

# Prestige bias in cultural evolutionary dynamics

Saar Egozi<sup>1,2</sup> and Yoav Ram<sup>2,3,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science, Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel

<sup>2</sup>School of Zoology, Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

<sup>3</sup>Sagol School of Neuroscience, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author: yoav@yoavram.com

November 14, 2023

## Abstract

If the traits of more successful individuals are more likely to be adopted, the resulting cultural transmission is described as being success-biased. In contrast, if the traits of ‘prestigious’ individuals—those individuals that have already been copied many times—are more likely to be adopted, this is described as prestige-biased cultural transmission. In this case prestige can be used as a convenient proxy for success. Here, we study the joint effect of success and prestige bias on cultural evolutionary dynamics using mathematical analysis and stochastic simulations. Analytic approximations to the stochastic role-model choice process facilitate the mathematical analysis and reduce the computational complexity of simulations. Approximations are given to the fixation probability and the fixation time of an invading cultural trait in different environments. We show that success bias effectively plays the role of natural selection, whereas prestige bias effectively plays the role of genetic drift. Prestige bias, which may be strong in highly social communities, also accelerates the evolutionary dynamics, as can be expected in a rich-get-richer process.

## 22 Introduction

Cultural transmission of attitudes, preferences, beliefs, norms, and behaviors may combine vertical  
24 transmission, in which parents transmit to their offspring; oblique transmission, in which adults  
(teachers, leaders, and even strangers) transmit to unrelated offspring; and horizontal transmission, in  
26 which individuals from the same age cohort transmit to one another [6]. It has been demonstrated that  
non-vertical cultural transmission can maintain maladaptive traits, which can be beneficial in changing  
28 environments [23, 56].

Transmission biases may cause a cultural trait to have a higher rate of transmission than its frequency in  
30 the population. *Success bias* occurs when individuals prefer to copy from role models that demonstrate  
success in some activity, such as fishing, growing yams, using medicinal plants [26], or hunting [55],  
32 and it can increase the probability of learning a trait that is present in those successful individuals [54].  
Indeed, in a tournament between learning strategies [9], most winning strategies included a mixture  
34 of success-biased social learning and individual learning, implying that success-biased learning is a  
good strategy, but that by itself it is not enough to best other strategies, even when success is measured  
36 accurately. Jimenez and Mesoudi [1] also note that a way to acquire adaptive social information is by  
preferentially copying competent individuals within a valuable domain (which they also call success  
38 bias). However, they claim that competence within a domain is often difficult or impossible to directly  
asses, and therefore people tend to use indirect cues of success. Henrich and Broesch [26] have also  
40 suggested that direct assessment of success may be “noisy, unreliable or unavailable” and therefore  
copiers should also take into account indirect measures of perceived success (e.g., “great fishermen  
42 may be chosen as role-models for growing yams”).

Boyd and Richerson [7, Ch. 5] suggested that the assessment of success can be divided to three  
44 categories: *direct bias*, *indirect bias* and *frequency-dependent bias*. Direct bias occurs when one  
phenotype is more attractive than other phenotypes, and is evaluated by *directly* testing the trait. For  
46 example, an individual observing a ping-pong match can try the observed paddle grips to determine  
which grip is better. Frequency-dependent bias occurs when the probability of copying a phenotype is  
48 higher or lower than the frequency of the phenotype among demonstrators. For example, suppose the  
common paddle grip is used by 60% of the demonstrators; if the this grip is adopted by 80% of copiers,  
50 then transmission is under positive frequency bias, also called *conformity*; if it is adopted by 40% of  
copiers, then transmission is under negative frequency bias, or *anti-conformity* [17]. The effects of  
52 conformity and anti-conformity on cultural evolution have been studied with both models [37, 38, 39]  
and experiments [5]. Indirect bias occurs when a copier uses some observed phenotype to evaluate  
54 the attractiveness of a potential role-model. For example, an observer may copy the paddle grip of  
the ping-pong player who scored more points in the match, thus indirectly evaluating the grip by the  
56 points scored. However, this may cause mismatches between the copied trait and the rest of the cultural  
or genetic repertoire of the individual [53]. Furthermore, Boyd and Richerson [7, Ch. 8] suggest  
58 that maladaptive traits may spread widely in a population if indirect bias is strong enough, e.g., by a

runaway process caused by a cultural equivalent of sexual selection [10]. Indeed, helping behaviors  
60 can evolve due to horizontal transmission bias even without any benefit to the recipient [36].

Henrich and Gil-White [28] noted that “the most skilled/knowledgeable role-models will, on average,  
62 end up with the biggest and most lavish clienteles, so the size and lavishness of a given model’s clientele  
size (the *prestige*) provides a convenient and reliable proxy for that person’s information quality”.  
64 Therefore, they predicted that skilled individuals have higher status, that people preferentially copy  
high-status individuals, and therefore that prestigious individuals may be influential even beyond their  
66 domain of expertise. They defined prestige as “freely conferred deference”, in contrast to *dominance*,  
and provided examples from the anthropological literature [28] . Similarly, the New Oxford American  
68 Dictionary defines prestige as the “widespread respect and admiration felt for someone or something  
on the basis of a *perception* of their achievements or quality”. Chudek et al. [32] have also defined  
70 prestige bias as “a tendency to learn from individuals to whom others have preferentially attended,  
learned or deferred” and demonstrated its occurrence in in 3-4 year old children. Henrich and Broesch  
72 [26] have further suggested that prestige bias can, over generations, lead to cultural adaptations, and  
that although prestige can lead to maladaptive traits spreading in the population, it can also accelerate  
74 the spread of adaptive traits.

The distinction between success and prestige bias is important, as prestige is a context-dependent bias,  
76 rather than a content-dependent bias: it does not depend on the phenotype itself but rather on the  
number of copiers that have already copied each role-model, which may be easier and more accurate  
78 to estimate than success. Prestige bias is also frequency independent (see Corollary 1 below), and thus  
it differs from conformity [37, 38, 39], which depends on the frequency of a trait in the population or  
80 in a sample of role-models, rather than the social dynamics of copying.

Prestige bias may be more common in humans than success bias [8]. In contemporary human society,  
82 social media make it especially easy to estimate the social and cultural influence individuals have  
over others, which can have an effect on decision making. Online social networks such as *Facebook*  
84 and *Instagram* are known to affect the influence of individuals [41, 42, 43], and specific marketing  
practices have been invented to capitalize on this effect [40]. However, despite many mentions of  
86 prestige in the cultural evolution literature, there are few models of prestige bias.

Here, we develop a stochastic model of cultural transmission with both indirect success bias and  
88 prestige bias to examine their relationship in contribution to the cultural evolution of populations. We  
find analytic approximations for this model and analyze its dynamics. We also find approximations  
90 for the probability and time to fixation of a ‘successful’ phenotype (i.e., that is subject to success bias)  
in both a constant and a cyclic changing environment. Comparing these approximations to Kimura’s  
92 approximations for the fixation of a favorable allele [21, 47], we demonstrate that success and prestige  
bias play the role of natural selection and genetic drift, respectively.

## 94 Models

We begin with a continuous-trait model with indirect success bias, previously suggested by Boyd  
 96 and Richerson [7]. Note that the indirect success bias is due to an indirect evaluation, in which a  
 certain phenotype is used to evaluate the success of potential role-models. We extend this model to  
 98 include prestige bias and then develop a version of the model with a dichotomous trait to facilitate  
 mathematical analysis.

100 We implement our stochastic models and approximations, perform statistical analyses, and pro-  
 duce figures using Python [44] with NumPy [45] and Matplotlib [46]. Source code is available at  
 102 <https://github.com/yoavram-lab/PrestigeBias>.

### Continuous trait

104 We follow the Boyd and Richerson model [7], assuming only oblique transmission of a single trait.  
 Consider a population of  $N$  individuals, described by a single trait that takes continuous values.  
 106 Each generation,  $N$  naive individuals, or copiers, each chooses a single role-model from the entire  
 previous generation. The copier then copies its trait value from the chosen role-model. Note that our  
 108 transmission models are slightly different from those modeled before, e.g. [7, 38, 58], in which the  
 population is infinite and each copier samples  $n$  role-models and then copies its trait from one or more  
 110 of the sampled role-models.

Similar to a Wright-Fisher model, generations are non-overlapping, and the entire population is  
 112 replaced in each generation. The population at time  $t$  can be described by  $\mathbf{A}(t) = (A_1(t), \dots, A_N(t))$   
 where  $A_i(t)$  is trait value of individual  $i$  at time  $t$ , and the initial population is drawn from a standard  
 114 normal distribution,  $\mathbf{A}(0) \sim N(0, 1)$ . Cultural transmission is modeled by a function  $F$  such that

$$A_i(t+1) = F_i(\mathbf{A}(t)) . \quad (1)$$

116 **Success bias.** Boyd and Richerson [7, Ch. 8, p. 247-249] describe a transmission algorithm by defining  
 $F$ , a weighted average of the traits of all role-models, as

$$118 \quad F_i(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{j=1}^N G_{i,j} \cdot A_{i,j} , \quad (2)$$

where  $G_{i,j}$  is the success bias of role-model  $j$  in the eyes of copier  $i$ ,

$$120 \quad G_{i,j} = \frac{\beta(A_{i,j})}{\sum_{k=1}^N \beta(A_{i,k})} , \quad (3)$$

$A_{i,j}$  is the absolute trait value that copier  $i$  estimates for role-model  $j$  with some error  $e_i \sim$   
 122  $N(0, \eta^2)$ ,

$$A_{i,j} = A_j + e_i, \quad (4)$$

124 and  $\beta(\cdot)$  is the bias function that quantifies the success bias of a role-model [7, eq. 5.11],

$$\beta(A_{i,j}) = b \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(A_{i,j} - \hat{A})^2}{2J}\right), \quad (5)$$

126 with  $\hat{A}$  as the arbitrary optimal trait value, and  $J$  and  $b$  as parameters that control the bias strength; unless otherwise mentioned, we set  $b = J = 1$ . Therefore,  $G_{i,j}$  is a relative success score that copier  $i$  128 assigns to role-model  $j$ .

