Too close for comfort: Relating own and coworker status to stress

Sandra E. Spataro
Northern Kentucky University

Deirdre G. Snyder
Cornell University

ABSTRACT

Informal, or naturally emergent, status is an important aspect of an individual's experience and effectiveness in an organization. The many advantages of having higher informal status relative to one's coworkers are well documented. This study extends research on the impacts of status to look beyond status level to the shape of the status hierarchy in terms of how close or distant individuals' status levels are from one another. The authors measured status distance using a dispersion measure drawn from the literature on relational demography that shows how close in status a given individual is to the other individuals on his or her team. Then the authors looked at the relationship of status distance to job stress, positing that lower status distance would be positively related to job stress because of the pressures inherent in close-status others challenging or overtaking one's existing level. The study observed naturally occurring status hierarchies within a telecommunications organization in the Western U.S. and found that while status distance is not directly related to job stress, status distance and status level interact such that higher-status participants experienced more job stress when on teams comprised of similar high-status others, as compared to lower-status others working with similar-status others. This study adds to our understanding of how emergent status in organizations affects how individuals experience their work.

Keywords: status, status distance, status characteristics, social identity theory, job stress

INTRODUCTION AND HYPOTHESES

Status in organizations—or the extent to which one is respected and held in high esteem in the eyes of his or her coworkers (Anderson et al., 2001)—is highly sought after in organizations. Indeed, the great emphasis placed on striving for informal status may be justified by the rewards afforded to those who attain it. Those with higher informal status are given opportunities that further develop their skills and abilities (Blau, n.d.; Hurwitz et al., 1960) they are listened to, looked up to, and have influence over others (Hurwitz et al., 1960; Nelson & Berry, 1965; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939); additionally they receive support and help when needed and receive more credit and praise than their lower status counterparts for a given level of performance (Blau, n.d.; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Informal status is so valued that individuals sometimes seek higher levels of it in their work more than they pursue higher financial compensation or formal promotions (Homans, 1950; Sutton & Hargadon, 1996).

While these outcomes of status level have been well established in the literature, we know comparatively less about how the shape of the status hierarchy, and specifically how proximate in status team members are to each other, affects individual experiences. Interactions among higher status peers have been shown to be complex and difficult to manage (Groysberg et al., 2011; Spataro et al., 2014), but this does not provide a complete picture.

What happens when individuals are close but not the same in status, and how is that different from when they are more distant? In this paper, we posit and test the notion that since the meaning and value of status is necessarily relative—that is, one's absolute status level has meaning only to the extent that it is higher or lower than another's—the status of one's associates, in terms of proximity to an individual's own status, will affect job stress levels. Specifically, we argue that the potential burdens of monitoring and making greater contributions than those at proximate status levels carry psychic costs, directly related to job stress. If associates are closer in status level, they may burden an individual to either defend or advance their status (depending on whether the proximate others are above or below), contemplation and implementation of which can both contribute to higher job stress. The authors hypothesize around the independent effect of the distance between an individual's status and that of their group members on job stress, and the authors look further at the interaction of one's own status level and the proximity of his or her coworkers' status to see how these factors are jointly related to job stress. The authors test these hypotheses in a field study of a large telecommunications organization.

Status Attainment and the Self

The drive for status is a universal motive which all humans pursue (Anderson et al., 2015; Hogan & Hogan, 1991). The status attainment process reflects a social consensus of all involved. Drawing from status characteristics theory, the prestige-based status differences in any group reflect who is most valued in that group—and who is valued, in turn, is determined by the group's expectations of each person's contribution to the group's goals (Benoit-Smullyan, 1944, p.; Berger et al., n.d.; Blau, n.d.; Davis & Moore, 1945). Group members assess others' "status characteristics" or personal attributes and behaviors and collectively assign greater value to individuals who are more likely to make greater contributions to shared objectives (e.g., (Berger et al., 1977; Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011). In this way, status is viewed as a sign of

competence and a resource that is valued independently above and beyond monetary compensation that could have been traded for it (Huberman et al., 2004). When an individual is expected to behave in ways that make important contributions to the group, that individual is rewarded with more respect, esteem, and deference. However, when an individual behaves in ways that contradict shared objectives, that individual is punished with social neglect, or even ridicule and scorn.

