix the number of topics to six based on interpretability and the coherence score (Figure A5.1). We assign each topic a label based on the most representative hashtags in each topic, that is, the hashtags with the highest probability (Table A5.2). The labels are fitness, beauty, fashion, food, entrepreneur, and travel.

### 4.3 Sample

Our analysis is within subject. That is, for the same author, we compare his similarity to cartel commenters versus his similarity to non-cartel commenters. For this comparison, we need to be able to evaluate both similarities for each author. As described above, for some authors we were not able to collect information on their non-cartel commenters. Furthermore, not all users had enough posts with text to calculate the outcome measures (the embeddings, cosine similarity, LDA topics). The main sample includes only the authors for whom: (A) we were able to find commenters both from cartels and not from cartels; and (B) we had sufficient data to calculate the similarity measures for both types of commenters. Table A5.3 in the Online Appendix describes how each restriction reduces the sample and Online Appendix A4 provides further details.

The main regression analysis focuses on 8507 cartel members as authors of content. For those authors, we were able to calculate both the LaBSE and CLIP embeddings, as well as the same embeddings for at least one cartel and non-cartel commenter. The topic analysis focuses on an analogous sample of 6654 authors with LDA topic measures for both cartel and non-cartel commenters.<sup>28</sup> The authors excluded from the main samples due to data limitations are similar to included authors in terms of their LDA topics (Figures A5.2 and A5.3), but, as expected, have fewer posts and use fewer words per post (Table A5.4).

---

<sup>28</sup>The sample is smaller because the LDA topic estimation has stricter data requirements as it uses only hashtags that are sufficiently common in the sample.

Summary statistics of the main sample are presented in the Online Appendix Tables A5.5 and A5.6. The distribution of topics in the cartels is as expected (Figure 1). In the fashion & beauty cartel, authors are posting more about fashion and beauty; in the fitness & health cartel, about fitness; in the travel & food cartel, about travel and food. In the general cartels, the topic distribution is rather uniform, with slightly more concentration on the topics of fashion and travel.




Figure 1: Authors' LDA topic distributions

Notes: The bars correspond to the average topic shares across authors and capped spikes describe the 95% confidence intervals.

## 5 Empirical Results

### 5.1 Empirical Strategy

Our empirical question is whether engagement from cartels is of lower quality compared to natural engagement. To answer the question, we estimate a panel data fixed effects regression where the outcome variable is the cosine similarity of an author and their

commenter. An observation is an author and their commenter pair. For each author, we focus on the first post in the cartel. Thus, we have only one post for each author. However, we have three types of commenters for each post. Type one are the cartel members that were required to comment according to the cartel rules.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, here we separate general and topic cartel commenters. Type two is what we call natural engagement: this is the non-cartel user that actually commented on the post. This gives us the first benchmark and allows us to measure whether cartel commenters are worse than natural engagement. That is, whether cartel commenters have lower similarity (to authors) than non-cartel commenters. Type three are what we call the counterfactual random users: these are randomly chosen non-cartel users who didn't comment on the post. This third group gives us another benchmark. It allows us to measure whether cartel commenters are better than random users. That is, whether cartel commenters have higher similarity (to authors) than random users. Our sample is a balanced panel, in a sense that we have all three types of commenters for each author: one non-cartel commenter, five random users, and on average four cartel commenters.

For the first post in cartels of author  $i$ , the similarity to their commenter  $j$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Similarity}_{ij} = & \beta_{Gen} \text{GeneralCartelCommenter}_j + \beta_{Top} \text{TopicCartelCommenter}_j \\ & + \beta_{Ran} \text{RandomUser}_j + \text{InstagramAuthorFE}_i + \varepsilon_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\text{Similarity}_{ij}$  refers to the cosine similarity between author  $i$  and commenter  $j$ ;  $\text{GeneralCartelCommenter}_j$  is an indicator for a general cartel member  $j$  who is required to comment;  $\text{TopicCartelCommenter}_j$  is an indicator for a topic cartel member  $j$  who is required to comment;  $\text{RandomUser}_j$  is an indicator for a random Instagram user not in the cartel who didn't actually comment.  $\text{InstagramAuthorFE}_i$  is the fixed effect for each author. Since we only have one post per author, this is equivalent to the post fixed effect. The base category is natural engagement, that is, a commenter who is not in the cartel.

In the main analysis, we use two alternative similarity measures as outcome variables: first, cosine similarity of users calculated using the text embeddings from the LaBSE model, and second, cosine similarity of the corresponding users' posts calculated using the photo and text embeddings from the CLIP model.<sup>30</sup> We look at three mutually exclusive samples, each defined by the type of cartel in which the author's first cartel post is included. The first sample consists of authors whose first post is only in general

---

<sup>29</sup>In the main analysis, we focus on cartel members required to comment instead of those actually commenting. We do this because we don't observe all comments. The robustness analysis shows that the results are similar when looking at who actually commented (Online Appendix A5).

<sup>30</sup>The details of the outcome variables are described in Section 4.2.

cartels; the second consists of those whose first post is only in topic cartels; and third, includes those whose first post is in both general and topic cartels.<sup>31</sup>

To preview our main results, let us first look at the raw distributions of outcome variables. Figure 2 presents the density of both outcome variables separately for general and topic cartels. It shows that non-cartel commenters have the highest similarity with the author, and random users have the lowest. Commenters from general cartels have almost as low similarity as the random users (Figures 2a and 2c). In contrast, commenters from topic cartels have relatively higher similarity (Figures 2b and 2d).




Figure 2: Probability density of authors' similarity to commenters and random users

Notes: The figures present kernel density estimates using the Epanechnikov kernel function of authors' cosine similarity to non-cartel commenters (grey line with solid circle markers), to random users (red dotted line), to general cartel commenters (blue dashed line on Figures 2a and 2c), and to topic cartel commenters (green dashed and dotted line on Figures 2b and 2d). The cosine similarity is calculated either: as the similarity of users using the text embeddings from the LaBSE model (Figures 2a and 2b) or the similarity of posts using the photo and text embeddings from the CLIP model (Figures 2c and 2d).

<sup>31</sup>With some abuse of terminology, we say that a post is only in general (or topic) cartel even if it was posted in both but we have information on the commenters from only one of these. This affects only a small number of posts.

## 5.2 Quality of Engagement Measured by Cosine Similarity

We find that in general cartels (columns 1 and 4 in Table 1), authors’ similarity to cartel commenters is significantly lower than their similarity to non-cartel commenters, who form the base category. Furthermore, similarity to general cartel members is almost as low as to random users. In contrast, in topic cartels (columns 2 and 5), authors’ similarity to cartel commenters is only slightly lower than to non-cartel commenters. Similar results hold for posts which are in both general and topic cartels (columns 3 and 6).

Table 1: Panel data fixed effects estimates of authors’ similarity to cartel commenters and random users versus non-cartel commenters

|  | (1)                                    | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)  | (5)                  | (6)                  |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Dependent variable: Cosine similarity  |                      |                      |  |                      |                      |
|  | Posts in general or topic cartels      |                      |                      |  |                      |                      |
|  | General                                | Topic                | Both                 | General                                      | Topic                | Both                 |
|  | Similarity of users<br>Text embeddings |                      |                      | Similarity of posts<br>Photo+text embeddings |                      |                      |
| General cartel commenter                         | -0.058***<br>(0.003)                   |                      | -0.060***<br>(0.008) | -0.033***<br>(0.001)                         |                      | -0.034***<br>(0.003) |
| Topic cartel commenter                           |  | -0.023***<br>(0.003) | -0.009<br>(0.008)    |  | -0.016***<br>(0.001) | -0.012***<br>(0.003) |
| Random user                                      | -0.071***<br>(0.003)                   | -0.076***<br>(0.003) | -0.062***<br>(0.008) | -0.040***<br>(0.001)                         | -0.040***<br>(0.001) | -0.037***<br>(0.003) |
| Wald test, $\beta_{Gen} = \beta_{Top}$ , p-value |  |                      | 0.000                |  |                      | 0.000                |
| Base (non-cartel) mean                           | 0.574                                  | 0.585                | 0.577                | 0.657  | 0.657                | 0.659                |
| Author fixed effects                             | Yes                                    | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes  | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors  | 4756                                   | 3263                 | 488                  | 4756   | 3263                 | 488                  |
| Observations                                     | 44900                                  | 30569                | 6665                 | 44900  | 30569                | 6665                 |

Notes: Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. In columns 1-3, the cosine similarity of users is calculated using the text embeddings from the LaBSE model; in columns 4-6, the cosine similarity of the corresponding users’ posts is calculated using the photo and text embeddings from the CLIP model. Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author’s similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *General cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author’s cosine similarity is calculated, is in the general cartel, and *Topic cartel commenter* whether he is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author’s similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn’t comment. The sample consists of authors whose first cartel post is either: only in general cartels (columns 1 and 4); only in topic cartels (columns 2 and 5; or in both general and topic cartels (columns 3 and 6). Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.

Both Figure 2 and Table 1 also validate our outcome measures. Although we do not observe advertising fees for engagement originating from cartels, advertisers are known to pay higher fees for more engagement when they do not directly track sales. The results show that users with higher similarity measures are more likely to engage with the content (non-cartel commenters versus random users). Therefore, according to our



measures, users with higher similarity provide greater value for advertisers.