Boyd and Richerson [7] note that the deterministic blended transmission algorithm they use has 130 alternatives. We can develop a similar stochastic model with transmission from a single random role-model where instead of eq. (2), we define the transmission function  $F$  as a random variable with 132 its distribution given by

$$\Pr(F_i(\mathbf{A}) = A_j) = G_{i,j}; \quad (6)$$

134 here  $G_{i,j}$  is the probability that copier  $i$  chooses to copy the trait of role-model  $j$ .

**Prestige bias.** Here we introduce a new element to the model by assuming that in each generation, 136 copiers choose their role-models one by one. We formulate this assumption in the following. Denote by  $K_{i,j}$  the number of copiers that choose role-model  $j$  after copier  $i$  chose a role-model. Thus,  $i$  out 138 of  $N$  copiers had already chosen a role-model,  $\sum_{j=1}^N K_{i,j} = i$ , and there are  $N - i$  copiers that have yet to choose a role-model. The stochastic process of role-model choice,

$$\{\mathbf{K}_i = (K_{i,1}, \dots, K_{i,N})\}_{i=1}^N, \quad (7)$$

is described by the recurrence equation

$$K_{i,j} = K_{i-1,j} + S_{i,j}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (8)$$

where  $S_{i,j} = 1$  if the  $i$ -th copier chose role-model  $j$  and 0 otherwise, and the initial state is  $K_{0,j} =$  144 0.

Following eq. (6), the probability that the  $i$ -th copier chose role-model  $j$  is given by the *influence* of 146 role-model  $j$  in the eyes of copier  $i$ ,

$$\Pr(S_{i,j} = 1 \mid S_{1,j}, S_{2,j}, \dots, S_{i-1,j}) = G_{i,j}. \quad (9)$$

148 The influence  $G_{i,j}$  of role-model  $j$  in the eyes of copier  $i$  is determined by success—the estimated biased trait value  $\beta(A_{i,j})$ —and prestige—the number of copiers that chose role-model  $j$  before copier  $i$ , 150  $K_{i-1,j}$ , replacing eq. (3) with

$$G_{i,j} = \frac{\alpha_{ij} \cdot \beta(A_{i,j}) + (1 - \alpha_{ij}) \cdot K_{i-1,j}}{W_i}, \quad (10)$$

152 where  $W_i$  is a normalizing factor that sums the numerator over all role-models ( $1 \leq j \leq N$ ) to ensure  $\sum_{j=1}^N G_{i,j} = 1$ . Here, the success-bias weight  $\alpha_{i,j}$  determines the relative weighting of success and

154 prestige bias. It is a characteristic of the interaction of role-model  $j$  with copier  $i$  that determines the  
relative significance of direct success vs. prestige in the role-model's overall influence in the eyes  
156 of the copier. Different individuals may evaluate the importance of success and prestige differently.  
Additionally, we assume each role-model displays its prestige and success individually. For example,  
158 individuals with more followers but lacking skill may emphasize the number of their followers rather  
than their skill (i.e., have lower  $\alpha_{i,j}$  value). Finally, the trait of role-model  $j$  estimated by copier  $i$ ,  
160  $A_{i,j}$ , remains as in eq. (4).

## Dichotomous trait

162 We introduce a simplified version of the above model where the trait has only two phenotypes: an  
optimal phenotype  $\hat{A}$  and a sub-optimal phenotype  $A$ . All role-models with the same phenotype will  
164 contribute to the probability that that phenotype is transmitted and thus influence is determined by  
the number of copiers that have already chosen a role-model with either phenotype. In addition, for  
166 simplicity and for easier mathematical analysis, we assume  $\alpha$  is homogeneous and constant ( $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha$ ),  
which entails exchangeability between role-models. Therefore, the probability that the  $i$ -th copier  
168 copies phenotype  $A$  is

$$G_{i,A} = \frac{\alpha \cdot (N - X)\beta(A) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot K_{i-1,A}}{\alpha \cdot (N - X)\beta(A) + \alpha \cdot X + (1 - \alpha) \cdot (i - 1)}, \quad (11)$$

170 where  $X$  is the number of role-models with trait  $\hat{A}$  and  $K_{i-1,A}$  is the number of copiers that already  
chose  $A$  when copier  $i$  chooses a role-model, and assuming that  $\beta(\hat{A}) = 1$  (thus the term  $\alpha X$  in  
172 the denominator). Complementing this, the probability of the  $i$ -th copier to copy phenotype  $\hat{A}$  is  
 $G_{i,\hat{A}} = 1 - G_{i,A}$ .

## Results

Our models are defined by two nested stochastic processes. Change over multiple generations is  
176 described by the dynamics of the phenotype distribution at each generation,  $\{\mathbf{A}(t)\}_t$ , see eq. (1). The  
transition from one generation to the next is described by the number of copiers each role-model has  
178 after  $i$  copiers have chosen a role-model,  $\{\mathbf{K}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , see eq. (7). We emphasize that the models are  
nested:  $\mathbf{A}(t + 1)$  can be computed from  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  by evaluating  $\mathbf{K}_N$ , where  $K_{N,j}$  is the number of copiers  
180 that chose role-model  $j$  after all copiers chose a role model. However, the former requires iterating  
over eqs. (8) and (9). Thus, we sought to find an equivalent stochastic process that has the same joint  
182 distribution as  $\mathbf{K}_N$ . We found two approximations for the distribution of  $\mathbf{K}_N$ , summarized here and  
explained in detail below. In both approximations we assume that the success-bias weight is either  
184 completely homogeneous,  $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha$ , or that  $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha_j$  is a characteristic of role-model  $j$  that does  
not vary between copiers. Note that these approximations apply for both the and the continuous trait  
186 (eq. (10)) and the dichotomous trait (eq. (11)) models.

**Generalized binomial distribution approximation.** The number of copiers of a specific role-model  
188 at each step,  $K_{i,j}$ , follows the *generalized binomial distribution* [18] and therefore, (i) the expected

number of copiers of role-model  $j$  equals its influence in the eyes of the first copier, multiplied by  
 190 the total number of copiers, that is,  $E[K_{N,j}] = N \cdot G_{1,j}$  if trait estimation error is uniform for all  
 copiers ( $e = e_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ); and (ii) the expected number of copiers of each role-model equals  
 192 its relative biased trait value, similar to the role of relative fitness in population-genetic models, that  
 is,  $E[K_{N,j}] = \beta(A_j + e)/\bar{\beta}$  if the bias weight is uniform for all role-models ( $\alpha = \alpha_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N$ ),  
 194 where  $\bar{\beta} = 1/N \sum_{j=1}^N \beta(A_j + e)$  is the population mean estimated trait value.

**Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution approximation.** The role-model choice process,  $\{\mathbf{K}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , is  
 196 equivalent to a *Pólya urn* model if trait estimation error is uniform for all copiers ( $e = e_i$  for all  
 $i = 1, \dots, N$ ).

198 After finding these approximations for the role-model choice process, we focus on the dichotomous-  
 trait model, in which mathematical analysis is simpler, and studied the fixation probability and time  
 200 in both a constant and a periodically changing environment.

### Generalized binomial distribution (GBD) approximation

202 The generalized binomial distribution (GBD) emerges from a series of dependent Bernoulli trials  
 (in contrast to the standard binomial distribution in which trials are independent) and is denoted by  
 204  $GBD(n, p, \theta)$  where  $n$  is the number of trials,  $p$  is the probability of success of the first trial, and  $\theta$  is  
 the correlation between trials (the latter can be estimated from data, but its value is insignificant for  
 206 our approximation). Note that  $\theta = 0$  gives the standard binomial distribution.

**Result 1** (Generalized binomial distribution approximation). *The number of copiers of role-model  $j$   
 after  $i$  copiers have chosen a role-model follows the generalized binomial distribution,*

$$K_{i,j} \sim \text{GenBin}(i, \alpha_j \cdot \beta(A_j + e), \theta)$$

208 if  $e_i = e$  for all copiers  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ; the success-bias weight only depends on the role-model and not  
 the copier, i.e.,  $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha_j$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ; and  $\theta$  is the correlation between successive role-model  
 210 choices.

*Proof.* Let  $Q_j(k, i) = P(K_{i,j} = k \mid K_{i-1,j})$  be the probability that exactly  $k$  out of  $i$  copiers choose  
 212 role-model  $j$  given  $K_{i-1,j}$  out of  $i - 1$  copiers chose role-model  $j$ . Using conditional probability and  
 eq. (8),

$$214 \quad Q_j(k, i) = P_j(S_{i,j} = 1 \mid k - 1, i - 1) \cdot Q_j(k - 1, i - 1) + P_j(S_{i,j} = 0 \mid k, i - 1) \cdot Q_j(k, i - 1), \quad (12)$$

where  $S_{i,j} = 1$  when the  $i$ -th copier chooses role-model  $j$ . Equation (12) is equivalent to eq. (2.1) in  
 216 [18], which completes the proof.