Those closest to "ideal" are granted leadership positions and the high-status and respect that accompanies that position (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Since the drive to attain status is core to our human nature and related to one's membership among important groups, it is also tied to an individual's social identity (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel et al., 1979). Social identities allow individuals to categorize themselves into groups and suggest prescriptions for ideal group member attributes. Because individuals identify more strongly with aspects of themselves that carry higher status value (Ellemers & Van Rijswijk, 1997), when the individual garners higher status in her group, she is more likely to consider her status in this group to be an integral aspect of her self-concept (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and she will work hard to protect and maintain that valued social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 2004). Status attainment can thus become an essential aspect of one's self-concept, setting the stage for the importance of maintaining status and always looking for ways to increase it.

Status Distance

One factor that may influence the salience of threats or opportunities to maintain or gain status is the distance between one's own status and that of his coworkers. Members of groups import their status from the larger hierarchy present in their organization (Pugh & Wahrman, 1983) to the small groups they are members of within that organization (e.g., Bales et al., 1951; Berger & Zelditch, Jr., 1985). This means that within a given status hierarchy, differences exist relative to the dispersion of status throughout the group. One group might be comprised entirely of higher-status, top performers specifically chosen to work on a complex problem, while another group may be comprised of a single higher-status leader chosen to lead, for example, a team of lower-status, entry-level workers as they roll out a new service.

Understanding the comparative similarity or dissimilarity among levels of group members' status can help clarify the impact of status positions on job stress. Specifically, the extent to which the acquisition and maintenance of status is a concern is partly a function of where other group members are. An individual with a "far" status distance from the rest of the group is farther away in status from her group members (e.g., a higher-status leader with intermediate- and lower-status members). On the other hand, an individual with a "near" status distance to the others in his group is amidst greater homogeneity of levels of status (e.g., a higher-status leader with relatively higher-status group members or lower-status group members working collectively on a task).

Management scholars have begun to consider status distance to represent the magnitude of difference between the status of individuals within a group (Blau, 1977; Doyle et al., 2016; Leslie, 2017; Phillips et al., 2009). Leslie (2017) built on the theorizing of Phillips, Rothbard, and Dumas (2009) and created a measure of status distance by calculating the societally endorsed status hierarchy of different ethnic groups and then applying those measures to the composition of different work teams (e.g., a workgroup with two white members and two Hispanic American members would have a higher ethnic status subgroup score because it was composed of equal

numbers of members from races with the largest perceived status differential). She found large status distance scores led to less workgroup cohesion and lower unit performance. Doyle, Lount, Wilk, and Pettit (2016) operationalized status distance as the degree of similarity or difference in real or ascribed performance of group members, such that a larger degree of spread between the performance of one member as compared to the performance of the other member of the dyad yielded a higher status distance score. As it indicates how *close* an opportunity or threat may be to changing one's existing status level, status distance likely relates to how individuals think about maintaining or increasing their status.

Status Maintenance and Job Stress

Status positions (and associated enhancements to identity and self-concept) are not fixed. To the contrary, while hierarchies overall are generally stable, individuals within them can move and change status. Status hierarchies, again, are based on one's *relative* amount of respect (e.g., (Anderson et al., 2001; Flynn, 2003; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), and this may change over time (Bendersky & Shah, 2012; Pettit et al., 2010), particularly if one's actual performance expectations are not met or not met consistently, or if the value of others' performance increases, relatively speaking (Berger, Fisek, Norman & Zelditch, 1977; Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

The nature of status as a desired and valued resource sets up a situation in which individuals may compete or jockey for higher status positions within their group (Frank, 1985; Huberman et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2019; Loch et al., 2001; Owens & Sutton, 2014). Such competition is high stakes when status levels are so closely tied to one's social identity and the resources afforded to those at higher levels. Whether proximate others are higher or lower in status, the prospect of status change is more salient than when others are more distant.