The regression results are robust to alternative ways to construct outcome variables and alternative samples. The Online Appendix (Tables A5.7 to A5.9) presents results where first, outcome variables in columns 1–3 are constructed based on (A) random sample of posts; (B) all posts in 2017–2020; (C) the whole text instead of hashtags; second, outcome variables in columns 4–6 are constructed based on (A) only the photos, (B) only the text. It also presents the results where the sample includes only the cartel commenters for whom we observe that they actually commented (Table A5.10). In all these specifications, the estimates remain similar to the main results. When looking at each of the topic cartels separately, we find that cartel commenters from the fitness & health cartel are the most similar to natural engagement (Table A5.11).

To interpret these estimates, we can do back-of-the-envelope calculations based on our theoretical model. According to our theoretical model, the value of engagement to the advertiser is proportional to the content author’s cosine similarity with the commenter. Our empirical estimates suggest that general cartels reduce cosine similarity measures by 5–10%, and topic cartels reduce them by 2–4%. However, these numbers are hard to interpret directly. In our sample, a completely random pair of users has a cosine similarity of 0.57–0.66, while in the theoretical model, the expected similarity of a random user is zero. One could argue that as advertisers use influencer marketing for targeted advertising, they would gain negligible value from a purely random match. To account for this, we normalize cosine similarity by the random match similarity. Using this comparison, engagement from general cartels is 82–97% worse than natural engagement (relative to purely random matching), whereas engagement from topic cartels is 15–40% worse. In other words, these back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that an advertiser paying for engagement from general cartels, expecting it to be like natural engagement, only gets 3–18% of the value (essentially paying for almost nothing). In contrast, if the engagement comes from a topic cartel, the advertiser overpays but still gets 60–85% of the value.


### 5.3 Quality of Engagement Measured by LDA Topic Match

To further study the quality of engagement, we compare the LDA topic distributions of cartel versus non-cartel commenters, separately for general and topic cartels. To do that, first, for each author, we define their main topic as the topic with the largest LDA probability. Then, for each group of authors who share the same main topic, we compare the same topic share of the post’s cartel versus non-cartel commenters. Figure 3a illustrates that the topic match from general cartels is worse than natural (non-cartel), separately for each topic. For the authors posting in general cartels, their non-cartel

commenters post on this topic about 42% of the time according to the LDA probability. In contrast, their cartel commenters post on the main topic of the author only 22% of the time. This comparison is different for topic cartels. Figure 3b focuses on the topics most prevalent in each of the topic cartels and the authors whose main topic it is. It shows that the topic match from topic cartels isn't worse than natural (non-cartel).



(a) General cartel versus non-cartel commenters



(b) Topic cartel versus non-cartel commenters

Figure 3: LDA topic shares of commenters from cartels versus non-cartels (natural)

Notes: The bars correspond to the average topic shares across commenters and capped spikes describe the 95% confidence intervals. The grey bars capture the non-cartel commenters and blue bars the cartel commenters. The sample is restricted to general cartel commenters on Figure 3a and topic cartel commenters on Figure 3. Each set of bars use a sample of commenters that is further restricted by the main topic of the author of the post they comment on, where the main topic is defined as the topic with the highest LDA probability. For example, on Figure 3a, for the first grey and blue bar, the sample is restricted to commenters on the posts in general cartels of the authors whose main topic is fitness.

## 6 Policy Implications

Our empirical and theoretical results suggest three main policy implications. Our theoretical results show that cartels that require engagement with only closely related influencers improve welfare, whereas cartels that require engagement regardless of the topic match are welfare-reducing. Our empirical results show that general cartels generate low-quality engagement. This engagement is about as bad as counterfactual engagement, where comments would come from random Instagram users. On the other hand, the topic cartels generate engagement, which quality is closer to natural engagement. Our results indicate that regulators should prioritize addressing general cartels, which our findings identify as certainly harmful. Our theoretical analysis suggests that engagement should come from influencers who are closely aligned in their topics, implying that narrowly focused cartels could potentially improve welfare. Practically, this means that cartels concentrating on specific topics can potentially be beneficial, such as the “fitness and health” cartel in our setting.

Second, our analysis points out that prohibiting obtaining fake social media indicators via monetary transfers is not enough. The regulation that prohibits buying and selling fake social media indicators, such as the U.S. Federal Trade Commission’s proposed new rule, should also prohibit obtaining these fake indicators via in-kind transfers.

The third implication of our theory is that monetary incentives based on the quantity of engagement amplify the creation of distorted engagement. According to our results, this scenario is the only situation where cartel members may prefer to participate in general cartels, which require engagements without regard to topics. The logic is straightforward: if the market provides strong rewards for the volume of engagement, it is best to join cartels that provide the largest engagement quantity, even though this may be socially detrimental. It is still common in the industry to base the payments on past engagement quantity. Our results suggest that this practice should be discontinued. Instead, it should be feasible in most cases to adopt an alternative compensation scheme that combines lump-sum payments with performance-based payments, such as bonuses for added sales. Furthermore, advertisers or platforms could use our methodology to assess the quality of engagement matches. For instance, rather than compensating based on the sheer number of comments, they could adjust payments according to the quality of the topic match. Implementing these changes would significantly diminish the incentive to produce fake engagement.

## 7 Conclusions

We have documented and studied influencer cartels, a form of collusion in the rapidly growing influencer marketing industry, which has stayed under regulators' radar. Our empirical results indicate that engagement from general cartels is significantly lower in quality compared to natural engagement, while engagement from topic cartels is closer to natural engagement. Our theoretical model sheds light on the trade-offs involved and explores the associated welfare implications. The key distortion is the free-rider problem, which cartels could help mitigate through enforced commitment. However, cartels also introduce new distortions, such as over-engagement and the exclusion of high-reach influencers. These issues become particularly severe when the advertising market heavily rewards the quantity of engagement, encouraging the creation of fake engagement.

## References

- ADUKIA, A., A. EBLE, E. HARRISON, H. B. RUNESHA, AND T. SZASZ (2023): "What We Teach About Race and Gender: Representation in Images and Text of Children's Books," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138, 2225–2285.
- ANA (2020): "The State of Influence: Challenges and Opportunities in Influencer Marketing," Tech. rep., Association of National Advertisers.
- ANDERSON, S. P. AND S. COATE (2005): "Market Provision of Broadcasting: A Welfare Analysis," *Review of Economic Studies*, 72, 947–972.
- ANDERSON, S. P. AND A. DE PALMA (2012): "Competition for Attention in the Information (Overload) Age," *RAND Journal of Economics*, 43, 1–25.
- ANDERSON, S. P. AND M. PEITZ (2023): "Ad Clutter, Time Use, and Media Diversity," *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 15, 227–270.
- ARIDOR, G., R. JIMÉNEZ DURÁN, R. LEVY, AND L. SONG (2024): "The Economics of Social Media," SSRN 4708840.
- ASH, E., R. DURANTE, M. GREBENSHCHIKOVA, AND C. SCHWARZ (2021): "Visual Representation and Stereotypes in News Media," SSRN 3934858.
- ASH, E. AND S. HANSEN (2023): "Text Algorithms in Economics," *Annual Review of Economics*, 15, 659–688.
- ASKER, J. (2010): "A Study of the Internal Organization of a Bidding Cartel," *American Economic Review*, 100, 724–762.

- BLEI, D. M., A. Y. NG, AND M. I. JORDAN (2003): “Latent Dirichlet Allocation,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3, 993–1022.
- BURNS, S. (2020): “Thinking About Influencer Marketing? Here’s What To Look For,” *Forbes*, Jan 21, 2020.
- CAPRINI, G. (2023): “Visual bias,” *Manuscript*.
- CHEN, Y., R. FARZAN, R. KRAUT, I. YECKEHZAARE, AND A. F. ZHANG (2023): “Motivating Experts to Contribute to Digital Public Goods: A Personalized Field Experiment on Wikipedia,” *Management Science*, Forthcoming.
- DELTAS, G., A. SALVO, AND H. VASCONCELOS (2012): “Consumer-Surplus-Enhancing Collusion and Trade,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 43, 315–328.
- DEVLIN, J., M.-W. CHANG, K. LEE, AND K. TOUTANOVA (2019): “BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding,” ArXiv 1810.04805.
- DONALDSON, D. AND A. STOREYGARD (2016): “The View from Above: Applications of Satellite Data in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30, 171–198.
- ERSHOV, D., Y. HE, AND S. SEILER (2023): “How Much Influencer Marketing is Undisclosed? Evidence from Twitter,” SSRN 4607235.
- ERSHOV, D. AND M. MITCHELL (2023): “The Effects of Influencer Advertising Disclosure Regulations: Evidence From Instagram,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, Forthcoming.
- FAINMESSER, I. P. AND A. GALEOTTI (2021): “The Market for Online Influence,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 13, 332–72.
- FENG, F., Y. YANG, D. CER, N. ARIVAZHAGAN, AND W. WANG (2022): “Language-agnostic BERT Sentence Embedding,” ArXiv 2007.01852.
- FERSHTMAN, C. AND A. PAKES (2000): “A Dynamic Oligopoly with Collusion and Price Wars,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 31, 207–236.
- FILIPPAS, A., J. J. HORTON, AND E. LIPNOWSKI (2023): “The Production and Consumption of Social Media,” NBER 28666.
- FRANCK, G. (1999): “Scientific Communication—A Vanity Fair?” *Science*, 286, 53–55.

