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Status hierarchies consist of rankings between people based on esteem and influence, and they are common in daily life (Anderson and Willer 2014; Berger et al. 1977; Berger and Webster 2006). Recent research has viewed status hierarchies as a way to organize people in cases where they need to work together to achieve shared goals or tasks (e.g., Halevy, Chou, and Galinsky 2011; Simpson, Willer, and Ridgeway 2012; Willer 2009). Such situations can be thought of as “collective action problems.” That is, where groups are faced with a shared task, people must find a way to motivate each group member to contribute to the group task effort, while also figuring out how to pool each person’s contribution into collective decisions and actions.

In this paper, we look at how the social rules of status hierarchies can help individuals to successfully work together in groups. A great deal of evidence shows that status hierarchies grant esteem and influence to group members based on the perceived value of each member’s contributions to the group’s task efforts, compared to the other members (Anderson and Willer 2014; Correll and Ridgeway 2003). By giving those expected to make more valuable contributions greater esteem and influence, the implicit rules of status hierarchies work to create a system that encourages group members to contribute to the group effort and to do so to the best of their ability (Goode 1978; Willer 2009). And by granting influence over group decisions in proportion to the perceived value of members’ contributions, the working rules of status hierarchies combine members’ contributions into collective actions.
As useful as this account is, it is incomplete in an important way. It focuses on rewards for contributions to the group that are primarily available to high-status members. Status hierarchies cannot function without the efforts of low-status members as well who accept the influence of high-status members and support the group activity. Thus, motivating the commitment of low-status members is as much a part of the collective action problem created by a shared task as is rewarding those who end up with high status and influence.

We argue that status hierarchies provide, as a result of their implicit “rules”, a system of rewards that offer a modest incentive for the deference of low-status members and their continuing efforts in a low-status role. In this article, we define low-status deference as agreeing to the judgments of higher-status members in regard to group decisions, even when those judgments disagree with the low-status member’s own. We argue below that when a lower-status member defers as expected to a higher-status member, the group reacts by viewing the lower-status member as reasonable and worthy of a degree of baseline respect. The dignity of being deemed reasonable, we argue, acts as a modest but meaningful incentive that tempts the low-status member to stay involved in the group endeavor despite being less valued. This incentive system means, however, that for low-status members, the price of being seen as reasonable is often deference to high status members.

We develop a theoretical account of how this incentive system for low-status deference develops from the implicit, taken-for-granted norms of status hierarchies. Our approach builds on expectation states theory’s well-documented account of status hierarchies (Berger and Webster 2006). But it adds complementary arguments about implicit norms within such hierarchies that, we argue, help maintain the hierarchy. As scope conditions, we focus on cooperative, goal-
oriented groups. We describe four studies that empirically test and support predictions derived from our account.

**The Problem of Low-status Members**

Research suggests that group members who end up with low status in interpersonal hierarchies value the respect and esteem of their fellow members as much as others (Anderson et al. 2012). Yet as expectation states research has shown, the development of shared expectations in the group, called *performance expectations*, results in low status members having to defer to the judgments of others and accept relatively lower social esteem (Berger and Webster 2006). Accepting a low-status position also makes these members subject to more negative and self-blaming emotions like sadness or guilt while high-status members feel more positive emotions like pride (Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Tiedens, Ellsworth, and Mesquita 2000). Thus low status has costs. Yet if people do not defer when others have firmly held low expectations for them, they risk criticism and rejection (Anderson et al. 2006).

By examining how the underlying norms in status hierarchies offer not just costs but also modest rewards for deference, we can better understand how groups sustain deference from low-status members, both when it comes willingly and when the low-status member feels the cost. To the extent that this normative provision of incentives for deference occurs, it will act to maintain the participation of low-status members in groups, even groups that lack exceptional task success or prestige. To see how the implicit rules of status produce incentives for the deference of low-status members, we need to understand the nature of the implicit consensus about each group member’s perceived value to the group that creates the status hierarchy and coordinates group task efforts.

