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# Article summary:

1. Institutions have traditionally been used to coordinate group output, but the rise of communication technology has allowed for cooperative infrastructure to replace institutional models.

2. Cooperative systems, such as Flickr and Meetup, allow for individuals to contribute their work without the need for institutional structures and management.

3. The power-law distribution of contributions in these systems highlights the limitations of institutions in capturing value from those who contribute less frequently, leading to a tension between institution as enabler and institution as obstacle.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article discusses the concept of coordination costs and how institutions have traditionally been used to coordinate group output. However, with the advent of communication technology, cooperative infrastructure has become a viable alternative to institutions. The author uses examples from Flickr to illustrate how tagging and other cooperative systems can replace institutional models.

The article is well-written and provides interesting insights into the changing nature of coordination in groups. However, there are some potential biases and missing points of consideration that should be noted.

Firstly, the article focuses heavily on the benefits of cooperative infrastructure without fully exploring its potential risks. For example, while it may be more inclusive than institutional models, it also opens up the possibility for misinformation or malicious content to spread unchecked.

Secondly, the article presents a somewhat one-sided view of institutions as being inherently exclusionary and bureaucratic. While this may be true in some cases, institutions can also provide stability and structure that is necessary for certain types of group output.

Additionally, the article does not fully explore counterarguments to its claims about cooperative infrastructure. For example, while it may be more flexible than institutional models, it may also lack accountability and oversight.

Overall, while the article provides valuable insights into the changing nature of coordination in groups, readers should approach it with a critical eye and consider both sides of the argument.

# Topics for further research:

* Risks of cooperative infrastructure in group coordination
* Misinformation and malicious content in cooperative systems
* Benefits and drawbacks of institutional models in group output
* Stability and structure provided by institutions in coordination
* Accountability and oversight in cooperative infrastructure
* Counterarguments to claims about flexible nature of cooperative systems

# Report location:

<https://www.fullpicture.app/item/54679c7e5ab9c203d3877a4a03708ba9>