- GABAIX, X. (2016): “Power Laws in Economics: An Introduction,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30, 185–206.
- GENESOVE, D. AND W. P. MULLIN (2001): “Rules, Communication, and Collusion: Narrative Evidence from the Sugar Institute Case,” *American Economic Review*, 91, 379–398.
- GENTZKOW, M., B. KELLY, AND M. TADDY (2019): “Text as Data,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57, 535–574.
- GLAZER, J., H. HERRERA, AND M. PERRY (2021): “Fake Reviews,” *Economic Journal*, 131, 1772–1787.
- HANSEN, S., M. MCMAHON, AND A. PRAT (2018): “Transparency and Deliberation Within the FOMC: A Computational Linguistics Approach,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133, 801–870.
- HE, S., B. HOLLENBECK, AND D. PROSERPIO (2022): “The Market for Fake Reviews,” *Marketing Science*, 41, 896–921.
- HINNOSAAR, M., T. HINNOSAAR, M. KUMMER, AND O. SLIVKO (2022): “Externalities in Knowledge Production: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment,” *Experimental Economics*, 25, 706–733.
- HYYTINEN, A., F. STEEN, AND O. TOIVANEN (2018): “Cartels Uncovered,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 10, 190–222.
- (2019): “An Anatomy of Cartel Contracts,” *Economic Journal*, 129, 2155–2191.
- IGAMI, M. AND T. SUGAYA (2022): “Measuring the Incentive to Collude: The Vitamin Cartels, 1990–99,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 89, 1460–1494.
- KAWAI, K., J. NAKABAYASHI, AND J. M. ORTNER (2022): “The Value of Privacy in Cartels: An Analysis of the Inner Workings of a Bidding Ring,” NBER 28539.
- LAMPE, R. (2012): “Strategic Citation,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 94, 320–333.
- LERNER, J. AND J. TIROLE (2004): “Efficient Patent Pools,” *American Economic Review*, 94, 691–711.
- LUCA, M. AND G. ZERVAS (2016): “Fake It Till You Make It: Reputation, Competition, and Yelp Review Fraud,” *Management Science*, 62, 3412–3427.

- MARSHALL, R. C. AND L. M. MARX (2012): *The Economics of Collusion: Cartels and Bidding Rings*, MIT Press.
- MAYZLIN, D., Y. DOVER, AND J. CHEVALIER (2014): “Promotional Reviews: An Empirical Investigation of Online Review Manipulation,” *American Economic Review*, 104, 2421–2455.
- MITCHELL, M. (2021): “Free Ad(vice): Internet Influencers and Disclosure Regulation,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 52, 3–21.
- MOSER, P. (2013): “Patents and Innovation: Evidence from Economic History,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27, 23–44.
- PEI, A. AND D. MAYZLIN (2022): “Influencing Social Media Influencers Through Affiliation,” *Marketing Science*, 41, 593–615.
- PESENDORFER, M. (2000): “A Study of Collusion in First-Price Auctions,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 67, 381–411.
- PORTER, R. H. (1983): “A Study of Cartel Stability: The Joint Executive Committee, 1880-1886,” *Bell Journal of Economics*, 14, 301–314.
- PORTER, R. H. AND J. D. ZONA (1993): “Detection of Bid Rigging in Procurement Auctions,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 101, 518–538.
- RADFORD, A., J. W. KIM, C. HALLACY, A. RAMESH, G. GOH, S. AGARWAL, G. SASTRY, A. ASKELL, P. MISHKIN, J. CLARK, G. KRUEGER, AND I. SUTSKEVER (2021): “Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision,” ArXiv 2103.00020.
- RHODES, A. AND C. M. WILSON (2018): “False advertising,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 49, 348–369.
- RÖLLER, L.-H. AND F. STEEN (2006): “On the Workings of a Cartel: Evidence from the Norwegian Cement Industry,” *American Economic Review*, 96, 321–338.
- SALOP, S. C. (1979): “Monopolistic Competition with Outside Goods,” *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10, 141–156.
- SMIRNOV, A. AND E. STARKOV (2022): “Bad News Turned Good: Reversal under Censorship,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 14, 506–560.
- SZYDŁOWSKI, M. (2023): “Deprioritizing Content,” SSRN 4398140.

- VAN NOORDEN, R. (2013): “Brazilian Citation Scheme Outed,” *Nature*, 500, 510–511.
- WEERASINGHE, J., B. FLANIGAN, A. STEIN, D. MCCOY, AND R. GREENSTADT (2020): “The Pod People: Understanding Manipulation of Social Media Popularity via Reciprocity Abuse,” in *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, WWW ’20, 1874–1884.
- WILHITE, A. W. AND E. A. FONG (2012): “Coercive Citation in Academic Publishing,” *Science*, 335, 542–543.
- ZINMAN, J. AND E. ZITZEWITZ (2016): “Wintertime for Deceptive Advertising?” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8, 177–192.



## Contents of Online Appendix

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| A1 Screenshots of Wolf Global Instagram Engagement Pods . . . . . | A2  |
| A2 Proofs . . . . .   | A6  |
| A3 Additional Theoretical Results . . . . .                       | A10 |
| A4 Data Collection . . . . .                                      | A15 |
| A5 Additional Empirical Results . . . . .                         | A19 |


## List of Online Appendix Tables

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| A5.1 How substantial and relevant are cartel versus non-cartel comments . . . . .  | A19 |
| A5.2 Most representative hashtags for each LDA topic . . . . .                     | A19 |
| A5.3 Sample construction . . . . .   | A20 |
| A5.4 Summary statistics of authors in cartel included/excluded from the sample     | A20 |
| A5.5 Summary statistics of authors in different types of cartel . . . . .          | A20 |
| A5.6 Summary statistics of users in cartels versus not in cartels . . . . .        | A21 |
| A5.7 Alternative outcome variables: random posts; all posts in 2017–2020 . . . . . | A21 |
| A5.8 Alternative outcome variable: whole text instead of hashtags . . . . .        | A22 |
| A5.9 Alternative outcome variables: photo embeddings, text embeddings . . . . .    | A23 |
| A5.10 Alternative sample: commenters who actually commented . . . . .              | A24 |
| A5.11 Heterogeneity by topic cartel . . . . .                                      | A25 |


## List of Online Appendix Figures

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| A1.1 Main page of <a href="https://www.wolfglobal.org/">https://www.wolfglobal.org/</a> . . . . . | A2  |
| A1.2 Description of how influencers can amplify their earnings . . . . .                          | A3  |
| A1.3 Wolf Onyx Comments on Telegram app mapped to Instagram users . . . . .                       | A4  |
| A1.4 Instagram comments coming from Wolf Onyx Comments . . . . .                                  | A4  |
| A1.5 Suggested Instagram post and a user who liked it . . . . .                                   | A5  |
| A2.1 Benefits and costs of an engagement . . . . .  | A6  |
| A3.1 Welfare as a function of engagement requirement . . . . .                                    | A11 |
| A5.1 LDA model coherence scores by the number of topics . . . . .                                 | A26 |
| A5.2 Authors' topics: regression sample versus excluded . . . . .                                 | A27 |
| A5.3 Authors' topics: LDA sample versus excluded . . . . .  | A28 |

# A1 Online Appendix: Screenshots of Wolf Global Instagram Engagement Pods



(a) Main page



(b) How it works?

Figure A1.1: Main page of <https://www.wolfglobal.org/>

Notes: Screenshots of <https://www.wolfglobal.org/>, taken on March 4, 2024.




Figure A1.2: Description of how influencers can amplify their earnings

Notes: Screenshot of <https://www.wolfglobal.org/>, taken on March 4, 2024.




Figure A1.3: Wolf Onyx Comments on Telegram app mapped to Instagram users

Notes: Screenshot of Telegram Wolf Onyx Comments, taken on March 4, 2024.



Figure A1.4: Instagram comments coming from Wolf Onyx Comments

Notes: Screenshot of Instagram, taken on March 4, 2024. To preserve anonymity, the Instagram account names are blurred and the photo is replaced with an analogous photo generated by AI image generator.



Figure A1.5: Suggested Instagram post and a user who liked it

Notes: Screenshot of Instagram, taken on May 9, 2024. To preserve anonymity, the Instagram account names are blurred and the photo is replaced with a analogous photo generated by AI image generator. Upper red oval shows that the post was suggested to the viewer (who was not follower for this Instagram account) and lower red oval shows a specific user that the viewer does follow liked the post, indicating that one reason the post was suggested to the viewer was because of this engagement.