This result gives the following corollary on the expected number of followers of a given role-model  $j$   
 218 by the end of the role-model choice process,  $K_{N,j}$ .

220 **Corollary 1.** *The expected number of copiers of role-model  $j$  after all copiers have chosen a role-*  
*model is  $E[K_{N,j}] = N \cdot G_{1,j}$ , where  $G_{1,j}$  is the probability of the first copier to copy role-model  $j$ . In*  
 222 *addition,  $E[K_{N,j}] = \alpha_j \cdot \beta(A_j + e) / \overline{\alpha \cdot \beta(A + e)}$ , where the averaging in the denominator is over the*  
*role-models index,  $j$ .*

224 *Proof.* The expected value of the GBD is  $E[K_{N,j}] = N \cdot Q_j(1, 1)$ , see Drezner and Farnum [18,  
 eq. (2.3)]. Here,  $Q_j(1, 1)$  is the initial probability to choose role-model  $j$ , before any role-model  
 226 choices are made, such that  $Q_j(1, 1) = G_{1,j}$  by definition. The rest of the proof is in Appendix A.

From Corollary 1 we see that if there is no success bias, meaning  $Q_j(1, 1) = q$  for  $j$  in  $1, \dots, N$ , then  
 228 the expected number of copiers will be Binomial distributed. This proves that prestige bias is not  
 frequency dependent.

230 The special case where the bias weight is uniform for all role-models ( $\alpha = \alpha_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) is  
 interesting, because we can evaluate the expected number of copiers using a linear equation

$$232 \quad E[K_{N,j}] = N \cdot \frac{\alpha \cdot \beta(A_j + e)}{\sum_{m=1}^N \alpha \cdot \beta(A_m + e)} = \beta(A_j + e) \sqrt{\overline{\beta(A + e)}}, \quad (13)$$

where the only variable is  $A_j + e$ , because  $\overline{\beta(A + e)}$  is the mean of the distribution of the trait values,  
 234 modified by some constant parameters of  $\beta$ . We can then write  $L = 1/\overline{\beta(A + e)}$  and

$$E[K_{N,j}] = L \cdot \beta(A_j + e). \quad (14)$$

236 **Numerical validation.** To validate that GBD approximation for the number of copiers of a role-  
 model is correct (eq. (13)), we ran 1,000 simulations of the full model, and compared the results with  
 238 Corollary 1. We compare the distribution of number of copiers by plotting the histograms of both our  
 simulations results and the expected values based on Corollary 1.

240 Although basic, Figure S1 shows good fit of the GBD approximation. We perform more extensive  
 validations on the Dirichlet-Multinomial approximation (see below), because that is what we will use  
 242 in our analysis.

## Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution (DMD) approximation

244 **Pólya urn model.** This stochastic process consists of  $N$  draws from an urn with an initial number of  
 colored balls of  $M$  colors. When a ball is drawn, it is then placed back in the urn together with an  
 246 additional new ball of the same color. Let  $\mathbf{U}_i = \{u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, \dots, u_{i,M}\}$  where  $u_{i,j}$  is the number of balls  
 of the  $j$ -th color in the urn after  $i$  draws. Let  $S_{i,j} = 1$  when drawing a  $j$ -colored ball on the  $i$ -th draw,  
 248 and 0 otherwise. The probability that  $S_{i,j} = 1$  given  $\mathbf{U}_{i-1}$  is

$$P(S_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{U}_{i-1}) = \frac{u_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{m=1}^M u_{i-1,m}} = \frac{o_j + w_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{m=1}^M o_m + w_{i-1,m}} = \frac{o_j + w_{i-1,j}}{i - 1 + \sum_{m=1}^M o_m}, \quad (15)$$



250 where  $o_j$  is the initial number of balls of color  $j$  in the urn, and  $w_{i,j}$  is the cumulative number of new balls that were added to the urn after  $i$  draws of color  $j$ .

252

**Result 2** (Pólya urn model). *The role-model choice process,  $\{\mathbf{K}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , is equivalent to a Pólya urn model if both the trait estimation error and the success-bias weight are constant in the population,  $e_i = e$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ .*

256 *Proof.* Write  $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}$  as the success-bias weight ratio, and  $A'_j = A_j + e$ . From eq. (10) and because  $\sum_{j=1}^N K_{i,j} = i$ , we have

$$258 \quad G_{i,j} = \frac{\alpha' \beta(A'_j) + K_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{m=1}^N [\alpha' \beta(A'_m) + K_{i-1,m}]} = \frac{\alpha' \beta(A'_j) + K_{i-1,j}}{i - 1 + \sum_{m=1}^N \alpha' \beta(A'_m)}. \quad (16)$$

Substituting  $M = N$ ,  $o_j = \alpha' \beta(A'_j)$ , and  $w_{i,j} = K_{i,j}$  in eq. (15) gives eq. (16), thus completing the proof.

262 Frigyik et al. [19, section 2] prove that the proportion of different colored balls in a *Pólya urn model* converges to the Dirichlet distribution as the number of draws (the population size,  $N$ , in our model) approaches infinity, based on the *Martingale Convergence Theorem* [20]. We therefore have an approximation for the relative influence each role-model has when evaluated by copiers. Thus, choosing the role-models for all copiers is equivalent to drawing from a multinomial distribution where the parameters are the modified weights from a Dirichlet distribution and we have the following corollary.

268 **Corollary 2** (Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution approximation). *The number of copiers of each role-model approximates a Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution,  $\mathbf{K}_i \sim \text{DirMul}(N, \mathbf{G}_1)$ , under the conditions of Result 2.*

**Numerical validation.** We next validated the DMD approximation of our model and tested its sensitivity to the assumptions ( $e_i = e$  and  $\alpha_i = \alpha$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) by comparing results of stochastic simulations of our model (eq. (11)) with the DMD approximation (Corollary 2). We used a relatively small population size,  $N = 100$ , thus validating that the approximation is in good agreement even for small  $N$ , despite the assumption of large  $N$  in the proof by Frigyik et al. [19, section 2]. First, we computed an observed distribution of the number of copiers from the average empirical distribution of multiple simulations. We then compared this observed distribution with the expected theoretical DMD (Figure S2A). The difference in distributions was not perceived when plotting both distributions on the same figure, so we used the difference instead. The maximum difference is 0.5 role-models, which indicates a very good fit. In addition, we tested the likelihood of the observed data to be drawn from the DMD, against a shuffle of the parameters vector of the DMD itself (Figure S2B). We see that the negative log likelihood of the observed data is much higher than any other shuffled version of the parameters vector, strongly supporting our approximation.

284 Next, we examined the fixation probability and fixation time of a favored phenotype  $\hat{A}$  when invading  
a population of phenotype  $A$  and compared results from the full model and the DMD approximation.  
286 Thus, we assume the population has a single individual with phenotype  $\hat{A}$  and  $N - 1$  individuals  
with phenotype  $A$ . We find that the number of simulations needed to sufficiently approximate our  
288 model with the DMD approximation is roughly 1,000 (Figure S3). We examined the robustness of  
the DMD approximation to relaxing the following assumptions. First, we relaxed our assumption of  
290 no estimation error  $e$ . Estimation error in the original model was drawn from a normal distribution,  
and added to the trait value before evaluation of the bias ( $A_{i,j} = A_j + e_i$ ). When estimation error  
292 is applied, we sample  $e_i$  for each copier  $i$  from a normal distribution with expected value zero and  
variance  $\eta^2$ . Even when the estimation error variance is 0.1, both the fixation probability and fixation  
294 time approximations are accurate (Figure S4). We also relaxed our assumption of a uniform bias  
weight  $\alpha$  (i.e.,  $\alpha_i = \alpha$ ). We allowed  $\alpha$  to vary in the population, drawing  $\alpha_j$  for each role-model  $j$   
296 from a normal distribution such that  $\alpha_j \sim N(0.5, q)$  where  $q$  is between  $10^{-7}$  and  $10^{-1}$ . We found  
again that results of the DM approximation are similar to those from stochastic simulations of the full  
298 model (Figure S5).

## Fixation probability and time

300 After finding that the DMD is a good approximation of the (within-generation) role-model choice  
process, we turn our attention to the (between-generation) evolutionary dynamics. We focus on the  
302 fixation probability and conditional fixation time (conditioned on the population reaching fixation)  
of a favored phenotype, using a diffusion-equation approximation approach, similar to analyses of  
304 population-genetic models [21, 47, 48]. We are mainly interested in the effect of the bias weight,  $\alpha$ ,  
which determines the relative effect of success and prestige bias, given by eq. (10).

306 For simplicity, we use the dichotomous-trait model, which also assumes a constant success-bias  
weight  $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha$ , and we do not include trait estimation error in this analysis, i.e.,  $e_i = 0$ . As shown  
308 above, transmission in our model is approximately Dirichlet-Multinomial distributed (Corollary 2 and  
eq. (16)).