**Consensus about What Others Can Be Expected to Expect**
The need for consensus about performance expectations comes from the fact that, whatever individuals want for themselves, they want others in the group to defer to those members who are expected to be able to best contribute to the collective effort. Doing so will maximize task success and the shared benefits that come group accomplishments (Ridgeway and Diekema 1989). As a result, group members are likely to form implicit coalitions to pressure others in the group to defer on the basis of performance expectations. By the same token, they are likely to be faced by an implicit coalition of other group members who pressure them to defer on that basis. Here it creates implicit norms for deference on the basis of performance expectations that carry penalties for violation (Anderson et al. 2006; Ridgeway and Diekema 1989). These are the core implicit rules of status that are likely taken-for-granted cultural knowledge for most people.

To create coalitions that can pressure members to defer to others on the basis of expected performance (i.e., to enact the rules of status), group members need to spontaneously form roughly consensual or shared expectations for others’ likely contributions to the group. Research suggests that members do this by collectively drawing on the same widely known and shared cultural beliefs about the status and competence associated with each other’s social characteristics (e.g., gender, race, education), their apparent skills, and their behavior (Berger and Webster 2006; Fiske et al. 2002; Webster and Rashotte 2010). By drawing on shared status beliefs, group members implicitly anticipate the expectations others will have for the status of a given member and coordinate that with their own expectations for that member (Correll et al. 2017). Moreover, group members anticipate how they, too, will be consensually judged in the group, since such judgments will follow these same cultural status beliefs. These anticipations are called “second-order performance expectations” and they reflect how others in the group see
them (Webster and Whitmeyer 1999). As Anderson et al. (2006) show, people accurately estimate others’ views of their standing. The result is an implicit shared consensus about the expected status of one’s self and others that allows members to pressure each other to defer on the basis of expected performance.

In this way, a rough consensus emerges, not necessarily in what each member wants for himself or herself, but in what each member expects that others expect for himself or herself and others in the group. Importantly, this “working consensus” can shape deference and coordinate behavior without members’ necessarily fully buying into it as what each “really deserves,” as studies of the spread of status beliefs have shown (Ridgeway and Correll 2006). How then does this consensus and the status rules it encodes create a positive reward system for those who defer to it by accepting low status in the group?

*Endorsing the Consensus as Being “Reasonable”*

When a shared definition of a situation is created from comparisons between group members, that definition is seen as valid and real for the participants (Hardin and Higgins 1996). These processes make the group status consensus seem to members to be a socially valid, legitimate, and objectively “reasonable” assessment of who is “better” at what the group values (Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006). When one member is expected to be not as good as a second member, the first member is expected to defer to the presumably superior judgment of the second. When the low-status member does defer, that behavior endorses the consensual, apparently valid assessment of what is better. It makes the low-status member appear as if he or she is also reasonable and smart enough to recognize what is legitimately better or worse. The low-status member’s deference to the group’s consensual assessment, we argue, is likely to cause the other members to view the deferrer with a measure of respect and approval.
The baseline respect earned by deference is less than the esteem offered to high-status members. It is respect for *knowing one’s place* because it views the deferrer as at least understanding what is validly better for achieving the group’s goals, even if he or she is not personally better at the task. Yet it is still a type of worthiness. It is an acceptance of the low-status member as someone who understands and affirms the group’s standards of value, standards the group takes to be valid and reasonable. Additionally, if a low-status group members defers to a high-status group member, they will earn respect and approval from others in the group too (since deference shows that the low-status member endorses the shared beliefs of what constitutes “better”). And since this reward for deference results from a consensus about expected status that the low-status member understands as well, the low-status member can anticipate that deference, despite its personal costs, will at least provide the partial compensation of collective approval and respect.