## A2 Online Appendix: Proofs

### A2.1 Proof of Proposition 1

**Proof** In equilibrium, player  $t$  chooses  $a_t = 1$  if and only if the benefits outweigh the costs,  $\gamma R_t \cos(\Delta_t) \geq R_t C(\Delta_t)$ . As costs are always non-positive, it requires that  $\Delta_t \leq 90^\circ$  and thus  $\gamma \cos(\Delta_t) \geq \sin(\Delta_t)$ , which is equivalent to  $\Delta_t \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)$ .

On the other hand, engagement is socially optimal whenever total benefits outweigh the costs,  $\gamma R_t \cos(\Delta_t) + (1 - \gamma)R_t \cos(\Delta_t) \geq C(\Delta_t)$  or equivalently  $\Delta_t \leq \tan^{-1}(1) = 45^\circ$ . As  $\gamma < 1$ , there exist socially optimal engagements that don't occur in equilibrium.

Finally, any engagement that is socially optimal, but not individually optimal, has strictly lower quality than compared to those that are individually optimal. That is, for any  $\Delta_t \leq \tan^{-1}(\gamma)$ , we have  $\cos(\Delta_t) \geq \cos(\Delta'_t)$  for any  $\Delta'_t \in (\tan^{-1}(\gamma), 45^\circ]$ .

The proof can be summarized by the following figure A2.1.




Figure A2.1: Benefits and costs of an engagement

Notes: The angle in blue depicts a particular example where the direct benefit is lower than the cost, and therefore, it is not optimal for the player. It would be optimal if the topics were more similar so that the angle would be within the red region. On the other hand, this engagement is socially optimal because the social benefit is greater than the cost.

□

### A2.2 Proof of Proposition 2

**Proof** Consider first the case when  $\lambda < \gamma$ . Then equation (4) is a product of two strictly negative values and therefore strictly positive, so that all players join the cartel. If  $\lambda = \gamma$ , then the expression simplifies to  $\frac{4\gamma(1-\gamma)}{\gamma^2+1} \mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}} > 0$ .

Next, suppose that  $\gamma < \lambda < 1$ . Then  $u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t})$  is a strictly decreasing function of  $R_{s_t}$ , so the equilibrium must be characterized by a (possibly infinite) threshold  $\bar{R}$ , so that players join the cartel if and only if  $R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}$ , which happens with probability  $1 - \frac{1}{\bar{R}^2}$ .

Therefore, the expected reach of the following cartel member is  $\mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}} | R_{s_{t+1}} \leq \bar{R}] = \frac{2}{1+\bar{R}}$ . This allows us to determine the marginal player's reach  $\bar{R}$  as

$$u^{\text{cartel}}(\bar{R}) = \frac{4\lambda(\lambda - \gamma)}{\lambda^2 + 1} \left( \frac{1 - \gamma}{\lambda - \gamma} \frac{2}{1 + \bar{R}} - \bar{R} \right) = 0 \iff \bar{R} = \frac{2 - \gamma - \lambda}{\lambda - \gamma}.$$

Finally, suppose that  $\lambda = 1$ , so that  $\Lambda = 90^\circ$ . Then equation (4) simplifies to  $2(1 - \gamma)(\mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}} - R_{s_t})$ , which is positive only if the player's own reach  $R_{s_t}$  is smaller than the average reach. This means that only players with the lowest reach  $R_{s_t} = 1$  would be willing to join, but we assume that the probability of such an event is zero.

To conclude the proof, observe that if  $\lambda > 1$  (that is  $\Lambda > 90^\circ$ ), then the expression in equation (4) is strictly negative. Also, remember that equation (4) was computed with cost equal to  $\sin(\Delta_{s_t})$ . However, if  $\Delta_{s_t} > 90^\circ$  the cost is  $C(\Delta_{s_t}) = 1 > \sin(\Delta_{s_t})$ . Therefore, the cartel payoff is strictly lower than the expression in equation (4). This implies that the cartel payoff would always be strictly negative, and nobody would join the cartel.  $\square$

### A2.3 Proof of Proposition 3

**Proof** Fix  $\Lambda > 0$  and  $\bar{R} > 1$ . The first term  $u^{\text{cartel}}(\bar{R})$  in (10) is strictly negative but bounded for a player with reach  $\bar{R}$ . Therefore, there exists value  $v > 0$  such that the second term in (10) dominates it and the cartel payoff  $u^{\text{cartel+ad}}(\bar{R})$  for player with reach  $\bar{R}$ . As  $u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t})$  is decreasing in  $R_{s_t}$ , we must have that  $u^{\text{cartel+ad}}(R_{s_t}) > 0$  for all  $R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}$ .  $\square$

### A2.4 Proof of Corollary 1

**Proof** We prove each part separately:

1. The realized welfare generated by engagement was defined by (1). When taking the expectation over this expression over  $\Delta_{s_{t+1}}$  that is distributed uniformly in  $[0^\circ, 180^\circ]$ , the benefit term becomes zero, whereas the expected cost is strictly positive, therefore such engagement is always reducing consumer welfare.

Even when replacing general cartels with cartels that have lower  $\Lambda$ , this change would clearly be welfare-improving for consumers.

2. With general cartels, the price of engagement is equal to  $p^{\text{engagement}} = (1 - \varepsilon)p^{\text{natural}}$ . Without the cartels, the price of engagement would be  $p^{\text{natural}} > p^{\text{engagement}}$ , while all other parts of the payoff would remain the same.

Again, just reducing the engagement requirement  $\Lambda$  would increase the price of engagement, therefore increasing the welfare of influencers that do not belong to cartels.

3. The cartels cannot affect advertisers' profits as they are equal to zero due to the assumption that the market is perfectly competitive. Cartels drive down the price of engagement so that advertisers who happen to be matched with an influencer who does not belong to a cartel get a positive expected profit, as they pay less than the true value of engagement in expectation. However, advertisers who are matched with general cartel members pay for worthless engagement. The expectation over the two possibilities is zero; the outcomes are just more uncertain.

As in earlier cases, replacing  $\Lambda = 180^\circ$  with a slightly lower value lowers this uncertainty.

4. Consider a general cartel with an engagement requirement equal to  $180^\circ$  and suppose  $v$  is large enough so that the cartel has members. It is straightforward to check that there exists a marginal type whose reach is  $\bar{R}$ , whose payoff of joining the cartel is zero.

Consider a cartel with  $\Lambda$  that is marginally smaller than  $180^\circ$ . We claim that if  $\varepsilon > 1/2$ , then the payoff of  $\bar{R}$  is strictly larger with  $\Lambda$  than with the general cartel. To see this, observe that under such a scenario, the expected reach of the follower,  $\mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}}|\text{Cartel}]$ , is strictly increased. This is because the former marginal player  $\bar{R}$  now gets a strictly positive value, and the payoff function is decreasing in reach, so the new marginal player has higher reach.

Now, the payoff of  $\bar{R}$  from joining the cartel,  $u^{\text{cartel+ad}}(\bar{R})$ , as defined by equation (10), has two elements. It is easy to see that  $u^{\text{cartel}}(\bar{R})$  is strictly increased. Moreover, the payoff from advertising is

$$\frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ}(1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}}|\text{Cartel}]p^{\text{engagement}}, \quad (12)$$

where the term  $(1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}[R_{s_{t+1}}|\text{Cartel}]$  is again increased by the same argument.

What remains to show is that the remaining term  $\frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ}p^{\text{engagement}}$  is increased. By equation (9),

$$\frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ}p^{\text{engagement}} = v \frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ} \left[ (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sin(\Lambda^{eq})}{\Lambda^{eq}} + \varepsilon \frac{\sin(\Lambda)}{\Lambda} \right]$$



where  $\Lambda^{eq} = \tan^{-1}(\gamma)$ .<sup>32</sup> If we differentiate  $\frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ} p^{\text{engagement}}$  with respect to  $\Lambda$ , we get

$$v \frac{1}{180^\circ} \left[ (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\sin(\Lambda^{eq})}{\Lambda^{eq}} + \varepsilon \frac{\sin(\Lambda)}{\Lambda} \right] + v \frac{\Lambda}{180^\circ} \left[ \varepsilon \frac{\cos(\Lambda)}{\Lambda} - \varepsilon \frac{\sin(\Lambda)}{\Lambda^2} \right].$$

To analyze a marginal decrease of  $\Lambda$  from  $180^\circ$ , we can take  $\Lambda = 180^\circ$  and get

$$\frac{v}{180^\circ} \left( \frac{(1 - \varepsilon) \sin(\Lambda^{eq})}{\Lambda^{eq}} - \varepsilon \right).$$

This expression is negative if and only if

$$\varepsilon > \frac{\sin(\Lambda^{eq})}{\Lambda^{eq} + \sin(\Lambda^{eq})} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + \tan^{-1}(\gamma) \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 1}} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, indeed, if  $\varepsilon > 1/2$ , the payoff of  $\bar{R}$  is strictly higher under  $\Lambda$  than under  $180^\circ$ .

Finally, note that the same argument applies for any member with  $R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}$ . This is because  $u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{s_t})$  is decreasing in  $\Lambda$  near  $180^\circ$  for the same reason as above, and the second term, i.e., the payoff from the advertising market is independent of  $R_{s_t}$  and therefore decreasing as well.