310 **Drift and diffusion terms in a constant environment.** We start by finding the expectation and  
variance of the change in frequency from one generation to the next, which are the drift and diffusion  
312 terms of the diffusion equation. Let  $x$  and  $x'$  be the frequency of phenotype  $\hat{A}$  in a population with  
 $N$  individuals in the current and next generation, respectively. We set  $\beta$  to be the success bias of  
314 phenotype  $A$  relative to phenotype  $\hat{A}$ , such that  $\beta = \beta(A)/\beta(\hat{A}) < 1$ . Then (see Appendix B for  
derivation),

$$\begin{aligned}
E[x' - x] &= x(1 - x)(1 - \beta) + o(1 - \beta), \\
V(x' - x) &= x(1 - x) \left( \frac{1}{\alpha N + (1 - \alpha)} \right) + o \left( \frac{1}{\alpha N + (1 - \alpha)} \right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{17}$$

This analysis gives an interesting result relating the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  to parameters of the clas-  
318 sical Wright-Fisher model from population genetics: the selection coefficient  $s$ , a measure of the  
effect of natural selection on the change in frequency of genotypes, and the effective population size,

320  $N_e$ , a measure of the effect of random genetic drift on the change in frequency of genotypes. In a  
diffusion-equation approximation of the classical Wright-Fisher model, the expectation and variance  
322 of the change in frequency are  $E[x' - x] = sx(1 - x) + o(s)$  and  $V[x' - x] = x(1 - x)/N_e$  [21, eq. 7],  
respectively. Therefore, we have the following result.

324

**Result 3** (Effective selection coefficient and population size). *The effective selection coefficient  $s$  and*  
326 *effective population size  $N_e$  can be written in terms of the success coefficient  $\beta$  (eq. (5)), the bias*  
*weight  $\alpha$  (eq. (10)), and the population size  $N$  as*

$$328 \quad s = 1 - \beta = \frac{\beta(\hat{A}) - \beta(A)}{\beta(\hat{A})}, \quad N_e = \alpha N + (1 - \alpha). \quad (18)$$

Note that when  $N \gg 1$ ,  $N_e \approx \alpha N$ , resulting in a very convenient expression.

330

Using our effective selection coefficient,  $s = 1 - \beta$ , and effective population size,  $N_e$ , with the  
332 population-genetics fixation probability approximation given by Kimura [21, eq. 8], we obtain the  
following result.

334

**Result 4** (Fixation probability). *The fixation probability of an invading phenotype favored by success*  
336 *bias is approximately*

$$\pi(x) = \frac{1 - e^{-2(1-\beta)N_e x}}{1 - e^{-2(1-\beta)N_e}}, \quad (19)$$

338 where  $x$  is the initial frequency of the invading phenotype.

Similarly, we can use  $1 - \beta$  and  $N_e$  in the population-genetics fixation time approximation given by  
340 [47, eq. 17].

342 **Result 5** (Fixation time). *The expected fixation time (conditioned on fixation) from an initial frequency*  
 *$x$  is approximately*

$$344 \quad T(x) = J_1(x) + \frac{1 - \pi(x)}{\pi(x)} \cdot J_2(x), \quad (20)$$


where  $N_e = \alpha N + (1 - \alpha)$ ,  $S = N_e(1 - \beta)$ , and

$$346 \quad \begin{aligned} J_1(x) &= \frac{-1}{(1 - \beta)(e^{-2S} - 1)} \int_x^1 \frac{1 - e^{2S\xi} - e^{-2S(1-\xi)} + e^{-2S}}{\xi(1 - \xi)} d\xi, \\ J_2(x) &= \frac{-1}{(1 - \beta)(e^{-2S} - 1)} \int_0^x \frac{(1 - e^{2S\xi})(e^{-2S\xi} - 1)}{\xi(1 - \xi)} d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that these integrals cannot be solved in closed form, and are estimated numerically.

348 **Numerical validation.** We compare our approximations (eqs. (19) and (20)) with results of sim-  
ulations of our dichotomous model using various  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values, as well as simulations of the

350 Wright-Fisher model, using the effective selection coefficient,  $1 - \beta$ , and effective population size,  
 $N_e = \alpha N + (1 - \alpha)$ . We find see that the two models have similar dynamics, and both are well  
 352 approximated by our approximations (Figure 1).



**Figure 1: Fixation probability and time in a constant environment.** Fixation probability and time (in generations) as a function of the success-bias weight  $\alpha$  (bottom x-axis) and effective population size,  $N_e$ , (top x-axis) in panels A and B, and as a function of the effective selection coefficient,  $1 - \beta$ , in panels C and D. The approximation (black; eq. (19)) agrees with both DMD simulations (green) and Wright-Fisher simulations (orange). The fixation probability in panel A is bounded by  $2(1 - \beta)$  (dashed line). Markers are averages of 10,000 simulations, error bars show 95% confidence intervals for panels A and B and 75% for panels C and D. Here, population size is  $N = 1,000$ ; in panels A and B,  $A = 0.7$ ,  $\hat{A} = 1$ , and  $1 - \beta = 0.044$ ; in panels C and D,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ,  $\hat{A} = 1$ , and  $0.01 < A < 0.99$ , which determines  $1 - \beta$  via  $\beta = \beta(A)/\beta(\hat{A})$  and eq. (5).

**Changing environment** . After finding a good approximation in a constant environment, where the  
 354 favorable trait is always  $\hat{A}$ , we proceeded to find an approximation for a cyclic changing environment.  
 Following [23], we denote  $k$  as the number of generations in which the invading phenotype is favored  
 356 by success bias, and  $l$  as the number of generations in which the resident phenotype is favored by  
 success bias. Thus, during the first  $k$  generations of the environmental cycle,  $\beta = \frac{\beta(A)}{\beta(\hat{A})} < 1$ , where  $\hat{A}$  is  
 358 the invading phenotype. During the following  $l$  generations of the environmental cycle, the phenotype  
 favored by success bias is switched, such that  $\frac{\beta(A)}{\beta(\hat{A})} > 1$ . We then proceed to find expressions for the  
 360 expectation and variance of the change in the frequency of phenotype  $\hat{A}$  after  $n = k + l$  generations.

The proof is in Appendix C.

362

**Drift and diffusion terms in a changing environment.** Let  $x$  be the initial frequency of the invading  
364 phenotype and  $X_t$  the number of individuals with that phenotype after  $n$  generations. Then,

$$E[X_n/N - x] \simeq x(1 - x)S_n/N_e, \quad \text{and} \quad V(X_n/N - x) \simeq nx(1 - x)/N_e, \quad (22)$$

366 where  $S_n = \sum_{t=1}^n N(1 - \beta_t)$  and  $\beta_t$  is  $\beta(A)$  at generation  $t$ .

Note that here, we have the average selection coefficient during a cycle of  $n$  generations as the selection  
368 coefficient in eq. (19). Using the drift and diffusion terms and following [23], we can approximate the  
fixation probability in a changing environment.

370

**Result 6** (Fixation probability in a changing environment). *The fixation probability of an invading  
372 phenotype under periodical environmental changes is approximately*

$$\tilde{\pi}(x) = \frac{1 - e^{-2\frac{S_n}{n}N_ex}}{1 - e^{-2\frac{S_n}{n}N_e}}. \quad (23)$$

374 where  $x$  is the initial frequency of the invading phenotype.


**Numerical validation.** To validate the the approximation for the fixation probability in a changing  
376 environment (eq. (23)), we compare it to results of simulations that use the DMD approximation  
(Corollary 2). We find that the approximation fits the simulation results well for variable bias weights,  
378  $\alpha$ , which corresponds to the effective population size (Figure 2A).

However, the approximation is more sensitive to the value of the success bias coefficient  $\beta$  (Figure 2B).  
380 We suspect that when  $\beta$  is too small, there will not be many cycles in the simulations, because either  
the population reaches a high frequency of the fitter phenotype after just a few cycles, or the fitter  
382 phenotype goes extinct very quickly. For such  $\beta$  values (below 0.65), the fixation probability exceeds  
even the constant environment approximation (which is the upper limit). We note that the diffusion-  
384 equation approximation assumes weak selection, or in our case, weak success bias.

We found that for a large  $k/l$  ratio (with a constant cycle length,  $n = k + l = 100$ ), the changing  
386 environment approximation (eq. (23)) converges to the constant environment approximation (eq. (19)),  
see Figure 2C and Figure 2D.

388 The approximation follows the trend of the simulation results for all  $\alpha$  values. On increasing the success  
coefficient  $\alpha$  to more than 0.15, the simulation results were located above the changing environment  
390 approximation, and below the constant environment approximation. We believe the reason is the  
structure of the cycle. Our proof and approximation in the changing environment are for a large  
392 number of cycles, and when the success coefficient  $\alpha$  is too high, there might be very few cycles.  
Either the ideal trait is copied by enough copiers so that the prestige is sufficient to negate the success  
394 bias when the cycle changes (and the trait favored by the bias becomes the disfavored), or the opposite

happens, and the ideal trait goes extinct before there are enough copiers that copied it. We then tried to  
396 change the ratio between the number of cycles where  $\hat{A}$  is favored and disfavored. We showed that the  
approximation fits well regardless of the ratio, but when the ratio of favored generations to disfavored  
398 ones is very high, it is very similar to a constant environment model.



**Figure 2: Fixation probability in a changing environment.** (A) Fixation probability decreases with the success-bias weight (bottom x-axis) and effective population size (top x-axis). The approximation (blue; eq. (23)) agrees with simulation results (orange). (B) Fixation probability increases with the success coefficient,  $\beta$ . When success bias is large ( $1 - \beta > 0.1$ ), simulation results (orange) are underestimated by the changing environment approximation (blue; eq. (23)). With even larger success bias ( $1 - \beta > 0.35$ ), even the constant environment approximation (green; eq. (19)) slightly underestimates simulation results, likely because the diffusion equation approximation assumes weak "selection". (C) The approximation (blue) is robust to changes in environmental cycle length, as it agrees with simulations (orange) for different sizes of the changing environment cycle, where  $k$  and  $l$  are the number of generations each trait value is under success bias. When  $k > l$ , the approximation and the simulations are both very close to the constant environment approximation (green), because the more generations the rare phenotype is favored, the more similar it is to the constant environment model, where it is always favored by the success bias. Markers show average of 10,000 simulations, error bars show 75% (panels A and C) and 95% (panel B) confidence intervals. Here, population size  $N = 1,000$ ;  $\hat{A} = 1$ ,  $A = 0.9$ ,  $k = 20$  and  $l = 80$  (panels A and B);  $A = 0.8$ , (panel C); in panel A, the success coefficient is  $1 - \beta = s = 0.005$ ; in panels B and C, the success-bias weight is  $\alpha = 0.1$ .