In competition for higher status, the loss or gain of status-based resources likely results in job stress or job eustress respectively (Hobfoll, 1989). Individuals actively seek "the protection and enhancement of self" (Pearlin et al., 1981) and are motivated to find opportunities and social circumstances that reinforce their self-concept, and more importantly, avoid the loss of the resources they value. Hobfoll (1989) defines job stress as: 1) the threat of a net loss of resources, 2) an actual loss of resources, and 3) a lack of resource gain after personal investment (p. 516). When confronted with a loss, a potential loss, or a failed attempt to gain, the model of conservation of resources predicts that individuals will find this stressful and will strive to conserve or maximize resources.

Finally, there is evidence to suggest that individuals are more comfortable being at a greater distance in status from their group members overall. Tiedens and Fragale (2003) found that individuals prefer hierarchical differentiation and that this status differentiation increased appraisals of the partner and comfort with the interaction (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003).

In summary, the authors posit that lower status distance, or a tighter clustering of members in a status hierarchy, will be positively related to job stress because of the competitive context proximity engenders and the pressure associated with it:

> Hypothesis 1: The proximity of an individual's informal status to those in their group will be positively related to their job stress level.

Status Distance Effects Conditioned on Status Level

As the experience of status is so different for those of higher status compared to those with lower status, so too is the stress they likely experience from proximate status others. Indeed, it is the highest status members who have the most at stake from perceived competition from proximate others. The potential competition for status is of little concern for higher-status leaders with far status distance from their group members given there are often stiffer penalties, including social exclusion, for lower-status members who act above their rank (Hollander, 1958). Surrounded by lower status members who project social cues that serve to validate and reinforce the higher-status standing of the leader, the leader feels secure in the higher-status position (Blader & Chen, 2011). It is unlikely that a lower status group member could overtake the leader's position, but rather maybe trying to make marginal improvements in his or her status position relative to the other lower-status members. Instead of exerting efforts for an attempted coup on the higher-status position, lower status individuals worry more about being exploited by higher-status others and are thus concerned with how much to trust the higher-status member (Chen et al., 2003). The authors therefore expect the impact of the higher status on job stress to be minimized within far status distance groups.

However, the competition for status may be a real concern to the higher-status member of a group made up of similarly higher status group members, that is, where the close status distance of others within the group makes them more capable of usurping one's higher-status position. In these groups, higher-status individuals are concerned with preserving their favored position and focused on the extent to which the social exchange will help them maintain their status (Chen et al., 2003; Keltner et al., 2003). Feelings of insecurity may be exacerbated if the slightly lower-status members do not acknowledge a status differential or send out social cues that question the higher-status party's standing in the group and make the higher-status party feel threatened or insecure about maintaining the higher-status position (Blader & Chen, 2011; S. E. Spataro et al., 2014) leading to heightened feelings of job stress among the higher-status members of near status distance groups.

Previous research has examined the performance of groups based on members' status and found that among Wall Street "sell-side" equity research analysts, groups composed entirely of higher-status members (i.e., near status distance groups) had decreasing marginal returns once the percentage of "stars" within the group exceeded 65.1%. This effect was moderated by expertise similarity, such that groups composed of stars with similar expertise performed worse than similarly composed groups with lower expertise similarity (Groysberg et al., 2011). Similarly, Kim, Pettit, and Reitman (2017, p. 3) found that group members actively negotiated status moves with the intent of "changing or solidifying a target's current status ranking in the group." These moves include both negotiating to increase one's own status, as well as to decrease or undermine the status the status of others. It is likely that the increased competition and jockeying for position within the near status group increased the job stress levels of the members in addition to decreasing the team's performance.

A large body of research supports the idea that the desire to avoid a loss is greater than the desire for a future gain (Kahneman & Tversky, 2012; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). As related to status maintenance, this means that those with higher-status might be particularly concerned with maintaining their higher-status position and not losing status. Across multiple experiments, Pettit and colleagues found that when faced with a possible status change, higher-status individuals worked harder to avoid a status loss than to achieve a status gain and allocated

resources to maintain their status as opposed to furthering the group's interests (Pettit et al., 2010).