□

---

<sup>32</sup>Note that

$$p^{\text{cartel}} = v \mathbb{E}[\cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}}) | \Delta_{s_{t+1}} \leq \Lambda] = v 2 \int_0^\Lambda \cos(\Delta_{s_{t+1}}) \frac{d\Delta_{s_{t+1}}}{2\Lambda} = v \frac{\sin(\Lambda)}{\Lambda}.$$

## A3 Online Appendix: Additional Theoretical Results

### A3.1 Welfare from Cartels

Using the equilibrium description from proposition 2, we can now study the welfare implications of the cartel. As with individual payoffs, we normalize social welfare without any engagements to zero. Then the social welfare generated by the cartel, which we denote again by  $W$ , is proportional to the average payoff of all players in the model.<sup>33</sup> It is useful to compute also another measure  $V^{\text{cartel}}$ , which denotes the average payoff of cartel members. Both measures depend on the engagement requirement  $\Lambda$ , and it is convenient to express these in terms of the transformed version  $\lambda = \tan\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2}\right)$ . Formally,

$$V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{R_{st}} [u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{st}) | u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{st}) \geq 0], \quad (13)$$

$$W(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{R_{st}} [\max\{0, u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{st})\}] = Pr(u^{\text{cartel}}(R_{st}) \geq 0) V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda). \quad (14)$$

Using proposition 2, we can directly compute the welfare. We postpone the explicit calculations to the end of the subsection and use figure A3.1 to discuss the results. Suppose that all players would belong to the cartel. Then, the welfare would initially increase with the engagement requirement  $\lambda$ , as the social benefits exceed the social cost. The social welfare reaches the peak at the first-best level  $\lambda^{fb} = \sqrt{2} - 1$  (corresponding to  $\Lambda = 45^\circ$ ) and then starts to decline, going back to zero at  $\lambda = 1$  (corresponding to  $\Lambda = 90^\circ$ ). At this level, the average social cost is exactly equal to the average social benefit, so the welfare generated by engagement would be zero. The hypothetical welfare from a cartel that everyone joins it is an upper bound for welfare generated by the cartel and it is depicted by the dashed gray line on the figure. When  $\lambda \leq \gamma$ , the cartel achieves this upper bound, but if the engagement requirement is larger, some players choose not to join the cartel, and therefore the welfare is lower than the upper bound.

There are three qualitatively different possibilities for the free-riding parameter  $\gamma$ . First, at a high level, for example,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$  (the green line with circle markers), the cartel can achieve the first-best outcomes by requiring first-best engagement  $\lambda^{fb}$ . Naturally, above this level, welfare starts to decrease as costs exceed the benefits. At  $\lambda = \gamma$  there is a kink due to a second distortion—above this engagement requirement, players with the highest reach choose not to participate. At a moderate level, for example,  $\gamma = \frac{3}{8}$  (the red line with square markers), the first-best outcome is not achievable by the cartel because at  $\lambda^{fb}$ , players with the highest reach would not participate in the cartel. The welfare-maximizing engagement is  $\lambda = \gamma = \frac{3}{8}$ , the highest engagement where all players join the

---

<sup>33</sup>Remember that the players extract constant fraction ( $\beta$ , normalized to 1) of social welfare as their own payoffs.




Figure A3.1: Welfare as a function of engagement requirement

Notes:  $\lambda^{fb}$  denotes the first-best engagement requirement, and  $\lambda_\gamma^{eq}$  the equilibrium engagement threshold. Corresponding dashed lines indicate mean payoffs for cartel members ( $V^{\text{cartel}}$ ).

cartel. Finally, at a low level, for example,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{10}$  (the blue line with cross markers), the optimal cartel is such that not all players join the cartel. It balances the trade-off between requiring more engagement and excluding fewer high-reach players. Figure A3.1 also shows the mean payoffs to cartel members,  $V^{\text{cartel}}$ , which coincides with  $W$  when  $\lambda \leq \gamma$  as all players join the cartel, but is strictly higher when  $\lambda$  is higher, as it does not account for the fact that the cartel only includes a fraction of influencers.

These results are formally characterized by the following corollary, where  $\gamma^{\text{inc}}$  is defined as

$$\gamma^{\text{inc}} = \frac{1}{3} \left( -2 - \frac{11}{\sqrt[3]{64 + 9\sqrt{67}}} + \sqrt[3]{64 + 9\sqrt{67}} \right) \approx 0.3444. \quad (15)$$

**Corollary 2.** *Depending on  $\gamma$ , we have one of three cases:*

1. *If  $\gamma \geq \lambda^{fb}$ , then first-best outcomes are achieved by a cartel with  $\lambda = \lambda^{fb}$ . Both  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$  and  $W(\lambda)$  are strictly increasing in  $\lambda$  for  $\lambda < \lambda^{fb}$  and strictly decreasing for  $\lambda > \lambda^{fb}$ .*
2. *If  $\gamma^{\text{inc}} \geq \gamma < \lambda^{fb}$ , then first-best outcomes are not achievable by a cartel and the welfare maximizing engagement is  $\lambda = \gamma$ , the highest  $\lambda$  where all players join the cartel. Again, both  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$  and  $W(\lambda)$  are strictly increasing in  $\lambda$  for  $\lambda < \gamma$  and strictly decreasing for  $\lambda > \gamma$ .*
3. *If  $\gamma < \gamma^{\text{inc}}$ , then the first-best outcomes are not achievable by a cartel. Welfare-maximizing  $\lambda^* \in (\gamma^{\text{inc}}, 1)$  involves some players staying out of the cartel.*

**Proof** By proposition 2, when  $\lambda \leq \gamma$ , all players join the cartel and therefore  $\mathbb{E}R_{s_t} = \mathbb{E}R_{s_{t+1}} = 2$ , so that

$$W(\lambda) = V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \frac{4\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2+1} \mathbb{E}[R] = \frac{8\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2+1}. \quad (16)$$

This expression is strictly increasing for  $\lambda \in [0, \lambda^{fb})$  and strictly decreasing for  $\lambda \in (\lambda^{fb}, 1]$ .

When  $\gamma < \lambda < 1$ , some players with highest reach choose not to join the cartel. By proposition 2, then the expected reach of a cartel member is  $\mathbb{E}[R_{s_t} | R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}] = \frac{2}{1+\bar{R}} = \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{1-\gamma}$ . Therefore, the expressions become

$$V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \frac{4\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2+1} \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{1-\gamma}, \quad (17)$$

$$W(\lambda) = Pr(R_{s_t} \leq \bar{R}) V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \frac{16\lambda(1-\lambda)^2}{(\lambda^2+1)(2-\gamma-\lambda)}. \quad (18)$$

The derivative of  $W(\lambda)$  is

$$W'(\lambda) = \frac{16(1-\lambda)(\gamma\lambda^3 + \gamma\lambda^2 + 3\gamma\lambda - \gamma - 6\lambda + 2)}{(\lambda^2+1)^2(2-\gamma-\lambda)^2}.$$

For brevity, let us denote

$$w(\lambda) = \gamma\lambda^3 + \gamma\lambda^2 + 3\gamma\lambda - \gamma - 6\lambda + 2.$$

Then  $\text{sgn } W'(\lambda) = \text{sgn } w(\lambda)$ . The function  $w(\lambda)$  is a continuous,  $w(0) = 2 - \gamma < 0$  and  $w(1) = -4(1 - \gamma) < 0$ , so  $w(\lambda)$  has a root in  $(0, 1)$ . Let us denote it by  $\lambda^*$ . Moreover, as  $w(\lambda)$  is a polynomial, with leading coefficient  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $w(\lambda) > 0$  for sufficiently large  $\lambda$  and  $w(\lambda) < 0$  for sufficiently small  $\lambda < 0$ . Therefore it must have one root in  $(1, \infty)$  and one root in  $(-\infty, 0)$ . As it is a third-order polynomial, it has at most three roots. We have therefore determined that  $\lambda^*$  is its only root in  $(0, 1)$ .

These arguments establish that  $W'(\lambda^*) = 0$ ,  $W'(\lambda) > 0$  for all  $\lambda < \lambda^*$ , and  $W'(\lambda) < 0$  for all  $\lambda > \lambda^*$ . Therefore  $W(\lambda)$  is maximized at  $\lambda^*$ . If we set  $\gamma = \lambda$ , we get a polynomial  $w(\lambda) = \lambda^4 + \lambda^3 + 3\lambda^2 - 7\lambda + 2$ . In this case, we can directly check the roots and see that it again has a unique root in  $(0, 1)$ , which is  $\gamma^{inc}$  defined by equation (15). The combination of these observations proves all claims for  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$ .

The proof for  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$  is analogous, with the exception that its derivative with respect to  $\lambda$  has a slightly higher root  $\lambda^{**} > \lambda^*$ . Notice that if we set  $\gamma = \lambda$  to this expression, we get the same polynomial as before, and its root is again  $\gamma^{inc}$ . This is not surprising because at the limit  $\lambda = \gamma = \gamma^{inc}$  all players participate in the cartel, and therefore

$V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$  coincides with  $W(\lambda)$ . □

### A3.2 Entry Requirements to the Cartel

Our model can also shed some light on the reasons why influencer cartels in practice often impose entry requirements. A typical requirement is to have at least some minimum number of followers, ranging from 1,000 to 100,000 in our sample.