## Optimal success-bias weight

400 In results 2-6, we assumed that  $\alpha$  is homogeneous in the population and constant, that is, it does not  
depend on any specific context. Next, we examined what happens in the continuous-trait model if the  
402  $i$ -th copier evaluates its own optimal success-bias weight,  $\alpha_i^*$ , which minimizes the expected squared  
error between the chosen trait value and the optimal trait value  $\hat{A}$ ,

$$404 \quad \alpha_i^* = \underset{j}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\alpha A_j + (1 - \alpha) K_{i-1,j}}{\sum_{l=1}^N \alpha A_l + (1 - \alpha) K_{i-1,l}} (\hat{A} - A_j)^2, \quad (24)$$

where  $A_j$  is the trait of role-model  $j$  and  $K_{i-1,j}$  is the number of copiers that already chose role-  
406 model  $j$  by the time the  $i$ -th copier chooses a role-model. Simply put, each copier  $i$  estimates what  
success-bias weight  $\alpha_i^*$  will result in copying a trait that is most similar to the ideal trait value  $\hat{A}$ .  
408 Indeed, if the trait value is correlated with fitness, the optimal success-bias weight would increase the  
fitness of individuals. However, here we ignore the effects of natural selection, focusing instead on  
410 selectively neutral traits.


We find that when copiers choose their success-bias weight according to eq. (24), it quickly decreases  
412 with the number of copiers that have already chosen a role-model and then stays at what appears to be an  
equilibrium (Figure 3). Moreover, their estimation error is much lower compared to a constant success-  
414 bias weight, which gives roughly the same high estimation error to all copiers (compare Figure 3B  
and C): in this example, the optimal success-bias weight gives an estimation error (difference between  
416 the chosen and optimal trait) converges to 0.046, whereas a constant success-bias weight gives values  
> 0.74.

## 418 Discussion

Some cultural traits or cultural role-models may be copied more often than others due to transmission  
420 biases. One such bias is success bias, in which copiers are more likely to copy a successful role-model.  
It has been suggested that because it is hard to estimate success, a more common bias is a bias towards  
422 role-models *perceived* to be successful. This perceived success can be determined by performance  
with respect to another trait, i.e., *indirect success* [7, 26], or by “the amount of voluntary deference  
424 and attention received by models” [1], i.e., *prestige* [28, 32] (but see Chellappoo [2] for a critical  
examination of the concept of prestige).

426 We developed two cultural-evolutionary models, one with continuous and one with dichotomous trait  
values. Our models include both indirect success and prestige biases, where the latter is a bias towards  
428 role-models with many copiers. We model these biases using a stochastic role-model choice process:  
each copier, in turn, randomly chooses a role-model, and this choice is affected both by the estimated  
430 success of each potential role-model and the number of copiers that already chose each role-model  
(eq. 10). Hence, our models have two “nested” stochastic processes: the role-model choice process  
432 within each generation, and the cultural-evolutionary process between generations. To simplify the  
mathematical and computational analysis, we developed analytic approximations for the role-model





**Figure 3: Advantage of an optimal success-bias weight.** Both success-bias weight  $\alpha$  (A) and estimation error (B) decrease during the role-model choosing process (within a single generation), demonstrating that prestige becomes more favored by copiers as more copiers have made their choice. However, when  $\alpha$  is homogeneous (C), the mean estimation error does not decrease, regardless of  $\alpha$  or  $\eta$ . The mean estimation error in the homogeneous  $\alpha$  model is larger by a factor of 10 than the optimal  $\alpha$  model. Here "Copier" of the x-axis is the index of the choosing copier, population size  $N = 200$ ; estimation error is normally distributed  $e \sim N(0, \eta^2)$  with standard deviation  $\eta = 0.0001$  (blue),  $0.001$  (orange),  $0.01$  (green), markers are average of 300 simulations.

choice process using the the *generalized binomial distribution* (GBD, Result 1) and the *Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution* (DMD, Corollary 2). The latter is especially useful, as it approximates the entire role-model choice process and only requires us to assume that the relative effect of success and prestige is a characteristic of the role-model and not the copier.

Analyzing the dichotomous-trait model using the the DMD approximation, we found approximations for the fixation probability and fixation time of a cultural trait under biased transmission in a constant environment. Our approximations are similar to Kimura's evolutionary-genetic approximations, in that (i) the strength of success bias towards the invading cultural trait,  $1 - \beta(A)$ , is equivalent to the selection coefficient in favor of a beneficial allele,  $s$ , and (ii) decreasing the relative weight of success versus prestige bias,  $\alpha$ , decreases the effective population size,  $N_e$  (Figure 1).

444 We also analyzed the dichotomous–trait model in a cyclic changing environment in which the identity  
of the success-biased trait switches after a fixed amount of generations (Figure 2). We find that,  
446 similarly to the constant environment approximation, a change in the success-bias weight  $\alpha$  has no  
negative effects on the goodness-of-fit of the approximation to simulation results. We also showed  
448 that this approximation is more sensitive to changes in the success coefficient  $\beta$  than the constant  
environment approximation, and a lower value is required to have a good fit. The ratio between  
450 the number of generations in which the rare phenotype is under positive transmission bias and the  
number of generations in which it is under negative bias does not affect the goodness-of-fit of the  
452 approximation.

Lastly, we examined a scenario in which copiers can adjust their success-bias weight,  $\alpha$ , to minimize  
454 their copying error, i.e., copy trait values closer to the optimal value. We found that as the role-model  
choice process proceeds (that is, more copiers make their choices), both the success-bias weight  
456 (adjusted by copiers) and the estimation error decrease. The latter is significantly lower than in a  
population using a constant, fixed success-bias weight, regardless of the value of the constant weight  
458 (Figure 3). This suggests that the later a copier makes its choice, the more it should rely on choices  
of previous copiers (prestige), and the less it should rely on its own estimation of the success of  
460 role-models. The rationale, then, is that the more information a copier has, e.g., by using others as  
information sources, the more informative and effective his choice can be.

462 Chudek et al. [32] report the first direct tests in children that suggest the existence of prestige bias,  
defined as the tendency to learn from individuals to whom others have preferentially attended, learned,  
464 or deferred. Their definition of prestige is similar to ours. They showed that the odds of 3–4 years-old  
children learning from an adult role-model to whom bystanders had previously preferentially attended  
466 for 10 seconds were more than twice those of learning from a role model whom bystanders ignored.  
They also note that prestige effects are domain sensitive: they found that prestigious role-models were  
468 attended more when demonstrating artifact use, whereas role-models presenting food preferences had  
less attendants, suggesting that the domain itself (artifact use vs. food preference) can affect the  
470 attendance, and hence the prestige of the role-model. This led to the suggestion that when the trait is  
costly to learn individually, prestige will have a stronger bias [32]. It would be interesting to include  
472 costs in our model to try and observe these effects and dynamics in a large population.

According to Henrich and Broesch [26], natural selection has favored the emergence of psychological  
474 biases for learning from those individuals most likely to possess adaptive information. The authors  
studied Fijian villages to examine if and how such biases emerge in a small-scale society. They  
476 found that Fijian villagers are more likely to learn from role-models perceived as more success-  
ful/knowledgeable, both within and across domains. Their research thus suggests that copying from  
478 those perceived as successful, rather than who are actually successful, is a common phenomenon. They  
show that the social networks representing copier–role-model relationships are centralized, which is  
480 consistent with the prediction that people substantially share notions about who is a good cultural  
model, but that individuals’ role-model selections are influenced by multiple factors.

482 Dunbar [31] hypothesized that larger, more complex brains can store and manage more information  
 and in turn, this information can support the costs of a larger brain. Following this, Muthukrishnan  
 484 and Henrich [30] suggested that prestige can directly affect human physical evolution. They present a  
 concept called *cultural brains*—brains that evolved primarily for the acquisition of adaptive knowledge.  
 486 They then develop a model that predicts a strong relationship between brain size and group size,  
 because group size also provides access to more adaptive knowledge. They also presented the  
 488 *cumulative cultural brain* hypothesis, which proposes that human brains have evolved with an ability  
 and tendency for selective, high-fidelity social learning. As part of this process, there are a variety of  
 490 strategies and biases that have evolved to hone in on the most adaptive knowledge. These strategies  
 and biases include direct and indirect cues of the popularity of cultural traits (e.g. success and prestige  
 492 biases). They suggest that one of the reasons for the extreme increase in brain size in humans is the  
 ability to ‘cheaply’ acquire adaptive knowledge via transmission biases such as prestige.