This is consistent with findings on status maintenance in which higher-status groups were evaluating a possible change to the status quo. Specifically, members of higher-status groups showed an increase in systolic blood pressure, mean arterial pressure, or pulse pressure, all physiological markers for job stress response, when they were suddenly confronted with the possibility of losing their preferred status position (Scheepers et al., 2009; Scheepers & Ellemers, 2005).

In addition, Fragale and colleagues found that after identical actions of wrongdoing, higher-status individuals were presumed to have acted more out of self-interest than lower-status individuals. Observers were also more likely to attribute greater intentionality to the wrongdoing of the higher-status individual and recommended more severe punishments (Fragale et al., 2009). All this suggests additional pressure to succeed for those of higher status, given the negative attributions and stiffer penalties they face if accused of wrongdoing.

In summary, in addition to the stress associated with the possibility of losing status, higher-status individuals have greater performance expectations placed upon them, as well as a reputation to live up to as an "ideal" member of the team and organization. The maintenance of sustained higher performance over time under these pressures can cause job stress, exhaustion, and burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001), as can the demands of living up to the lofty ideals placed upon higher-status others by group members (e.g., Little et al., 2015). Finally, higher-status others may feel job stress about the negative attributions and stiffer penalties observers will place on them should they fail (Fragale et al., 2009). Altogether, this leads to the following hypothesis:

> Hypothesis 2. Status level moderates the effect of status distance on job stress such that higher-status individuals experience more job stress than lower-status individuals when status proximity is near rather than far.

METHOD

Research Design and Sample

This study observed naturally occurring status hierarchies in a telecommunications organization and the attitudes and experiences of employees within it. Specifically, the organization studied was the engineering department within a telecom firm located in the Western United States. This department provided technical support for the company's telecommunications installations at client sites and was comprised of engineers and technicians along with some general managers and administrative support individuals. All levels of employees of the participating organizations (e.g., administrative staff, professionals, technical support, etc.) were included in the study.

Data Collection

Three primary sources of data were used in this study. First, participants supplied information via survey responses about their own attitudes and behaviors at work; second, workgroup members described the status levels of their coworkers, also via survey responses; and third, management and human resource groups provided personnel data regarding demographic characteristics of participants (e.g., education, tenure).

The survey included information about the respondent as well as the respondent's ratings of the status of some coworkers. The survey administration was conducted on-site and incorporated into a larger business process reengineering project the department was undergoing. The response rate was 93%, as 184 of 197 individuals returned surveys.

Variables

Independent and Moderator Variables.

Status Level. Based on previous research (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001), coworker ratings were used to measure informal status. In preliminary interviews, the first author identified appropriate subgroups in which to collect peer-ratings, based on shared tasks and sufficient interaction to support evaluations of informal st atus. Surveys were then delivered to all members of the subgroups involved. It was infeasible to ask everyone to rate all other subgroup members, so participants rated 10 randomly selected coworkers from their subgroup on the following four dimensions of status: "respected," "valued," "influential," and "overall status" at work on a scale of 1 (lower) to 7 (higher). Because there was sufficiently higher inter-rater agreement among the raters for each dimension for each focal individual (average ICC = .75), ratings were averaged for each dimension, and then calculated the mean of the four dimensions for each individual (alpha = .91) to indicate their informal status in the organization. The mean status level was 4.97, with a standard deviation of .91.

Status Distance. As opposed to using ethnic status measures (Leslie, 2017) or differences in performance (Doyle et al., 2016), we took advantage of our direct, socio-metric measures of informal status and chose to operationalize status distance by using a measure of relational difference that is the standard in relational demography research (e.g., (Chatman et al., 1998; Tsui et al., 1992; Wagner et al., 1984). The distance between a focal individual's status level and those of his or her work group is calculated as:

$$\text{status distance} = [1/n \sum(x_i - x_j)^2]^{1/2}$$

where x_i = the focal individual's status, x_j = each other unit member's status, and n = the number of subjects in the unit.