We saw that the cost of joining the cartel depends on the player’s own reach, while the benefit depends on the average reach of a cartel member. By imposing a minimum entry requirement for reach, the cartel can increase the average reach, making the cartel more appealing to players with higher reach. The combination of these two effects raises the average reach and benefits all members. Therefore, we would expect the entry requirement to raise the average benefits for the cartel member,  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$ . On the other hand, excluding players with low reach means that fewer players are eligible to join the cartel, which may reduce the social welfare,  $W(\lambda)$ . The following proposition confirms this intuition.

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose that in addition to engagement requirement  $\Lambda > 0$ , the cartel imposes an entry requirement  $\underline{R} > 1$ , so that only players with  $R_t \geq \underline{R}$  are eligible to join. The mean payoff of a cartel member,  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$ , is proportional to  $\underline{R}$  and the mean payoff of a player,  $W(\lambda)$ , is proportional to  $\underline{R}^{-1}$ .*

The cartel may, therefore, choose to restrict the eligibility as such a restriction would raise the cartel member’s welfare. On the other hand, the cartel organizer must be wary of the downside—eligibility restriction reduces the number of cartel members, and this effect is large enough to reduce the overall welfare. If there is a single cartel, it depends on the cartel organizer’s objective whether the restriction is beneficial. However, it is easy to imagine an extension where multiple cartels can be arranged: some that focus on smaller players who will then engage more actively and others that limit access to large players and require less engagement. As we see in the data, this is what happens in practice.

**Proof** If  $\lambda \leq \gamma$ , then by the same arguments as above, all eligible players join the cartel, and therefore the expected reach of cartel members is  $\mathbb{E}(R_{s_t} | R_{s_t} \geq \underline{R}) = 2\underline{R}$ . The mean payoff for cartel members is

$$V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \frac{8\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2 + 1} \underline{R}.$$

This is the same expression as above, in equation (16), but multiplied with  $\underline{R}$ . The difference is that now players with  $R_t < \underline{R}$  cannot join. Their probability that player is

eligible is  $Pr(R_t \geq \underline{R}) = \underline{R}^{-2}$ . Therefore the, social welfare is

$$W(\lambda) = \frac{8\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2+1} \underline{R}^{-1}.$$

Again, the same expression as equation (16), but now multiplied with  $\underline{R}^{-1}$ .

Suppose now that  $\gamma < \lambda < 1$ . By the same arguments as before, only players with a reach below marginal value  $\bar{R}$  will join the cartel. Therefore, the average reach of a cartel member is now

$$\mathbb{E} [R_{st} | \underline{R} \leq R_{st} \leq \bar{R}] = \frac{\int_{\underline{R}}^{\bar{R}} R_{st} 2R_{st}^{-3} dR_{st}}{\int_{\underline{R}}^{\bar{R}} 2R_{st}^{-3} dR_{st}} = \frac{2}{\underline{R}^{-1} + \bar{R}^{-1}}.$$

Using this value, we can now compute the marginal type using  $u^{\text{cartel}}(\bar{R}) = 0$  and get  $\bar{R} = \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{\lambda-\gamma} \underline{R}$ . Therefore, the expected reach of a cartel member is in equilibrium  $\mathbb{E}(R_{st} | \underline{R} \leq R_{st} \leq \bar{R}) = \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{1-\gamma} \underline{R}$ . Inserting this into the expected payoff expression gives the expected payoff for a cartel member,

$$V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda) = \frac{4\delta\lambda(1-\lambda)}{\lambda^2+1} \frac{2-\gamma-\lambda}{1-\gamma} \underline{R}.$$

Again, this expression is identical to the unconditional payoff expression, just scaled with  $\underline{R}$ . Finally, the probability that a player is eligible and chooses to join the cartel is

$$Pr(\underline{R} \leq R_{st} \leq \bar{R}) = \underline{R}^{-2} - \bar{R}^{-2} = \frac{4(1-\gamma)(1-\lambda)}{(2-\gamma-\lambda)^2} \underline{R}^{-2}.$$

Therefore the, social welfare is

$$W(\lambda) = \frac{16\delta\lambda(1-\lambda)^2}{(\lambda^2+1)(2-\gamma-\lambda)} \underline{R}^{-1}.$$

In each case, our findings are the same. Increasing  $\underline{R}$  increases the mean cartel member's payoff,  $V^{\text{cartel}}(\lambda)$  from the cartel linearly. However, it reduces cartel membership quadratically and, therefore, reduces the overall average payoff  $W(\lambda)$  linearly.  $\square$

## A4 Online Appendix: Data Collection

### A4.1 Telegram Cartel History

We collected Telegram cartel interaction history for 9 cartels: 6 general cartels (1K, 5K, 10K, 30K, 50K, 100K) and 3 topic cartels (fashion & beauty, health & fitness, travel & food). The 9 cartels were formed the earliest in August 2017 (10K and 50K) and the latest in February 2018 (5K). We downloaded the data in June 2020. In June 2020 all cartels had new posts.

The Telegram cartel interaction history consists of three pieces of information: Telegram username, Instagram post shortcode, and time. The interaction history tells us which Telegram user, added when, and which Instagram post to the cartel. According to the cartel rules, this information allows to determine which cartel member has to comment and like which post. This is because one has to comment and like five posts by other users directly preceding one's own.

### A4.2 Mapping Telegram Posts to Instagram Users

The Telegram cartels included 220,893 unique Instagram posts that we were able to map to 21,068 Instagram users. Specifically, the Telegram cartels included 316,462 unique Instagram posts altogether. Some posts are posted multiple times and/or multiple cartels, the 316,462 unique Instagram posts were posted in total 527,498 times. The cartel interaction files don't include the Instagram username of the author of the Instagram post. We mapped the Instagram posts included in cartels to Instagram users using the following interactive procedure. For the first Instagram post in the cartel of each Telegram user, we searched for the post on Instagram to learn the Instagram username of the post's author. Then we obtained from CrowdTangle the full list of all the Instagram posts of that Instagram username and matched those to the posts in the cartel. We checked the remaining unmatched posts in the cartel one by one until we either found a match for it on Instagram or determined that the post had been deleted on Instagram or made private. In this way, we were able to determine the Instagram usernames of 70% of the posts in the cartels, altogether 21,068 Instagram usernames.

Of the 21,068 Instagram users, 22% of users had posted in both topic and general cartels. Altogether, 11,158 users had posted in topic cartels and 14,566 users in general. This includes 4,656 users who had posted in both. Hence, the total number of users equals  $11,158 + 14,566 - 4,656 = 21,068$ .

From CrowdTangle, for all the 21,068 Instagram users, we obtained the history of all their Instagram posts. This data included the time of the post, and the text of the

post including the hashtags. The data was downloaded from August 19 to September 16, 2021.

### **A4.3 Instagram Comments**

For each Instagram user, for their first post in cartels (no matter which cartel), we collected information on who commented on the post. Our goal was to learn who engaged with the post and compare natural (non-cartel) engagement to that obtained via cartels. Therefore, we did not focus on the comment but instead only on the username that posted the comment. We restricted attention to the commenters on the post itself, and excluded commenters who commented on a comment.

We focused on each user's first post in cartels to minimize the possibility that involvement in cartels had affected engagement. However, when the first post did not have enough information for the analysis, that is, when for the first post none of the cartel members who were required to comment existed anymore, then we focused on the second (if the second post existed) and so on. We did not require that the cartel members actually commented, only that the users still existed. For 18 users no post existed that satisfied the requirement reducing the sample to 21,050 users. Among the remaining 21,050 users, for 99.8% (20,999), it was of their actual first posts. To simplify the exposition, in going forward, we call all the first posts satisfying the requirement, simply the first posts.

We used Apify to collect the comments. It allows access to the comments that are available without logging in to Instagram and provides only up to 50 comments for each post. The data included the username of the commenter and the text of the comment. While we don't use the text of the comment in our main analysis, we do analyze it in Appendix A5. The comments were downloaded in January 2024.

We were able to collect comments only for 16,630 posts, which is 79.0% of the 21,050 first posts. We could not collect comments for all the first posts, because these posts either did not have any comments but mostly because we attempted to collect these comments more than two years after collecting posts itself, and in two years these users or their posts were either deleted or made private. Of the posts for which we were able to collect comments, some had no non-cartel comments, leaving us with 16,386 posts. Hence, we were able to find non-cartel comments for 77.8% of the total 21,050 first posts. For both topic and general cartels the percentage of first posts for which we got non-cartel comments was similar, 78%.



#### **A4.4 Random Non-Cartel Commenter on Each Cartel Member’s First Cartel Post**

For each cartel member’s first post in cartels, we used a random number generator and picked a random non-cartel user who had commented on the post. We picked these random non-cartel users for 16,386 posts. Some of the randomly picked non-cartel commenting users were the same across posts. Hence, we were left with 14,490 unique non-cartel commenting users.

