Why Things Compound

https://gerolds.github.io/textbook/textbook/posts/why-things-compound/

Contents

1. The two channels: access and conversion
2. Why early wins snowball
3. Quality still matters, eventually
4. The four stocks
5. The scarce resource isn’t talent
6. Why some people recover and others don’t
7. What this implies
8. How to measure network position
9. How to measure commitment
10. The bottom line
11. Appendix: sources and further reading
    - 11.1 Preferential attachment and cumulative advantage
    - 11.2 Luck, randomness, and success distributions
    - 11.3 Network position and social capital
    - 11.4 Self-regulation and goal pursuit
    - 11.5 Skill acquisition and deliberate practice
    - 11.6 Field-specific evaluation and detection
    - 11.7 Recovery from shocks and career resilience

Why Things Compound

Standard explanations for success and failure usually overstate one variable and ignore the rest. Effort matters, but it does not explain why people with similar ability and discipline end up far apart. Luck matters, but it is not enough on its own either. Network position matters, but it still has to be converted into work someone values.

This essay is an attempt to name the mechanism more clearly. Outcomes diverge in systems where attention, trust, and opportunity move through networks, and where people differ in their ability to convert chances into visible work. The same pattern shows up in scientific careers, music scenes, open source projects, political organizations, and small online communities. The point here is not to sell a worldview or offer a self-help program. It is to describe a set of dynamics that make later gaps easier to understand.

The model is simple: opportunity access, opportunity conversion, feedback from prior visibility, and the self-regulation required to keep converting under stress. Once those variables are on the table, a lot of outcomes that otherwise look mysterious start to look legible.

1. The two channels: access and conversion

Outcomes flow through two channels. Both matter.

Channel one is opportunity access: the rate at which chances worth taking arrive. This looks different in every domain. For a scientist, it's invitations to collaborate, conference slots, grant reviews that actually read the proposal. For a musician, it's opening slots, playlist adds, people with audiences sharing your work. For an open source maintainer, it's contributors showing up, companies adopting the project, other projects depending on yours. For a game modder, it's features on community hubs, YouTubers covering your work, the core dev team noticing you exist.

You can be extraordinary, but if opportunities don't reach you, your ability converts to nothing.

Channel two is opportunity conversion: your ability to turn those chances into output that the relevant community values. This is where skill lives, but also where execution lives. You can have all the access in the world, but if you choke, procrastinate, or ship mediocre work, the opportunities drain away.

The folklore conflates these. "Be so good they can't ignore you" assumes access follows automatically from quality. Sometimes it does. Often it doesn't. The brilliant researcher at a poorly-connected institution gets fewer chances than the adequate one at a prestigious lab. The talented musician in a city with no scene gets fewer breaks than the decent one who happened to be roommates with someone who blew up. Both channels matter; pretending otherwise is cope.

Rule: you need opportunity flow *and* the ability to convert it. Neglect either and the loop stalls.

---

2. Why early wins snowball

Opportunity access is not distributed fairly, and it doesn't stay proportional to quality.

The mechanism is called preferential attachment. Sociologist Robert Merton called it the Matthew Effect; network scientists call it “rich get richer.” When you convert an opportunity into visible output, that output raises your profile within whatever network you’re operating in. People remember you, trust you more, and route future opportunities your way. Your position improves. The next opportunity is slightly easier to get than the last one.

This creates a compounding loop. Early wins raise your visibility, which increases your opportunity rate, which gives you more chances to produce, which raises your visibility further. Two people with identical ability at time zero can diverge rapidly if one gets an early head start. Not because they are necessarily better, but because they become more *attached* to the network that routes opportunities.

You can see this everywhere once you look:

- **Scientific citations:** early-cited papers get cited more, regardless of quality. A paper that happens to get noticed in the first few months accumulates attention that late-blooming papers never catch.
- **Music:** artists who get early playlist placement or blog coverage build the listener base that gets them more playlist placement. The feedback loop is the career.
- **Open source:** projects that cross a visibility threshold attract contributors, which makes them better, which attracts more contributors. Most projects never cross the threshold.
- **Games and mods:** creators who get featured once are more likely to get featured again. The algorithm and the community memory both favor the already-visible.