This Euclidean distance measure describes the distance between any focal individual and every other person in the population of interest. Thus individuals who are roughly the same small distance from everybody else are considered close to one another (Wagner et al., 1984). That is, the measure is not intended to distinguish one who is different from his or her group by being higher status than others from one who is different by being lower in status. Rather, the measure indicates the absolute amount of difference. "Near" status distance would be reflected by lower status distance scores and "far" status distance are reflected by higher status distance scores.

Since the status distance measure is meaningful only to the extent that individuals are aware of and may compare themselves to others in their work unit, the reference group for purposes of calculating status distance in this study was the subgroup from which raters were drawn for a focal individual. The range of status disparity across the organization went from a lower of .54 to a higher of 2.58, with a mean value of 1.07 (*s.d.*=.34).

Dependent Variable

Job stress. One's job stress at work was measured in this study by House and Rizzo's tensions at work scale (House & Rizzo, 1972). Respondents indicated their agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) with seven items relating to tension, anxiety, and health including: "I work under a great deal of tension" and "Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night." Responses to these seven items were averaged (alpha=.78) and scores ranged from 1.00 to 6.42, with a mean score of 3.34 (*s.d.*=1.46).

Control Variables.

The authors controlled for the average level of friendship indicated by those who rated the person's status in order to minimize any bias in status ratings that might be due to friendship. Additionally, to isolate the potential effects of education, length of service to the organization and place in the formal hierarchy on job stress, the authors controlled for whether individuals had a formal engineering degree (1 = engineering degree, 0 = no engineering degree), organizational tenure in months (self-reported) and formal job level (as provided by the organization) in all equations. Additionally, since job satisfaction is a separate and distinct construct from job stress, the authors controlled for self-report measures of satisfaction derived from the three-item satisfaction scale included in the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Seashore et al., 1982); alpha = .86.

Finally, in addition to differences in attitudes and experiences across individuals, aspects of the situation, and specifically the culture of an organization, may affect work attitudes (e.g., Chatman, 1989; Swift & Campbell, 1998). Specifically, the extent to which individuals perceive the organization to be competitive, aggressive, and reward oriented may affect job stress by directing attention toward achievement, especially as compared to one's peers. The authors thus controlled for these aspects of culture in the analyses. Perceptions of organizational culture were indicated by participants' ratings of the extent to which various dimensions of culture were characteristic of the organization on a scale of 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 7 (extremely characteristic). The average rating of how competitive participants perceived their organizational culture in this study was 4.95 (s.d.=1.27); rating of aggressiveness of the culture averaged 4.69 (s.d.=1.34); and participants ratings of their culture as rewards orientation averaged 3.84 (s.d.=1.65).

RESULTS

Table 1 (Appendix A) reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables.

Hierarchical regression analyses (Cohen et al., 1983) were used to test the predictions offered above. The results of the tests of Hypotheses 1 and 2, about how status distance and the interaction of status distance with status level both relate to job stress at work, are found in Table 2.

Main Effect of Status Distance on Job Stress

Hypotheses 1 positively related status distance to job stress. The tests of this hypothesis are in Model 1 of Table 2 (Appendix B). One's status distance is not related to his or her job stress (Model 1, b = -.36; n.s.), contrary to Hypothesis 1.