For these 14,490 non-cartel users, we collected their information about their number of public posts. We collected this information using Apify in January 2024. Of these users, 24 didn’t exist anymore. So that we were left with 14,466 non-cartel users. Of those, 3,049 (21.0%) had no public posts. We had to exclude those user because they had no information we could analyze. So that we were left with 11,417 public non-cartel users. We further limited the sample to non-cartel users who had at least 10 public posts and this restriction reduced the sample to 10,394 non-cartel users.

For these random non-cartel users, we obtained the history of all their Instagram posts from CrowdTangle. We did this to calculate authors’ similarity to the non-cartel users who commented on the post. For these non-cartel users, the data was downloaded from CrowdTangle in January 2024. We were able to get the history only for 10,280 non-cartel users (99%). For the remaining 114 usernames either they had changed the username, made the account private or deleted it. Furthermore, we learned that 551 (5%) of the 10,280 non-cartel users were associated with cartel members as they had posted at least one post associated with a cartel member. The association can happen as Instagram allows posts to be associated with multiple users (this is different from tagging a user) or it can happen when users change usernames. We excluded those 551 non-cartel users from our sample, while keeping the corresponding cartel members. That reduced the sample of non-cartel users to 9,729. These 9,729 non-cartel users mapped to 10,683 first posts because, as said above, some of these non-cartel users were commenting on multiple posts.

#### **A4.5 Photos from First Posts**

We collected a photo from a single Instagram post for each user. For cartel members, we use the first post each cartel member posted to the cartels. For non-cartel members, we select their closest post within a symmetric time window to the cartel member’s post they commented on. The photos were downloaded in February and March in 2024. We were able to get the photos for only 16,693 (79%) cartel members and 9,269 (95%) non-cartel users. The reason why we did not get photos for 21% of the cartel members is the same

as for the comments, that in the two years the posts were either deleted or made private. Similarly, due the delay, we did not get photos for 5% of the non-cartel users.

## A5 Online Appendix: Additional Empirical Results

Table A5.1: How substantial and relevant are cartel versus non-cartel comments

|                        | (1)                               | (2)                 | (3)                 | (4)                 | (5)                 | (6)                 | (7)                      | (8)                 | (9)                 |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                        | Posts in general or topic cartels |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                          |                     |                     |
|                        | General                           | Topic               | Both                | General             | Topic               | Both                | General                  | Topic               | Both                |
|                        | Comment has text                  |                     |                     | Log. comment length |                     |                     | Photo-comment similarity |                     |                     |
| General cartel comment | 0.104***<br>(0.005)               |                     | 0.101***<br>(0.016) | 0.369***<br>(0.020) |                     | 0.386***<br>(0.060) | 0.005***<br>(0.001)      |                     | 0.004**<br>(0.002)  |
| Topic cartel comment   |                                   | 0.119***<br>(0.006) | 0.113***<br>(0.016) |                     | 0.464***<br>(0.023) | 0.524***<br>(0.059) |                          | 0.008***<br>(0.001) | 0.008***<br>(0.002) |
| Base (non-cartel) mean | 0.873                             | 0.868               | 0.863               | 2.693               | 2.719               | 2.662               | 0.221                    | 0.220               | 0.219               |
| Author fixed effects   | Yes                               | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes                      | Yes                 | Yes                 |
| Authors                | 4432                              | 3399                | 380                 | 4432                | 3399                | 380                 | 4398                     | 3369                | 376                 |
| Observations           | 14922                             | 11862               | 2328                | 14922               | 11862               | 2328                | 14045                    | 11210               | 2218                |

Notes: Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and commenter pair. Outcome variable in columns 1–3 is an indicator whether the comment includes any text; in columns 4–6, the logarithm of the comment length measured in characters; in columns 7–9, the cosine similarity between the photo (in the author’s first post in cartels) and the text of the comment, and it is calculated using embeddings from the CLIP model. Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the non-cartel comment; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents the average value of the outcome variable for the base category. *General cartel comment* is an indicator variable for the comment from the general cartel, and *Topic cartel comment* whether it is from the topic cartel. The sample consists of authors whose first cartel post is either: only in general cartels (columns 1, 4, and 7); only in topic cartels (columns 2, 5, and 8); or in both general and topic cartels (columns 3, 6, and 9). Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.

Table A5.2: Most representative hashtags for each LDA topic

| Topic number | Topic label  | Most representative hashtags  |
|--------------|--------------|---|
| Topic 1      | Fitness      | #fitness #gym #workout #motivation #fitnessmotivation #fitfam #fit #bodybuilding #health #training  |
| Topic 2      | Beauty       | #art #music #makeup #artist #photography #beauty #makeupartist #design #mua #yoga   |
| Topic 3      | Fashion      | #fashion #ootd #instagood #style #photooftheday #fashionblogger #picoftheday #beautiful #photography #beauty                              |
| Topic 4      | Food         | #foodie #foodporn #food #instafood #liketkit #foodphotography #foodstagram #foodblogger #yummy #delicious                                 |
| Topic 5      | Entrepreneur | #motivation #entrepreneur #success #business #inspiration #luxury #quotes #motivationalquotes #mindset #entrepreneurship                  |
| Topic 6      | Travel       | #travel #travelgram #travelphotography #wanderlust #travelblogger #nature #photography #instatravel #photooftheday #beautifuldestinations |

Table A5.3: Sample construction

|   | Number of authors |
|---|-------------------|
| Panel A: Number of authors in the regression sample |                   |
| Total number of authors in the cartel               | 21068             |
| .. with cartel commenters                           | 21050             |
| .. and with non-cartel commenters                   | 10683             |
| .. and author has embeddings                        | 10171             |
| .. and cartel commenter has embeddings              | 10022             |
| .. and non-cartel commenter has embeddings          | 8507              |
| Panel B: Number of authors in the LDA sample        |                   |
| Total number of authors in the cartel               | 21068             |
| .. with cartel commenters                           | 21050             |
| .. and with non-cartel commenters                   | 10683             |
| .. and author has LDA                               | 8936              |
| .. and cartel commenter has LDA                     | 8835              |
| .. and non-cartel commenter has LDA                 | 6654              |

Table A5.4: Summary statistics of authors in cartel included/excluded from the sample

|                                     | (1)  | (2)      |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------|
|                                     | Authors included vs excluded from the sample |          |
|                                     | Excluded                                     | Included |
|                                     | Regression sample                            |          |
| Number of posts                     | 583.0  | 735.7    |
| Number of words per post            | 47.0   | 54.9     |
| Average number of hashtags per post | 13.2   | 14.4     |
| Observations                        | 12561  | 8507     |
|                                     | LDA sample                                   |          |
| Number of posts                     | 615.0  | 709.0    |
| Number of words per post            | 46.8   | 57.6     |
| Average number of hashtags per post | 12.5   | 16.3     |
| Observations                        | 14414  | 6654     |

Notes: According to the t-test, all differences between columns 1 and 2 are statistically significant at 1 percent level.

Table A5.5: Summary statistics of authors in different types of cartel

|                                     | (1)                | (2)   | (3)   |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|
|                                     | Authors in cartels |       |       |
|                                     | General            | Topic | Both  |
| Number of posts                     | 860.8              | 570.1 | 624.3 |
| Number of posts in cartel           | 13.3               | 10.0  | 12.7  |
| Number of words per post            | 51.4               | 59.3  | 58.9  |
| Average number of hashtags per post | 14.0               | 15.0  | 14.4  |
| Observations                        | 4756               | 3263  | 488   |

Notes: The table includes authors in the main regression sample. According to the t-test, all differences between columns 1 and 2 are statistically significant at 1 percent level.

Table A5.6: Summary statistics of users in cartels versus not in cartels

|                                     | (1)                | (2)            |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
|                                     | User not in cartel | User in cartel |
| Number of posts                     | 769.1              | 730.9          |
| Number of words per post            | 48.9               | 53.8           |
| Average number of hashtags per post | 13.7               | 14.4           |
| Observations                        | 7847               | 12088          |

Notes: The table includes users (authors and commenters) in the main regression sample. According to the t-test, all differences are statistically significant at 5 percent level.

Table A5.7: Alternative outcome variables: random posts; all posts in 2017–2020

|  | (1)  | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                  | (6)                  |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Dependent variable: Cosine similarity from text embeddings |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|  | Posts in general or topic cartels                          |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|  | General  | Topic                | Both                 | General              | Topic                | Both                 |
|  | Random 100 posts   |                      |                      | All posts 2017-2020  |                      |                      |
| General cartel commenter                         | -0.044***<br>(0.002)                                       |                      | -0.044***<br>(0.007) | -0.028***<br>(0.002) |                      | -0.038***<br>(0.007) |
| Topic cartel commenter                           |  | -0.012***<br>(0.003) | 0.006<br>(0.007)     |                      | -0.000<br>(0.003)    | 0.010<br>(0.007)     |
| Random user                                      | -0.073***<br>(0.002)                                       | -0.075***<br>(0.003) | -0.062***<br>(0.007) | -0.066***<br>(0.002) | -0.068***<br>(0.003) | -0.062***<br>(0.007) |
| Wald test, $\beta_{Gen} = \beta_{Top}$ , p-value |  |                      | 0.000                |                      |                      | 0.000                |
| Base (non-cartel) mean                           | 0.626  | 0.630                | 0.623                | 0.651                | 0.656                | 0.647                |
| Author fixed effects                             | Yes  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors  | 4749   | 3261                 | 487                  | 4750                 | 3261                 | 488                  |
| Observations                                     | 44752  | 30459                | 6630                 | 43650                | 29745                | 6546                 |

Notes: Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. In columns 1–3, the outcome variable is calculated based on the hashtags in user’s 100 randomly chosen posts; in columns 4–6, it is calculated based on hashtags in all posts in 2017–2020 (for further details see Section 4.2.1). Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author’s similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *General cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author’s cosine similarity is calculated, is in the general cartel, and *Topic cartel commenter* whether he is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author’s similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn’t comment. Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.