494 Prestige bias can help to cheaply estimate and acquire knowledge, which may facilitate survival and  
 reproduction. However, it is not always the case, and there could be negative repercussions to this  
 496 bias, such as invasion of maladaptive traits. Takahashi and Ihara [29] mention that social learning  
 not only takes the form of random copying of other individuals, but also involves learners’ choice  
 498 of what to learn and from whom to learn. They suggest a best-of-k model where an individual  
 samples  $k$  role-models and chooses the one he deems most "successful". They mention that a previous  
 500 mathematical analysis has shown that it may sometimes result in maladaptive cultural evolution when  
 the payoffs associated with cultural variants vary stochastically. In such a case, learners may be  
 502 selectively disfavored and in the long run replaced by unbiased learners, who simply copy someone  
 chosen at random. They developed new mathematical models that are simpler and mathematically  
 504 tractable. They found that best-of-k learning, unlike unbiased learning, can facilitate the invasion of  
 an on average inferior variant that sometimes gives a very high payoff (see Fogarty et al. [57] and  
 506 references there). Our model, which includes both success and prestige bias, is consistent with this  
 claim. When a maladaptive trait is ‘piggybacking’ on a role-model with high influence (joint effect of  
 508 success and prestige), the former could spread in the population. In addition, best-of-k learning can be  
 stable against invasion by unbiased learning if social learning is sometimes combined with individual  
 510 learning [29]. Our model includes only social learning, and not individual learning, but it could be  
 interesting to combine it with individual learning and see how it affects the dynamics.

512 Prestige bias can also accelerate reversal of harmful traditions such as child marriage and domestic  
 violence. Efferson et al. [27] suggest a *spillover* mechanism, in which an intervention affects a large  
 514 enough group in a target population, so that others not included in the intervention also change their  
 behavior. They find that there are individuals who act as *agents*, who are often observed, and therefore  
 516 they are ideal targets for interventions. This is similar to prestigious role-models in our model, which  
 are copied more often, and will therefore spread their trait faster and wider in the population. They  
 518 also suggest a way to use this phenomenon to change existing traditions in a population. It is very  
 clear however, that just as it can be used to end harmful traditions, the same agents could start harmful  
 520 traditions.

Others have analyzed models with interactions between different transmission biases. Hong [59] studied a model with both conformity and success bias (which he calls ‘payoff bias’). He showed that an intermediate level of conformity bias—not too little but not too much—can be adaptive and evolve to prevent invasion of low-success traits while allowing the invasion of high-success traits (for another example of adaptive filtering, see [60]). Similar to our model (eq. (10)), Hong [59] also additively combined the two transmission biases (his eq. 1). However, transmission biases can be combined in many ways. For example, Denton et al. [37] combined frequency-dependent bias and genetically determined content bias multiplicatively (their eq. 1). Ammar et al. [61] studied a model in which individuals have a repertoire of cultural variants to choose from, and both variant choice and transmission via social learning are success-biased. Moreover, they also included the possibility to ‘forget’ infrequently used variants; therefore, because usage is success-biased, memory is also success-biased. It remains to be seen how different assumptions on the mechanisms of learning and forgetting affect the evolutionary dynamics under different and interacting transmission biases.

One path forward is an analysis of the dynamics of the optimal success-bias weight model, in which every copier chooses its  $\alpha$ . It would be interesting to see if the mean estimation error and the varying weight,  $\alpha^*$ , converge to specific values, and how they are affected by the model parameters. It may also be possible to relax the assumptions required for our approximations, such as homogeneous estimation error and success-bias weight. Lastly, it would be interesting to analyze the continuous model and determine how much it differs from the dichotomous model.

Another way to expand our model is to account for the two types of prestige or leadership suggested by Van Vugt and Smith [25] that are attributed to Confucius and Machiavelli. Confucius viewed leaders as role-models who exercise influence through possessing superior knowledge, skills, and (outstanding) personal qualities. This fits the success bias in our model. In contrast, Machiavelli viewed leaders as rulers who exercise influence by imposing costs through (the threat of) punishment and violence. Van Vugt and Smith suggest that these opposing views are both partially supported by the available evidence but each one on its own offers an incomplete view of the complex and dynamic concept of leadership. Henrich and Gil-White [28] have suggested a similar distinction between ‘prestige and ‘dominance’, or between ‘persuasion’ and ‘force’. Several adjustments could be made so that our model reflects these leadership styles, such as assuming there is a correlation between phenotype and leadership style. The resulting cultural-evolutionary dynamics and their dependence on the costs and benefits are intriguing.

**Conclusions.** We studied a model of cultural evolution under two transmission biases: the commonly studied success bias, together with prestige bias, which has so far received less attention by modelers. We found approximations for this complex dynamics. We then showed that success bias affects the evolutionary dynamics much like natural selection does, whereas prestige bias has a similar effect to random genetic drift. We also find a clear advantage to individuals that can choose the relative weight of the two biases.

## 558 **Acknowledgements**

560 We thank Marc Feldman, Martin Pontz, Gili Greenbaum, Alon Rozen, Tal Simon and two anonymous reviewers for discussions and comments. This work was supported in part by Minerva Stiftung Center for Lab Evolution (YR) and the John Templeton Foundation (YR 61809).

- [1] Jiménez, Ángel V., and Alex Mesoudi. (2019) "Prestige-biased social learning: Current evidence and outstanding questions." *Palgrave Communications* 5.1 (2019).
- [2] Chellappoo, Azita. (2021) "Rethinking prestige bias." *Synthese* 198.9: 8191-8212.
- [3] Battesti, Marine, Celine Moreno, Dominique Joly, and Frederic Mery. (2012) "Spread of Social Information and Dynamics of Social Transmission within *Drosophila* Groups." *Current Biology* 22 (4): 309–13.
- [4] Creanza, Nicole, Oren Kolodny, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2017) "Cultural evolutionary theory: How culture evolves and why it matters." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114.30: 7782-7789.
- [5] Aljadeff, Naama, Luc-Alain Giraldeau, and Arnon Lotem. (2020) "Competitive advantage of rare behaviours induces adaptive diversity rather than social conformity in skill learning." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 287.1933: 20201259.
- [6] Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca, and Marcus W. Feldman. (1981) :Cultural transmission and evolution: A quantitative approach." No. 16. Princeton University Press.
- [7] Boyd, Robert, and Peter J. Richerson. (1985) "Culture and the Evolutionary Process". University of Chicago Press.
- [8] Fogarty, Laurel, Joe Yuichiro Wakano, Marcus W. Feldman, and Kenichi Aoki. (2017) "The Driving Forces of Cultural Complexity: Neanderthals, Modern Humans, and the Question of Population Size." *Human Nature* 28 (1): 39–52.
- [9] Rendell, Luke E., Robert Boyd, D. Cownden, M. Enquist, K. Eriksson, Marcus W. Feldman, Laurel Fogarty, S. Ghirlanda, T. Lillicrap, and Kevin N. Laland. (2010) "Why Copy Others? Insights from the Social Learning Strategies Tournament." *Science* 328 (5975): 208–13.
- [10] Andersson, Malte, and Yoh Iwasa. (1996) "Sexual selection." *Trends in ecology & evolution* 11.2: 53-58.
- [11] Kendal, Rachel L., Lydia M. Hopper, Andrew Whiten, Sarah F. Brosnan, Susan P. Lambeth, Steven J. Schapiro, and William J.E. Hoppitt. (2015) "Chimpanzees Copy Dominant and Knowledgeable Individuals: Implications for Cultural Diversity." *Evolution and Human Behaviour* 36 (1): 65–72.
- [12] Horner, Victoria, Darby Proctor, Kristin E. Bonnie, Andrew Whiten, and Frans B.M. de Waal. (2010) "Prestige Affects Cultural Learning in Chimpanzees." *PLoS ONE* 5 (5): 1–5.
- [13] Henrich, Joseph, and Richard McElreath. (2012) "Dual-Inheritance Theory: The Evolution of Human Cultural Capacities and Cultural Evolution." In *Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, edited by Louise Barrett and Robin Dunbar, 1st ed., 555–70. Oxford University Press.

- [14] McComb, K., C. Moss, Sarah M. Durant, L. Baker, and S. Sayialel. (2001) "Matriarchs As Repositories of Social Knowledge in African Elephants." *Science* 292 (5516): 491–94.
- [15] Eickbush, Michael T., Janet M. Young, and Sarah E. Zanders. (2019) "Killer meiotic drive and dynamic evolution of the wtf gene family." *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 36.6: 1201-1214.
- [16] Xing, Wenpu, and Ali Ghorbani. (2004) "Weighted pagerank algorithm." *Proceedings. Second Annual Conference on Communication Networks and Services Research*, IEEE.
- [17] Molleman, Lucas, Ido Pen, and Franz J. Weissing. "Effects of conformism on the cultural evolution of social behaviour." *PloS one* 8.7 (2013): e68153.
- [18] Drezner, Zvi, and Nicholas Farnum. "A generalized binomial distribution." *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* 22.11 (1993): 3051-3063.
- [19] Frigyik, Bela A., Amol Kapila, and Maya R. Gupta. "Introduction to the Dirichlet distribution and related processes." *Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, UWEETR-2010-0006* 6 (2010): 1-27.
- [20] Durrett, Richard, and R. Durrett. *Essentials of stochastic processes*. Vol. 1. New York: Springer, 1999.
- [21] Kimura, Motoo. "On the probability of fixation of mutant genes in a population." *Genetics* 47.6 (1962): 713.
- [22] Durrett, Richard, and Richard Durrett. *Probability models for DNA sequence evolution*. Vol. 2. New York: Springer, 2008.
- [23] Ram, Yoav, Uri Liberman, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2018) "Evolution of vertical and oblique transmission under fluctuating selection." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115.6: E1174-E1183.
- [24] King, Andrew J., and Guy Cowlshaw. (2009) "Leaders, followers, and group decision-making." *Communicative & integrative biology* 2.2: 147-150.
- [25] Van Vugt, Mark, and Jennifer E. Smith. (2019) "A dual model of leadership and hierarchy: Evolutionary synthesis." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 23.11: 952-967.
- [26] Henrich, Joseph, and James Broesch. (2011) "On the nature of cultural transmission networks: evidence from Fijian villages for adaptive learning biases." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 366.1567: 1139-1148.
- [27] Efferson, Charles, Sonja Vogt, and Ernst Fehr. (2020) "The promise and the peril of using social influence to reverse harmful traditions." *Nature human behaviour* 4.1: 55-68.
- [28] Henrich, Joseph, and Francisco J. Gil-White. (2001) "The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission." *Evolution and human behavior* 22.3: 165-196.