This is why “who you know” matters, but not only in the cynical sense people usually mean. It is not just schmoozing or nepotism. It is about *position in a system that allocates attention unevenly*. The relevant question is less whether the system is fair than whether you can see the mechanism clearly enough to understand what is happening.

Rule: opportunity flow grows superlinearly with network position. Small early differences compound into large later

gaps.

---

3. **Quality still matters, eventually**

Does this mean quality is irrelevant? No. But the relationship is subtler than “cream rises to the top.”

Domains vary in how well they detect quality. Math proofs are high-detection: your proof either works or it doesn’t, and competent reviewers can verify. Art markets are low-detection: quality is contested, and status often substitutes for evaluation. Music is somewhere in between, depending on genre and era. Political movements are notoriously low-detection; rhetoric and tribal signaling often matter more than policy coherence.

In high-detection domains, quality gates opportunity access more tightly. You can’t fake a correct proof or a program that actually runs. In low-detection domains, attachment capital can substitute for quality longer, sometimes indefinitely. A mediocre but well-connected artist can occupy a position that a better but poorly-connected artist never gets to contest.

Quality also enforces itself through conversion. If your work is weak, you will eventually squander the opportunities you get, and your credibility will decay. But “eventually” can take a long time, and during that time, a high-attachment, low-quality person can crowd out others who might have done better work. The system is leaky.

Rule: quality matters because low conversion eventually destroys credibility. But “eventually” can take years, and detection is noisy.

---

4. **The four stocks**

Think of outcomes as driven by four evolving quantities:

1. **Quality.** Your actual skill and output, as evaluated by people who can tell. This is what deliberate practice builds. It decays if you stop practicing or if standards shift.

2. **Attachment capital.** Your network-mediated position: who trusts you, who will vouch for you, who will route opportunities to you. This grows when you convert opportunities into visible output. It decays when you go quiet, when communities shift, or when attention moves elsewhere.
3. **Credibility.** Others' belief that you'll convert *future* opportunities. Related to attachment but distinct: you can be well-connected but have a reputation for flaking. A serial flaker can have a thick network; a newcomer who ships reliably can have credibility that outweighs their thin connections. Credibility is what gets you the *next* chance, not just the current introduction.
4. **Self-regulation.** Your ability to keep executing under stress, variance, and emotional noise. This is the internal mechanism that holds everything together when circumstances get hard. It prevents opportunity from turning into avoidance, distraction, or self-sabotage.

Most conventional wisdom focuses on quality and maybe attachment. But self-regulation is often the binding constraint. Two people with equal skill and equal network position will diverge if one can execute through a rough patch and the other can't.

Rule: outcomes require all four stocks. Starve any one and the loop collapses.

---

5. The scarce resource isn't talent

The folklore treats talent as the scarce resource. But talent is abundant. The world is full of skilled people who never compound: great musicians who never built an audience, brilliant researchers who never got traction, excellent programmers whose projects never crossed the visibility threshold.

The scarcer resource is **sustained, directed agency under variance.**

Life is noisy. Motivation fluctuates. Circumstances change. Shocks happen: health crises, relationship implosions, economic downturns, random bad luck. The question is not whether you have

ability in ideal conditions. The question is whether you keep producing when conditions are not ideal.

Self-regulation is the multiplier on conversion. When it’s high, you convert opportunities into output even when you’re tired, stressed, or demoralized. When it’s low, you need perfect conditions to function. Any disruption collapses your output, so you lose compounding during exactly the periods when others pull ahead.

This reframes “resilience” as something more specific than a personality trait. It is a functional property: reduced sensitivity of your behavior to your momentary state. You can build it through routines, precommitments, environment design, and processing the emotional load that would otherwise destabilize you. It is trainable.

Rule: variance attacks agency, not ability. Self-regulation keeps conversion alive when everything else is trying to kill it.

---

6. **Why some people recover and others don’t**

This explains one of the harder questions: why do some people bounce back from setbacks while others permanently derail?

People who derail permanently aren’t less talented. They’re less buffered.

A shock depletes self-regulation, which collapses conversion, which erodes credibility and attachment, which reduces future opportunity flow. The spiral is vicious and fast. Those who recover either had more buffer to absorb the hit, or rebuilt self-regulation faster than their other stocks decayed. The mechanism is the same; the initial conditions differ.