We argue, then, that our implicit cultural rules for enacting status hierarchies not only incentivize contributions to the collective group goal. They create a general, if modest, incentive to defer to those for whom the group has higher performance expectations—an incentive we characterized as the dignity of being deemed reasonable. In any given situation, the power of this modest incentive to actually induce deference depends on the low-status individual’s access to other courses of action. One alternative is to simply leave the group. Constraints in the workplace and elsewhere may sometimes make this alternative impractical (i.e., very costly), but not in all situations. The point here, however, is that to the extent that deference earns a positive reward of respect and approval, leaving the group becomes a less attractive alternative than it otherwise would be. And when leaving is not a viable option, rewards for deference encourage the low-status member to stay committed to the group.
The other alternative would be for the low-status individual to remain in the group but try to alter the group’s low performance expectations and improve his or her status position. This alternative, however, is risky for the low-status group member. Given the group’s low expectations, self-assertions of greater competence will encounter skepticism and could potentially fail (Cohen and Roper 1972; Ridgeway 1982). The greater the apparent social validity and certainty of the low performance expectations that the group holds for an individual, the less appealing this riskier alternative is likely to seem in comparison to the dignity of “reasonably” deferring (Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000). In many situations, then, especially when it seems that the status information others have about them is clearly against them, people defer and take the modest rewards that it provides them.

**Empirical Predictions**

The account we have developed above leads us to three testable hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: A group member who expects that others expect him or her to perform less well than others will anticipate that he or she has a positive likelihood of being viewed by the group with respect and as reasonable if he or she defers to those others rather than resists deferring.

Hypothesis 2: (a) When one group member is expected to perform less well than another, other group members will have a positive likelihood of viewing the first member with respect and as reasonable when he or she defers, rather than resists deferring, to the other member (b) This reaction of respect will come not just from the group member who is deferred to but from other group members.

Hypothesis 3: If a group member who expects that others expect him or her to perform less well than others receives a reaction of respect and perceived reasonableness when he or she
defers to those others, he or she will be more committed to the group effort and less willing to leave the group than if group members do not react with respect and perceived reasonableness.

We conducted three online experiments with diverse, nonstudent samples of adult participants to test Hypothesis 1 (study 1), Hypotheses 2a and 2b (study 2), and Hypothesis 3 (study 3). A fourth study employed a nationally representative sample to demonstrate the robustness of the findings across the population.

STUDY 1

To test Hypothesis 1, an online experiment created a situation that cast the participant into the low-status position. A sample of 188 U.S. adults was recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online crowdsourcing platform for individuals who work for pay. Studies show MTurk samples are reasonably representative of, although slightly more educated than, the general American population (Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling 2011).

Method

Study 1 participants were told that they would work as part of a three-person team. They were linked with two (fictional) teammates who were of the same sex as the participant (Adam and Mike or Sarah and Allison). The participant and, supposedly, the other team members, then took a ten-item test of “meaning insight ability” that asked them to decide which among three words from an early language has the same meaning as a given English word. This fictitious task has no correct answers, but allows researchers to create status distinctions. Respondents learned they scored 3 of 10 (described as no better than guessing), while the teammates had scored 6 and 7, described, respectively, as moderately and extremely good.

To see if these task ability scores caused participants to form expectations about their teammates’ views of them, participants rated how much they thought other members wanted
them to have status and influence in the upcoming task. We then asked participants to consider some situations: “…you have a different opinion than [Adam/Mike or Sarah/Allison]. There are different strategies by which you could react. Please rate how your teammates would view you if you used one strategy compared to the other.” The strategies were, “You react by explaining your choice but agree to go with [Adam’s/Mike’s or Sarah’s/Allison’s] choice for the group decision” or “You react by explaining your choice and sticking to it rather than agreeing to go with [Adam’s/Mike’s or Sarah’s/Allison’s].” We refer to the strategy of agreeing to go with the higher scorer as defer and the strategy of sticking to one’s own opinion as resist.

For each strategy, participants rated the likelihood that the group would view them in terms of seven items that we grouped and averaged into three scales: Respect (respect, approval), Reasonable (reasonable, useful), and Cooperative (cooperative, helpful, likeable). Participants answered these items about the mid-scoring and high-scoring teammate. Finally, we asked participants which strategy they were likely to use in the group task and then the study concluded.