Interaction of Status Distance and Status Level

Hypothesis 2 predicted a moderating effect of coworker status level on the relationship of status distance and job stress. The results of the tests of this hypothesis are in Model 2, Table 2, which shows a significant interaction (b = -.48, p<.05). The authors conducted a simple slopes analysis (Aiken et al., 1991) by plotting predicted levels of job stress based on one standard deviation below and above both status level and status distance as shown in Figure 1 (Appendix C). The form of the interaction predicting job stress was as hypothesized, in that the slope of the line relating coworker status to job stress in near and distant status conditions was greater for those with higher status. In addition, the authors tested for the regions of significance using the Johnson-Neyman technique (Johnson & Neyman, 1936) by using an SPSS macro developed by Hayes and Matthes (Hayes & Matthes, 2009). This technique finds the value of the moderator variable for which the ratio of the conditional effect to its standard error is equal to the critical *t* score. The conditional effect of status level on job stress transitioned to significance at a status distance level of .49 (SE = .15, $t(162) = 1.97$, $p = .05$). Specifically, recalling that lower status distance scores equate to a near status distance, this analysis revealed that for status distance scores below .49, higher status employees displayed significantly more job stress relative to lower status employees. Thus, the authors find support for Hypothesis 2.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study showed that status distance is an important factor in understanding job stress for higher status individuals. Though status distance is not directly related to job stress (H1), the interaction of status level and status distance significantly relates to job stress, such that the increase in stress from status distant others to status proximate others was greater for higher status individuals. Specifically, higher status individuals experienced significantly more job stress when status distance was near compared to when it was far (H2). The results of this study, therefore, point out the discomfort of having colleagues close in status for higher status individuals.

This study shows the importance of considering proximity to others' status when evaluating one's experience of their own status. While the value of status has always been understood to be rooted in position relative to one's teammates, most research on the topic considers status level alone. In recent work, the status of one's outgroup has been shown to affect motivation (Pettit & Lount, 2010), and status distance has been related to willingness to help (Doyle et al., 2016), decreased group cohesion, and team performance (Leslie, 2017). Further, existing research that shows higher status individuals are more sensitive than their middle- and lower-status counterparts to the nature of interactions with their status peers; collaborative overtures from higher status peers are met with warmth and desire to continue collaborating, whereas competitive behavior elicits just the opposite (S. E. Spataro et al., 2014). The current study adds to the growing body of work calling for more context beyond status level in studies of

naturally occurring status in groups. As a construct whose meaning is inherently relative to those around an individual, status is best understood when we look not just at one's absolute status level, but also at the status levels of the individuals around him or her.

Additionally, this study adds to our understanding of job stress and job stressors. Specifically, the results of this study reinforce a more nuanced view of perceived advantages and disadvantages of status. Lower status has long been associated with more job stress (Anderson et al., 2015), while with higher status, the literature notes almost exclusively positive outcomes. But this "black and white" view—higher status is only good, and lower status is only bad, does not cover the whole story. Job stress is a great demonstrator of the nuance required here. Resource-based views of job stress (e.g., Hobfoll, 1989) imply lack of status means lack of resources and thus greater job stress. But this also includes the threat of possibly losing resources as a job stressor. This aspect of the construct applies more to those with much to lose—higher-status individuals, for example—than to those with little to lose. For examples, higher status individuals involved in the criminal justice system have been shown to lose much more status from that involvement than their lower status counterparts (Dennison & Demuth, 2018). As the authors explore job stress and job stressors further, researchers need to consider other perceived advantages that can also be stressful. A broader approach to the complexities of where job stress comes from, including from advantage, will enrich our understanding of this complex and important phenomenon.

The implications of this study for managers are multi-faceted. First, managers should be cognizant of the costs of status maintenance for high status employees. Particularly when managers are in homogenous higher status teams, there may be increased pressure from want-to-be leaders that causes the higher-status leader to choke under pressure, causing increased job stress and performance decrements (Baumeister, 1984; Bendersky & Shah, 2012). Second, higher-status holders need to attend to the personal costs of maintaining their status position within the hierarchy. As Voltaire (and Peter Parker's Uncle Ben) wisely noted, "with great power comes great responsibility". Higher-status individuals must recognize that the many benefits attributed to higher status also comes with a price of higher maintenance responsibilities, and ultimately, increased job stress as he or she works to accomplish both. Finally, because the status value of characteristics varies across organizations (Anderson et al., 2008; S. Spataro, 2012), managers should be aware of which characteristics drive status evaluations for these will also be the basis of status competitions (Owens & Sutton, 2014).