This has practical implications. If you know a shock is coming (or just arrived), the priority is protecting self-regulation, not pushing through on output. Triage the commitments. Reduce scope. Preserve the capacity to produce at all, because partial output beats a collapse that takes months to reverse.

---

7. What this implies

Given this model, what does it mean to understand the dynamics rather than hope outcomes are random or purely merit-based?

First, domain selection matters. The mechanism operates everywhere, but some domains are more forgiving. You want contexts where quality is detectable and feedback is fast. If quality is hard to verify, attachment capital dominates and you're in a pure status game. If feedback is slow, you can't course-correct. The ideal is a niche where practice converts quickly into demonstrable output that the relevant community can evaluate.

Second, visibility isn't vanity. The trap is treating output as sufficient, assuming quality will be recognized automatically. It usually won't. Converted output needs to be *visible* output for the feedback loop to close. This doesn't mean self-promotion in the cringe sense; it means putting work where the relevant network can encounter it. A great mod nobody knows about doesn't compound. A solid paper that gets discussed does.

Third, fragility is expensive. If your ability to produce depends on perfect conditions, any shock collapses the loop. Routines, habits, environment design, and processing emotional load aren't productivity hacks; they're insurance against losing compounding when variance hits.

Fourth, the loop requires all the stocks. It's tempting to focus only on quality (the virtuous-feeling part) while neglecting attachment maintenance (the part that feels like selling out). But the loop requires both. You can't compound if nobody knows your work exists. You also can't compound if your work is weak. The question is always: which stock is currently the bottleneck?

Rule: understanding the mechanism isn't a scheme. It's replacing folklore with variables.

---

8. How to measure network position

Most people measure network position wrong. They count followers, track impressions, accumulate platform connections.

These are vanity metrics. They proxy for reach but not for opportunity flow.

The right question is: *who has actually routed opportunities to you in the last six to twelve months?*

What counts as “opportunity” depends on the domain. For a musician, it might be gigs, playlist adds, collaborations, or features. For a researcher, it might be co-authorships, citations, or invitations. For an open source maintainer, it could be contributors, adoption, or dependency chains. For a game dev, it might be coverage, features, or community signal boosts.

Make a list of people and nodes that have actually moved opportunities your way recently. That list is your real network, your opportunity edges. Everything else is decoration.

Recency matters because attachment decays. People forget. Communities shift. Attention moves. If you haven’t converted recently, your position is eroding even if your follower count looks stable. The decay is silent until it bites.

Rule: measure network position by routed opportunities per unit time, not by follower counts or vague prestige.

---

9. **How to measure commitment**

Commitment is not how intensely you feel about your goals. Feelings fluctuate. What matters is behavioral stability: how reliably your actions match your objectives despite noise, temptation, and shocks.

Commitment shows up in behavior: promises kept, hours in focused work, cadence of shipped output, all divided by how much your schedule falls apart when conditions aren’t perfect. The denominator matters most. Two people can ship the same amount, but the one who needs perfect conditions to function is more fragile and will lose compounding during inevitable disruptions.

Direction of commitment is a portfolio problem. You’re allocating effort across the four stocks: quality growth, visibility/conversion, network maintenance, and self-regulation training. Each has

diminishing returns; each is necessary. The question is where the marginal gain is highest *right now*, given the current bottleneck.

Rule: commitment is reliability of production under imperfect conditions. Direction is maximizing marginal gain to the compound loop.

---

10. The bottom line

This model isn't a success scheme. It's a description of dynamics that operate whether you're trying to build a scientific reputation, grow a music audience, establish a game modding presence, or gain influence in a political movement. The mechanism doesn't care what you value or what network you're embedded in. It just describes how small differences in access, conversion, and self-regulation compound over time into large differences in outcomes.

The inputs: skill built through practice, opportunities accessed through network position, credibility earned through visible conversion, self-regulation trained through deliberate effort. The output: a rate of compounding that either accelerates or decays depending on how well all the stocks are maintained.

The hustle-culture story misses network effects by treating effort as sufficient. The pure-luck story misses the role of quality and self-regulation in conversion. The meritocracy story misses preferential attachment almost entirely.

The mechanism is more useful than any of those stories. Once you see it, the question shifts from "how do I get discovered?" to *which stock is the bottleneck right now, and what would change if I addressed it?*

---

11. Appendix: sources and further reading

The model above synthesizes research from network science, sociology of science, and self-regulation psychology. Below are the primary sources for readers who want the technical details.