**Results and Discussion**

Our procedures clearly caused participants to expect that others in their group expected them to have low status and influence. On our measure of how much other group members valued them and wanted them to have a high-status position, participants placed themselves at 2.22 (SD = 1.31), which was significantly ($t = -18.7, p < .001$) less than the midpoint of 4 on the scale. Thus, participants clearly understood themselves to be in a low-status position when they evaluated how the group would view them if they deferred or resisted deferring in a disagreement with a higher-scoring member.
Analyses with three-way ANOVAs confirmed what Figure 1 shows, namely, participants thought they were dramatically more likely to be viewed with respect \((F = 321.49, p < .001)\) and seen as reasonable \((F = 334.08, p < .001)\) and cooperative \((F = 357.85, p < .001)\) if they deferred rather than stuck to their own opinion in a disagreement with a higher-scoring group member. In support of our normative argument that deference to any member expected to perform better than one’s self is rewarded, it made only modest differences if the disagreement was with the high- or mid-scoring member.

It is notable that the means in Figure 1 for the anticipated likelihood of respect \((4.96, 5.04)\), reasonable \((5.14, 5.10)\), and cooperative \((5.14, 5.09)\) reactions to deference are well into the upper half of the seven-point scale while reactions for resisting were all below 3.00. This suggests that participants clearly perceive these respect reactions as available positive rewards for deference. When asked which strategy they would actually use during the upcoming group
task, 69.7 percent of participants chose the defer strategy, 14.4 percent the resist strategy, and 16.0 percent “other”. An examination of the “other” responses revealed most to be efforts to engage and persuade others. These are, in effect, efforts to alter the others’ low performance expectations for the participant by successfully reasoning with them.

It seems, then, that when in a situation in which they expect that others in the group expect low performance from them, people do anticipate that deference to those the group deems better will earn them some respect and the dignity of being deemed reasonable, clearly confirming Hypothesis 1. Results from study 1 suggest that people understand the cultural rules of status as providing a modest incentive, not merely punishments, for being a low-status member who defers to higher status group members. But to be certain, in study 2 we look to see if other members grant these rewards to the deferrer, as suggested by Hypothesis 2a. Additionally, in study 2 we determine if such rewards are granted not only by the person deferred to but by other group members witnessing deference (Hypothesis 2b).

STUDY 2

Study 2 was an online MTurk experiment with the three-person group decision-making context of study 1, but this time participants were randomly assigned as either the mid scorer (n = 94) or high scorer (n = 87). To test Hypothesis 2a and Hypothesis 2b, the participant was asked how he or she would view the low scorer if, in an opinion disagreement, she or he either deferred to or resisted deferring to the other team member and the participant.

Method

Participants were again told they were in a three-person group and that they would first take a “meaning insight” test that was related to ability at the task the group would work on. Each group contained a high scorer (7 / 10 on the test), mid scorer (6 / 10 on the test), and low
scorer (3 / 10 on the test) and participants were randomly assigned to be either the mid scorer or high scorer. As in study 1, participants rated how much their teammates would want them to have status and influence in the group. Next, we asked them to consider some situations before the group task: “During the task, [Mike or Allison] finds that [he or she] has a different opinion than [Adam or Sarah] on how a question should be answered… how you will view [Mike or Allison] if [he or she] uses one of these strategies compared to the other.” The strategies were, “[Mike or Allison] reacts by explaining [his or her] choice but then agrees to go with [Adam’s or Sarah’s] choice for the group decision” (defer) and “[Mike or Allison] reacts by explaining [his or her] choice and sticking to it rather than agreeing to go with [Adam’s or Sarah’s] choice for the group decision” (resist).

After rating the low scorer’s deference or resistance in a disagreement with the other fictitious member, participants rated the low scorer in a disagreement with themselves. Finally, we asked them to rate how much influence the low scorer, Mike/Allison, and the other group members should have on the group task and whether s/he would be a valued team member. We also asked which strategy (defer, resist, or “other”) Mike/Allison would be most likely to use in the upcoming group task.

Results and Discussion

The test score feedback created clear expectations about the status and influence participants thought others wanted them to have. Mid scorers estimated themselves on average at 3.70 on the seven-point scale, but high scorers put themselves significantly higher at 4.62 ($p < .001$). When asked about their teammates, participants clearly expected the low scorer to have less influence and value than the relatively higher-scoring other team member. Thus, by the rules of status documented in previous research (Anderson and Willer 2014; Berger and Webster
2006), participants should have expected the low scorer to defer to the other teammate and to themselves in a disagreement. If these implicit rules effectively create incentives for appropriate deference, then participants should react to deference with respect and perceptions of reasonableness (Hypothesis 2a) not only when the deference is to self but also when it is to the other teammate (Hypothesis 2b).