- [29] Takahashi, Takuya, and Yasuo Ihara. (2019) "Cultural and evolutionary dynamics with best-of-k learning when payoffs are uncertain." *Theoretical Population Biology* 128: 27-38.
- [30] Muthukrishna, Michael, and Joseph Henrich. (2016) "Innovation in the collective brain." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371.1690: 20150192.
- [31] Dunbar, Robin IM. (2009) "The social brain hypothesis and its implications for social evolution." *Annals of human biology* 36.5: 562-572.
- [32] Chudek, Maciej, Sarah Heller, Susan Birch, and Joseph Henrich. (2012) "Prestige-Biased Cultural Learning: Bystander's Differential Attention to Potential Models Influences Children's Learning." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 33 (1): 46–56.
- [33] Henrich, Joseph, and Richard McElreath. (2003) "The evolution of cultural evolution." *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* 12.3: 123-135.
- [34] O'Brien, Michael J., R. Lee Lyman, Alex Mesoudi, and Todd L. Van Pool. (2010) "Cultural Traits as Units of Analysis." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 365 (1559): 3797–3806.
- [35] Whitehead, Hal. (2017) "Gene–culture coevolution in whales and dolphins." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114.30: 7814-7821.
- [36] Cohen, Dor, Ohad Lewin-Epstein, Marcus W. Feldman, and Yoav Ram. (2021) "Non-Vertical Cultural Transmission, Assortment and the Evolution of Cooperation." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 288 (1951): 20203162. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.3162>.
- [37] Denton, Kaleda K., Yoav Ram, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2022) "Conformity and content-biased cultural transmission in the evolution of altruism." *Theoretical Population Biology* 143: 52-61.
- [38] Denton, Kaleda K., Uri Liberman, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2021) "On randomly changing conformity bias in cultural transmission." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118.34: e2107204118.
- [39] Denton, Kaleda Krebs, Yoav Ram, Uri Liberman, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2020) "Cultural evolution of conformity and anticonformity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117 (24): 13603–14.
- [40] Lee, Woojin, Lina Xiong, and Clark Hu. (2012) "The effect of Facebook users' arousal and valence on intention to go to the festival: Applying an extension of the technology acceptance model." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 31.3: 819-827.
- [41] Anagnostopoulos, Aris, Ravi Kumar, and Mohammad Mahdian. (2008) "Influence and correlation in social networks." *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*.



- [42] Peng, Sancheng, Yongmei Zhou, Lihong Cao, Shui Yu, Jianwei Niu, and Weijia Jia. (2018) "Influence Analysis in Social Networks: A Survey." *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 106 (March): 17–32.
- [43] Diga, Marichris, and Tom Kelleher. (2009) "Social media use, perceptions of decision-making power, and public relations roles." *Public Relations Review* 35.4: 440-442.
- [44] Van Rossum, Guido. (2007) "Python Programming Language." *USENIX annual technical conference*. Vol. 41. No. 1.
- [45] Van Der Walt, Stefan, S. Chris Colbert, and Gael Varoquaux. (2011) "The NumPy array: a structure for efficient numerical computation." *Computing in Science & Engineering* 13.2: 22-30.
- [46] Hunter, John D. (2007) "Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment." *Computing in Science & Engineering* 9.03: 90-95.
- [47] Kimura, Motoo, and Tomoko Ohta. (1969) "The average number of generations until fixation of a mutant gene in a finite population." *Genetics* 61.3: 763.
- [48] Slatkin, Montgomery. (1981) "Fixation probabilities and fixation times in a subdivided population." *Evolution*: 477-488.
- [49] Erhart, Elizabeth M., and Deborah J. Overdorff. (1999) "Female coordination of group travel in wild *Propithecus* and *Eulemur*." *International Journal of Primatology* 20: 927-940.
- [50] Boyd, Robert, and Joseph Henrich. (2002) "On modeling cognition and culture: Why cultural evolution does not require replication of representations." *Journal of cognition and culture* 2.2: 87-112.
- [51] Gardner, Andy, Stuart A. West, and Geoff Wild. (2011) "The genetical theory of kin selection." *Journal of evolutionary biology* 24.5: 1020-1043.
- [52] Truskanov, Noa, Yasmin Emery, and Redouan Bshary. (2020) "Juvenile cleaner fish can socially learn the consequences of cheating." *Nature communications* 11.1: 1159.
- [53] Kolodny, Oren, Marcus W. Feldman, Arnon Lotem, and Yoav Ram. (2022) "Differential Application of Cultural Practices at the Family and Individual Levels May Alter Heritability Estimates." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 45 (September): e167.
- [54] Borofsky, Talia, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2022) "Success-biased social learning in a one-consumer, two-resource model." *Theoretical Population Biology* 146: 29-35.
- [55] Mesoudi, Alex, and Michael J. O'Brien. (2008) "The Cultural Transmission of Great Basin Projectile-Point Technology II: An Agent-Based Computer Simulation." *American Antiquity* 73 (4): 627–44.
- [56] Lehmann, L., and M.W. Feldman. (2009) Coevolution of adaptive technology, maladaptive culture, and population size in a producer-scrourer game. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276: 3853-3862.

- [57] Fogarty, L., J. Y. Wakano, M. W. Feldman, and K. Aoki. (2017) The driving forces of cultural complexity: Neanderthals, modern humans, and the question of population size. *Human Nature* : 28: 39-52.
- [58] Denton, Kaleda K, Yoav Ram, and Marcus W. Feldman. (2023) "Conditions That Favour Cumulative Cultural Evolution." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 378 (1872).
- [59] Hong, Ze. (2022) "Combining Conformist and Payoff Bias in Cultural Evolution: An Integrated Model for Human Decision-Making." *Human Nature* 33.4: 463-484.
- [60] Enquist, Magnus, and Stefano Ghirlanda. (2007) "Evolution of Social Learning Does Not Explain the Origin of Human Cumulative Culture." *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 246 (1): 129–35.
- [61] Ammar, Madeleine, Laurel Fogarty, and Anne Kandler. (2023) "Social Learning and Memory." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120 (33): e2310033120.

# Appendices

## Appendix A General binomial distribution approximation

**Proving  $E[K_{Nj}] = \alpha_j \cdot \beta(A_j + e) / \overline{\alpha \cdot \beta(A + e)}$ , where the average in the denominator is over the role-models index,  $j$ .**

*Proof.* The initial influence of role-model  $j$  based on eq. (10) is

$$G_{1,j} = \frac{\alpha_j \cdot \beta(A_j + e)}{\sum_{m=1}^N \alpha_m \cdot \beta(A_m + e)} . \quad (A1)$$

The denominator of eq. (A1) can also be formulated as:

$$\sum_{m=1}^N \alpha_m \beta(A_m + e) = N \cdot \overline{\alpha \cdot \beta(A + e)} , \quad (A2)$$

where  $\overline{\alpha \beta(A + e)}$  is the mean value of  $\alpha_m \cdot \beta(A_m + e)$ . Using eq. (A2) and **Corollary 1** we get,

$$E[K_{N,j}] = \alpha_j \cdot \beta(A_j + e) \left/ \overline{\alpha \cdot \beta(A + e)} \right. , \quad (A3)$$

## Appendix B Drift and diffusion in a constant environment

**Proving drift and diffusion terms in a constant environment.** Let  $x$  and  $x'$  be the frequency of type  $\hat{A}$  in a population with  $N$  individuals in the current and next generation, and  $\beta$  be the success coefficient of phenotype  $A$ ,  $\beta = \beta(A) < \beta(\hat{A}) = 1$ . Then,

$$E[x' - x] \approx x(1 - x)(1 - \beta) , \quad V(x' - x) \approx x(1 - x) \left( \frac{1}{\alpha N + (1 - \alpha)} \right) .$$

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be the number of individuals of type  $\hat{A}$  such that  $x = X/N$ .  $X'$  is the number of individuals with  $\hat{A}$  in the next generation. The expected number of individuals is (due to the DM approximation),

$$E[X'] = N \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} , \quad (B1)$$

where  $\alpha_1 = \alpha'X$  and  $\alpha_2 = \alpha'(N - X)\beta$ , from eq. (11). To use frequencies instead of counts,  $E[x'] = E[X'/N] = \frac{1}{N}E[X']$ . Putting it together,

$$\begin{aligned} E[x'] &= \frac{1}{N}N \frac{\alpha'xN}{\alpha'xN + \alpha'N(1-x)\beta} = \frac{x}{x + (1-x)\beta} \\ &= \frac{x}{x + (1-x) - (1-x) + (1-x)\beta} = x \frac{1}{1 - (1-x)(1-\beta)} \\ &= x(1 + (1-x)(1-\beta) + o(1-\beta)) = x + x(1-x)(1-\beta) + o(1-\beta), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

following Durrett [22, p. 253, ch 7.2] and because  $1/(1-y) = 1 + y + y^2 + \dots$

We therefore have

$$E[x' - x] = E[x'] - E[x] = x(1-x)(1-\beta) + o(1-\beta), \quad (\text{B3})$$

which gives us the drift term of the diffusion equation.