11.1. **Preferential attachment and cumulative advantage**

Barabási, A.-L., & Albert, R. (1999). “Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks.” *Science*, 286(5439), 509–512. The foundational paper on preferential attachment in network formation. Demonstrates mathematically why “rich get richer” dynamics produce scale-free degree distributions.

Merton, R. K. (1968). “The Matthew Effect in Science.” *Science*, 159(3810), 56–63. Introduced the concept of cumulative advantage in scientific careers: early recognition leads to more resources, which leads to more recognition. The sociological foundation for why equally talented people diverge.

Barabási, A.-L. (2018). *The Formula: The Universal Laws of Success.* Little, Brown and Company. An accessible synthesis of network-based success research, including the Q-factor model (quality times opportunity) and evidence on how performance and success decouple in low-detection fields.

11.2. **Luck, randomness, and success distributions**

Frank, R. H. (2016). *Success and Luck: Good Fortune and the Myth of Meritocracy.* Princeton University Press. Economist Robert Frank’s analysis of how small random advantages compound through winner-take-all dynamics. Strong empirical grounding for why initial conditions matter disproportionately.

Pluchino, A., Biondo, A. E., & Rapisarda, A. (2018). “Talent versus Luck: The Role of Randomness in Success and Failure.” *Advances in Complex Systems*, 21(03n04), 1850014. Agent-based simulation showing that moderate-talent individuals with lucky early breaks outperform high-talent individuals with unlucky ones. Won an Ig Nobel Prize but the underlying model is sound.

11.3. **Network position and social capital**

Burt, R. S. (2004). “Structural Holes and Good Ideas.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399. Demonstrates that network position (specifically, bridging structural holes) predicts idea generation and career advancement independent of human

capital. The empirical basis for treating attachment capital as distinct from merit.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). “The Strength of Weak Ties.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360–1380. Classic paper showing that weak ties (acquaintances) route more job opportunities than strong ties (close friends) because they bridge otherwise disconnected clusters.

11.4. **Self-regulation and goal pursuit**

Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the Greatest Human Strength.* Penguin. Synthesis of ego-depletion research (some findings now contested) but the core insight remains: self-regulation is a depletable resource that can be trained and conserved through environmental design.

Duckworth, A. L. (2016). *Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance.* Scribner. While “grit” as a construct has methodological critics, the underlying research on consistency of effort over time predicting outcomes is robust. Relevant to the commitment-as-behavioral-stability framing.

Inzlicht, M., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). “What Is Ego Depletion? Toward a Mechanistic Revision of the Resource Model of Self-Control.” *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 450–463. Important update to the self-regulation literature, reframing depletion as shifts in motivation and attention rather than a depleted “resource.” Supports the variance-attacks-agency model.

11.5. **Skill acquisition and deliberate practice**

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). “The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance.” *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406. The original deliberate practice paper. Establishes that accumulated hours of structured, effortful practice predict expert performance across domains.

Ericsson, K. A., & Pool, R. (2016). *Peak: Secrets from the New Science of Expertise.* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Accessible

summary of the deliberate practice research program, with practical implications for skill development.

11.6. **Field-specific evaluation and detection**

Mauboussin, M. J. (2012). *The Success Equation: Untangling Skill and Luck in Business, Sports, and Investing.* Harvard Business Review Press. Framework for estimating the skill-luck continuum across different domains. Directly relevant to the “detection” variable: how well does performance predict outcomes in a given field?

11.7. **Recovery from shocks and career resilience**

Carver, C. S. (1998). “Resilience and Thriving: Issues, Models, and Linkages.” *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(2), 245–266. Review of resilience research distinguishing recovery (return to baseline) from thriving (growth beyond baseline). Grounds the “buffer” concept in the shock-recovery section.

Bonanno, G. A. (2004). “Loss, Trauma, and Human Resilience: Have We Underestimated the Human Capacity to Thrive After Extremely Aversive Events?” *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20–28. Demonstrates that resilience after major shocks is more common than previously assumed, and identifies protective factors. Relevant to why some people recover and others derail.

Drafting assistance: Claude Opus. All claims mine; errors my responsibility.