Figure 2 shows the participants’ evaluations of the low scorer’s deference and resistance in a disagreement with the other teammate on the Respect, Reasonable/Competent, Cooperative, and two-item Reasonable scales. Figure 3 shows these results for low-scorer disagreements with the participant (self). Results from statistical models confirmed what Figures 2 and 3 clearly show. Participants were dramatically more likely to view the low scorer with respect ($F = 180.82, p < .001$) and see the low scorer as reasonable/competent ($F = 207.08, p < .001$) and cooperative ($F = 309.79, p < .001$) when he or she deferred rather than resisted deferring in disagreements with higher-scoring members, whether the participant or the other teammate.
Figure 2. Means and SDs (in parentheses) for Conflict with Other Member by Condition and Strategy from Study 2

Note: For the 2-item Reasonable scale: Defer, High Scorer M=5.28 (1.09); Defer, Mid Scorer M=5.22 (1.28); Resist, High Scorer M=3.32 (1.38); Resist, Mid Scorer M=3.17 (1.46)
It is clear, then, that people view low scorers with respect and see them as more reasonable and cooperative when they defer rather than resist higher-scoring members. Furthermore, note again that the likelihood of positive, respect reactions to deference are not simply greater than those for resistance but are, in absolute terms, highly likely, typically about 5.0 on 7-point scales, suggesting widespread granting of positive rewards for deference both to the other teammate and to self. Together, these results clearly confirm Hypothesis 2a and Hypothesis 2b. They suggest that predictable reactions of respect along with perceptions of reasonableness and competence for appropriate deference reflect shared status rules and not just the personal interests of participants receiving deference.

Studies 1 and 2 put participants directly into situations where they must anticipate the group’s reactions to a low-status member’s deference in a disagreement with a member who is expected to perform better. Furthermore, they examined reactions from the perspective of both...
low-status and higher-status members, finding similar expectations that deference would be rewarded with respect and reasonableness perceptions. But does this positive incentive of respect and the dignity of being deemed reasonable matter to low-status recipients? In study 3, we turn to this question and test Hypothesis 3, which predicts that when a lower-status member receives such reactions to his or her deference to a member for whom the group has higher performance expectations, he or she will be more committed and less willing to leave than when others do not react with respect and approval to his or her deference.

**STUDY 3**

Study 3 used an online MTurk experiment with 199 participants. First, participants read a vignette about doing an unfamiliar task with two same-sex group members. The vignette describes how all three first take a test of task ability in which the participant scored 3/10 (poor performance), while the other teammates scored 6 and 7, described as performing moderately and extremely well. Afterwards, participants completed items from studies 1 and 2 evaluating how much they thought other group members would want them to have status and influence in this situation. The mean for this scale (2.05) was significantly less than the scale midpoint of 4 ($p < .001$), confirming that participants perceived themselves as having low status in the group.

Participants then read, “…you find you have a difference of opinion with [Jessica/Bill], the high scorer on the test…You could explain your choice and stick to it for the group decision. Or you could explain your choice but agree to go with [Jessica’s/Bill’s] choice for the group decision.” Next they read, “…you decide to agree to go with [Jessica’s/Bill’s] choice for the group decision.”

After this, half the participants were randomly assigned to read, “You sense your teammates see your choice as reasonable and respect your behavior.” This constitutes our
Respect condition. The remaining participants in the Not Respect condition read, “You sense your teammates do not see your choice as reasonable or respect your behavior.” Both vignettes ended with, “The group discussion moves on to the next question.” Participants then completed a three-item commitment scale and also rated how likely they would be to leave the group if they could.