Table A5.8: Alternative outcome variable: whole text instead of hashtags

|   | (1)                               | (2)                  | (3)                  |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Dependent variable: Cosine similarity from text embeddings of full text |                                   |                      |                      |
|   | Posts in general or topic cartels |                      |                      |
|   | General                           | Topic                | Both                 |
| General cartel commenter  | -0.043***<br>(0.002)              |                      | -0.042***<br>(0.006) |
| Topic cartel commenter  |                                   | -0.014***<br>(0.003) | -0.003<br>(0.006)    |
| Random user   | -0.073***<br>(0.002)              | -0.079***<br>(0.003) | -0.063***<br>(0.006) |
| Wald test, $\beta_{Gen} = \beta_{Top}$ , p-value                        |                                   |                      | 0.000                |
| Base (non-cartel) mean  | 0.659                             | 0.665                | 0.662                |
| Author fixed effects  | Yes                               | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors   | 4756                              | 3263                 | 488                  |
| Observations  | 44900                             | 30569                | 6665                 |

Notes: Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. It is calculated using the whole text instead of only hashtags (for further details see Section 4.2.1). Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author's similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *General cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author's cosine similarity is calculated, is in the general cartel, and *Topic cartel commenter* whether he is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author's similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn't comment. Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.

Table A5.9: Alternative outcome variables: photo embeddings, text embeddings

|  | (1)  | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)                  | (5)                  | (6)                  |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Dependent variable: Cosine similarity of posts |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|  | Posts in general or topic cartels              |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|  | General  | Topic                | Both                 | General              | Topic                | Both                 |
|  | Photos embeddings                              |                      |                      | Text embeddings      |                      |                      |
| General cartel commenter                         | -0.033***<br>(0.002)                           |                      | -0.037***<br>(0.005) | -0.019***<br>(0.001) |                      | -0.021***<br>(0.004) |
| Topic cartel commenter                           |  | -0.008***<br>(0.002) | -0.004<br>(0.005)    |                      | -0.009***<br>(0.002) | -0.008**<br>(0.004)  |
| Random user                                      | -0.051***<br>(0.002)                           | -0.053***<br>(0.002) | -0.044***<br>(0.005) | -0.016***<br>(0.001) | -0.018***<br>(0.002) | -0.022***<br>(0.004) |
| Wald test, $\beta_{Gen} = \beta_{Top}$ , p-value |  |                      | 0.000                |                      |                      | 0.000                |
| Base (non-cartel) mean                           | 0.487  | 0.493                | 0.491                | 0.777                | 0.780                | 0.784                |
| Author fixed effects                             | Yes  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors  | 4756   | 3263                 | 488                  | 4756                 | 3263                 | 488                  |
| Observations                                     | 44900  | 30569                | 6665                 | 44900                | 30569                | 6665                 |

Notes: Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. It is calculated using embeddings from the CLIP model of either only photos (columns 1–3), or only text (columns 4–6). Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author’s similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *General cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author’s cosine similarity is calculated, is in the general cartel, and *Topic cartel commenter* whether he is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author’s similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn’t comment. Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.

Table A5.10: Alternative sample: commenters who actually commented

|  | (1)                                    | (2)                  | (3)                  | (4)  | (5)                  | (6)                  |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Dependent variable: Cosine similarity  |                      |                      |  |                      |                      |
|  | Posts in general or topic cartels      |                      |                      |  |                      |                      |
|  | General                                | Topic                | Both                 | General                                      | Topic                | Both                 |
|  | Similarity of users<br>Text embeddings |                      |                      | Similarity of posts<br>Photo+text embeddings |                      |                      |
| General cartel commenter                         | -0.055***<br>(0.003)                   |                      | -0.062***<br>(0.011) | -0.033***<br>(0.002)                         |                      | -0.032***<br>(0.005) |
| Topic cartel commenter                           |  | -0.020***<br>(0.004) | 0.005<br>(0.011)     |  | -0.014***<br>(0.002) | -0.011**<br>(0.005)  |
| Random user                                      | -0.067***<br>(0.003)                   | -0.074***<br>(0.003) | -0.056***<br>(0.010) | -0.037***<br>(0.001)                         | -0.040***<br>(0.002) | -0.035***<br>(0.004) |
| Wald test, $\beta_{Gen} = \beta_{Top}$ , p-value |  |                      | 0.000                |  |                      | 0.000                |
| Base (non-cartel) mean                           | 0.566                                  | 0.581                | 0.573                | 0.652  | 0.655                | 0.656                |
| Author fixed effects                             | Yes                                    | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes  | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors  | 3361                                   | 2635                 | 281                  | 3361   | 2635                 | 281                  |
| Observations                                     | 27379                                  | 21797                | 2961                 | 27379  | 21797                | 2961                 |

Notes: The table presents estimates from the same regressions as in Table 1 except the sample includes only these cartel commenters who actually commented. Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author's similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *General cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author's cosine similarity is calculated, is in the general cartel, and *Topic cartel commenter* whether he is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author's similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn't comment. Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.



Table A5.11: Heterogeneity by topic cartel

|                        | Posts in topic cartels, by the topic   |                      |                      |  |                      |                      |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
|                        | Fashion<br>& beauty                    | Fitness<br>& health  | Travel<br>& food     | Fashion<br>& beauty                          | Fitness<br>& health  | Travel<br>& food     |
|                        | Similarity of users<br>Text embeddings |                      |                      | Similarity of posts<br>Text+photo embeddings |                      |                      |
| Topic cartel commenter | -0.014**<br>(0.007)                    | 0.005<br>(0.008)     | -0.033***<br>(0.004) | -0.011***<br>(0.003)                         | -0.006<br>(0.004)    | -0.018***<br>(0.002) |
| Random user            | -0.059***<br>(0.006)                   | -0.081***<br>(0.008) | -0.081***<br>(0.004) | -0.038***<br>(0.003)                         | -0.050***<br>(0.004) | -0.038***<br>(0.002) |
| Base (non-cartel) mean | 0.572                                  | 0.569                | 0.596                | 0.662  | 0.666                | 0.652                |
| Author fixed effects   | Yes                                    | Yes                  | Yes                  | Yes  | Yes                  | Yes                  |
| Authors                | 728                                    | 573                  | 1881                 | 728  | 573                  | 1881                 |
| Observations           | 6386                                   | 4953                 | 18184                | 6386   | 4953                 | 18184                |

Notes: The table presents estimates from the same regressions as in Table 1 except the sample is a subset of the sample in columns 2 and 5 of Table 1. Specifically, the sample consists of authors whose first cartel post is either: only in Fashion and beauty cartel (columns 1 and 4), only in Fitness and health cartel (columns 2 and 5), or only in Travel and food cartel (columns 3 and 6). Note that those authors whose post is in multiple cartels are excluded. Each column presents estimates from a separate panel data fixed effects regression. Unit of observation is an author and another user pair. Outcome variable is the cosine similarity of the author to his commenter or to a random user. In columns 1–3, the cosine similarity of users is calculated using the text embeddings from the LaBSE model; in columns 4–6, the cosine similarity of the corresponding users' posts is calculated using the photo and text embeddings from the CLIP model. Each regression includes author fixed effects (equivalent to the post fixed effects because only one post per author). In all the regressions, the base category is the author's similarity to a non-cartel commenter; and *Base (non-cartel) mean* presents their average cosine similarity. *Topic cartel commenter* is an indicator variable whether the commenter to whom the author's cosine similarity is calculated, is in the topic cartel. *Random user* indicates that the author's similarity is calculated to a random non-cartel user who didn't comment. Standard errors in parenthesis are clustered at the author level.






Figure A5.1: LDA model coherence scores by the number of topics


Notes: The figure presents the Normalized Pointwise Mutual Information (NPMI) coherence score (y-axes) for each LDA model, comparing models with the number of topics (x-axes) ranging from two to twenty. The score is calculated for the top ten words in each topic with a window size of five words.




(a) General cartels



(b) Fashion & beauty cartel




(c) Fitness & health cartel




(d) Travel & food cartel

Figure A5.2: Authors' topics: regression sample versus excluded


Notes: Average LDA topic distribution of the authors in the regression sample versus excluded cartel members.




(a) General cartels



(b) Fashion & beauty cartel



(c) Fitness & health cartel



(d) Travel & food cartel

Figure A5.3: Authors' topics: LDA sample versus excluded

Notes: Average LDA topic distribution of the authors in the LDA sample versus excluded cartel members.