Using the variance of the DMD,

$$V(X') = N \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}\right) \left(\frac{N + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}\right). \quad (\text{B4})$$

Again, we want to use frequencies so we have  $V(X'/N) = \frac{1}{N^2}V(X')$ . Putting it together with our model notations,

$$V(x') = \frac{1}{N^2}N \frac{x}{x + (1-x)\beta} \left(1 - \frac{x}{x + (1-x)\beta}\right) \left(\frac{N + \alpha'xN + \alpha'N(1-x)\beta}{1 + \alpha'xN + \alpha'N(1-x)\beta}\right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

Following Durrett [22, ch 7.2], we assume  $\beta \approx 1$ , such that

$$\frac{x}{x + (1-x)\beta} \approx x \quad (\text{B6})$$

and for the entire variance expression we get

$$V(x') \approx \frac{1}{N}x(1-x) \left(\frac{N + \alpha'xN + \alpha'N - \alpha'xN}{1 + \alpha'xN + \alpha'N - \alpha'xN}\right) = x(1-x) \left(\frac{1 + \alpha'}{1 + \alpha'N}\right). \quad (\text{B7})$$

The current frequency  $x$  is a given, such that  $V(x) = 0$ , and therefore

$$V(x' - x) = V(x') - V(x) \approx x(1-x) \left(\frac{1 + \alpha'}{1 + \alpha'N}\right). \quad (\text{B8})$$

$\alpha'$  is the odds ratio of the bias weight,

$$\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

Combining eq. (B8) and eq. (B9) we get:

$$V(x' - x) \approx x(1 - x) \left( \frac{1 + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}{1 + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}N} \right) = x(1 - x) \left( \frac{1}{\alpha N + (1 - \alpha)} \right). \quad (\text{B10})$$

This gives the diffusion term of the diffusion equation.

## Appendix C Drift and diffusion in a changing environment

**Proving drift and diffusion terms in a changing environment.** Let  $x$  be the initial frequency of the invading phenotype and  $X_t$  is the number of individuals with the phenotype at time  $t$ . Then,

$$E[X_t/N - x] \simeq x(1 - x)S_t/N_e, \quad \text{and} \quad V(X_t/N - x) \simeq tx(1 - x)/N_e,$$

where  $S_t = \sum_{i=1}^t N(1 - \beta_i)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $s_t = N(1 - \beta_t)$ , and  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i$ , where  $\beta_t$  is  $\beta(A)$  at generation  $t$ . We prove by induction both terms in eq. (22). From eq. (B3) we know that

$$E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - \frac{X_t}{N} \middle| X_t \right] = \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) (1 - \beta_{t+1}) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) s_{t+1}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Also note that using the definition of  $V(y) = E[y^2] - (E[y])^2$

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right] &= E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} - \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \right)^2 \right] = E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] - E \left[ \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] - V \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \right) - \left( E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

We can now use the induction assumption of  $V(\frac{X_t}{N})$  to get

$$E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right] \simeq E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \left( 1 - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{N_e} tx(1 - x). \quad (\text{C3})$$

From eq. (C1) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - \frac{X_t}{N} \right] &= \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right] \simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \left( E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \left( 1 - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{N_e} tx(1 - x) \right) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \cdot E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \left( 1 - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{N_e N} s_{t+1} tx(1 - x). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

Now we omit  $O(\frac{1}{N_e N})$  and get

$$E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \cdot E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \left( 1 - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] \right). \quad (\text{C5})$$

We now look at the induction assumption to see that

$$E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} - x \right] = E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] - E[x] = E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] - x , \quad (\text{C6})$$

so using the assumption we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] &\simeq \frac{1}{N} S_t x (1-x) + x , \\ 1 - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \right] &\simeq 1 - \frac{1}{N} S_t x (1-x) + x . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C7})$$

We use both expressions in eq. (C5) and get

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - \frac{X_t}{N} \right] &\simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \left( \frac{1}{N} S_t x (1-x) + x \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{N} S_t x (1-x) + x \right) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \cdot x (1-x) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

after again omitting  $O(\frac{1}{N^2})$  terms. To conclude the proof, we note that

$$E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - x \right] = E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - \frac{X_t}{N} \right] + E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} - x \right] , \quad (\text{C9})$$

so again using the induction assumption, together with eq. (C8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} - x \right] &\simeq \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \cdot x (1-x) + \frac{1}{N} S_t \cdot x (1-x) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{N} x (1-x) (S_t + s_{t+1}) \simeq \frac{1}{N} S_{t+1} x (1-x) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C10})$$

which proves the drift term.

For the diffusion term, we use a property of variance,

$$V \left( \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \right) = E \left[ V \left( \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right) \right] + V \left( E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right] \right) . \quad (\text{C11})$$

Using eq. (C1) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right] - E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \middle| X_t \right] &= \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \\ E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right] &= \frac{X_t}{N} + \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C12})$$

Using eq. (B10) we get

$$V \left( \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right) = \frac{1}{N_e} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) , \quad (\text{C13})$$

and using the equation  $y'(1 - y') \simeq y(1 - y)$  on the first part of eq. (C11) we get

$$E \left[ V \left( \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right) \right] = \frac{1}{N_e} E \left[ \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right] \simeq \frac{1}{N_e} x(1 - x) . \quad (\text{C14})$$

Moving on to simplify the second part of eq. (C11) using eq. (C12),

$$V \left( E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right] \right) = V \left( \frac{X_t}{N} + \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right) \quad (\text{C15})$$

Now, because  $\frac{X_t}{N}$  is a frequency, i.e  $0 \leq X_t/N \leq 1$ , we know that  $V \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . We therefore find that

$$V \left( \frac{1}{N} s_{t+1} \frac{X_t}{N} \left( 1 - \frac{X_t}{N} \right) \right) \leq \frac{1}{4N^2} s_{t+1}^2 ; , \quad (\text{C16})$$

and so it can be ignored. Combining our equations we get


$$V \left( E \left[ \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \middle| X_t \right] \right) = V \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \right) + O \left( \frac{1}{N^2} \right) \simeq V \left( \frac{X_t}{N} \right) . \quad (\text{C17})$$

Using the induction assumption and eq. (C14),

$$V \left( \frac{X_{t+1}}{N} \right) \simeq \frac{1}{N_e} x(1 - x) + \frac{1}{N_e} t x(1 - x) \simeq \frac{1}{N_e} x(1 - x)(t + 1) \quad (\text{C18})$$


which proves the diffusion term.

## Supplementary Figures




**Figure S1: Numerical validation of the GB approximation.** The approximation (orange) fits simulation results (blue) well when using 1,000 simulations. Here, population size,  $N = 2,000$ ; bias weight,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ; ideal phenotype value,  $\hat{A} = 1$ ; role-model traits  $\mathbf{A} \sim N(0, 1)$ ; success bias value,  $\beta(A) = 0.956$ .







**Figure S2: Numerical validation of the DM approximation.** We performed computational simulations of the role-model choice process (Equation (10)) and compared the distribution of the number of copiers to simulations when using the DMD approximation (Corollary 2). **(A)** The difference between the DM distribution (orange) and the empirical distribution of the simulations (blue) is very small. **(B)** The log-likelihood of the DMD for results of the simulations (red vertical line) is much higher than the log-likelihood of permutations of simulations (blue histogram). Here, population size,  $N = 100$ ; number of simulations,  $m = 100$ ; phenotype values,  $\hat{A} = 1$ ,  $A \sim N(0, 1)$ ; success-bias weight,  $\alpha = 0.5$ . No estimation error or bias is applied, and traits are estimated and copied perfectly.



**Figure S3: DMD approximation precision as function of number of simulations.** Our DMD approximation (orange) agrees with stochastic simulation results (blue) when using 1,000 or more simulations. Both fluctuate around the analytic fixation probability approximation (black; eq. (19)). Markers are averages across simulations, error bars are 95% confidence intervals. Here, population size,  $N = 1000$ ; success-bias weight,  $\alpha = 0.5$ ; phenotype values,  $\hat{A} = 1$ ,  $A = 0.7$ ; success-bias value,  $\beta(A) = 0.956$ .



**Figure S4: Robustness of DMD approximations to success estimation error.** Both the DMD approximation (orange) and our approximation (black) agree with the stochastic simulations (blue), even with a high estimation error. Markers are averages across simulations, error bars are 95% confidence intervals. 5,000 simulations per data point; population size,  $N = 1000$ ; success-bias weight,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ; phenotype values,  $\hat{A} = 1, A = 0.7$ ; bias strength parameter  $J \sim N(1, \eta^2)$  where  $\eta^2$  is on the x-axis.



**Figure S5: Robustness of DM approximations to variation in the bias weight  $\alpha$ .** Fixation probability does not seem to be affected by variation in success bias weight between role-models. Thus, both the DM approximation (orange) and Kimura's equation (black line) have a good fit to results of stochastic simulations (blue). Markers for average across 5,000 simulations, error bars are 95% confidence intervals. Here, population size,  $N = 1000$ ; success bias weight is normally distributed,  $\alpha_j \sim N(0.5, \epsilon^2)$  where  $10^{-7} \leq \epsilon^2 \leq 10^{-1}$ ; phenotype values,  $\hat{A} = 1, A = 0.7$ ; success bias value,  $\beta(A) = 0.956$ .