**Results and Discussion**

Results from ANOVAs show that when deference elicited perceptions of reasonableness and respect, participants anticipated being quite committed to the group and willing to work for it despite being low status ($M=5.52$, significantly above the scale midpoint of 4, $p < .001$). In contrast, when participants did not receive respect for deference, mean commitment was noticeably lower ($M=3.92$), yielding a highly significant main effect for Respect condition ($F = 83.42, p < .001$). Similarly, when deference brought respect and perceptions of reasonableness, participants estimated a relatively low likelihood of leaving ($M=3.13$, less than the midpoint of 4, $p < .001$). But when deference was not respected, they leaned towards leaving if they could ($M=4.55$), resulting in a strong main effect for Respect condition ($F = 41.32; p < .001$). These results clearly confirm Hypothesis 3.

It seems, then, that participants in low-status positions thought deference to higher-status members would cause them to be seen as reasonable and respected as study 1 showed; in addition, these responses acted as a positive incentive that increased willingness to continue working in the group despite their low status. This is what we would expect if the widely understood cultural rules of status provide positive incentives for deference and the assumption of low status in groups. In study 4 we turn to a nationally representative sample to see if our results hold across diverse demographic groups.
STUDY 4

Study 4 presented a representative sample of 436 U.S. adults with vignettes describing a three-person team. Respondents read: “…three people have to work together on an unfamiliar task. The better they all do on the task as a team, the more the team will benefit. Also, the better the team does, the more each teammate will benefit.” Members of the team, the vignette continued, all take a test of task ability, and results, shown to all, reveal a low scorer, a mid scorer, and a high scorer. During the task discussion, the low scorer has an opinion different than the top scorer’s.

Respondents were randomly assigned to rate how other team members would view the low-scoring member under either the deference strategy (n = 225) or the resistance strategy described in prior studies (n = 211). We asked about the likelihood that the low scorer would be viewed in that case as reasonable, competent, helpful, and likeable. Respondents also reported how likely they personally would be to use this strategy in such a situation.

Results

Analyzing the results, we found that respondents expected the low scorer to be viewed by teammates as significantly more reasonable, competent, helpful, and likeable when he or she deferred rather than resisted (p < .001). Respondents also said they personally would be most likely to use the deference strategy (p < .01). These results held controlling for respondents’ gender, race, age, income, and education (for further details, see the full article). Thus, this final study suggests that the positive reward for deference that we have called the “dignity of appearing reasonable” is indeed a broadly understood and widely shared part of our implicit cultural rules for status hierarchies.

GENERAL DISCUSSION
Current accounts of how status hierarchies help people work together focus primarily on incentives of esteem and influence offered to high-status members (Anderson and Willer 2014; Berger and Webster 2006). Less is said about the equally important problem of incentivizing members who end up with low status. Across our studies we have shown how status hierarchies also provide a general, modest, but meaningful positive incentive for low-status deference—the dignity of being respected in the group as reasonable. Low-status members anticipated this respected-as-reasonable reaction when they deferred and higher-status members did indeed offer that reaction. Moreover, we find evidence that when low-status members received this reaction, they were more committed to the group and less willing to leave. Additionally, since the basis of this respected-as-reasonable reaction for low-status deference is normative, it comes from all group members and not just from the member receiving deference.

The approval offered for deference represents a devil’s bargain for the low-status member. It provides a temptation to defer despite the social and personal costs of doing so. Whether this temptation is sufficient to actually induce deference may depend on the low-status member’s alternatives. For example, if leaving is not possible, the low-status member could try to convince the group that he or she deserves higher status and influence. But this can be risky, especially in cases where expectations about the low-status member’s ability to contribute are deeply held and public. However, the group’s rewards for deference at least offer a modicum of dignity and approval that allow the low-status member to continue to share in the group’s goals and benefits.

Interpersonal status hierarchies play a significant part in the broader structure of inequality in society by mediating people’s access to resources and positions of power (a hiring decision, a promotion). They also distribute a commodity people strive for—respect in the eyes
of others (Ridgeway 2014). Better understanding of how they pull in and motivate both high-
status and low-status members gives us deeper insight into not only how status hierarchies work,
but also how they persist by drawing people into their collective assessments of who is better. In
making deference by low-status members the price of being seen as reasonable in the eyes of the
group, they legitimate inequality.
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