Although this study has many strengths, including the use of an organizational sample to measure naturally occurring status hierarchy within the organizational context and socio-metric evaluations of informal status, there are also some limitations. The study is limited to one department within one organization, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, this study is correlational in nature so causality in the relationship between status distance and job stress is not empirically demonstrated. Future studies should look to replicate the status distance-job stress relationship and explore causality and mediators to explain the psychological process at work. Additionally, future studies could continue to explore other factors contributing to a potential downside of high status in order to provide a more complete picture of the entire experience of status. Such work might seek to track status fluctuations over time in order to understand the dynamic nature of status hierarchies and the impact of employees on gaining or losing status to proximate others.

CONCLUSION

This study sheds light on dynamics within a status hierarchy, especially at the higher end: when a higher status individual's potential rivals are close in status rather than far, job stress increases. Status is a competitive game; the benefits, *and costs*, are best understood in the full context of hierarchical differentiation.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Reno, R. R. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. SAGE.

Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*, 574–601. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038781

Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., & Kring, A. M. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 116–132. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.116

Anderson, C., Spataro, S. E., & Flynn, F. J. (2008). Personality and organizational culture as determinants of influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 702–710. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.702

Anderson, C., Srivastava, S., Beer, J. S., Spataro, S. E., & Chatman, J. A. (2006). Knowing your place: Self-perceptions of status in face-to-face groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(6), 1094–1110. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1094

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20–39.

Bales, R. F., Strodtbeck, F. L., Mills, T. M., & Roseborough, M. E. (1951). Channels of Communication in Small Groups. *American Sociological Review*, *16*(4), 461–468. https://doi.org/10.2307/2088276

Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Choking under pressure: Self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skillful performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 610–620. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.610

Bendersky, C., & Shah, N. P. (2012). The Cost of Status Enhancement: Performance Effects of Individuals' Status Mobility in Task Groups. *Organization Science*, *23*(2), 308–322. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0543

Benoit-Smullyan, E. (1944). Status, Status Types, and Status Interrelations. , 9(2), 151–161. Https://doi.org/10.2307/2086307 Co. *American Sociological Review*, *9*(2), 151–161. https://doi.org/10.2307/2086307

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, Jr., M. (n.d.). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, *37*(3), 241–255.

Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, Jr., M. (1977). Status characteristics and expectation states: A graph-theoretical formulation. In *Status Characteristics and social interaction: An expectations states approach* (pp. 91–34). Elsevier.

Berger, J., & Zelditch, Jr., M. (1985). *Status, rewards, and influence.* Jossey-Bass Inc. Pub.

Blader, S. L., & Chen, Y.-R. (2011). What Influences How Higher-Status People Respond to Lower-Status Others? Effects of Procedural Fairness, Outcome Favorability, and Concerns About Status. *Organization Science*, *22*(4), 1040–1060. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0558

Blau, P. M. (n.d.). Social mobility and interpersonal relations. *American Sociological Review*, *21*(3), 290–295.

Blau, P. M. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity*. Academic Press.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Matching People and Organizations: Selection and Socialization in Public Accounting Firms. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *1989*(1), 199–203. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1989.4980837

Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being Different Yet Feeling Similar: The Influence of Demographic Composition and Organizational Culture on Work Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*(4), 749–780. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393615

Chen, Y.-R., Brockner, J., & Greenberg, J. (2003). When is it "a pleasure to do business with you?" The effects of relative status, outcome favorability, and procedural fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *92*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978(03)00062-1

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (1983). Applied multiple regression. *Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, *2*.

Davis, K., & Moore, W. E. (1945). Some Principles of Stratification. *American Sociological Review*, *10*(2), 242–249. https://doi.org/10.2307/2085643

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Dennison, C. R., & Demuth, S. (2018). The More You Have, The More You Lose: Criminal Justice Involvement, Ascribed Socioeconomic Status, and Achieved SES. *Social Problems*, *65*(2), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spw056

Doyle, S. P., Lount Jr, R. B., Wilk, S. L., & Pettit, N. C. (2016). Helping others most when they are not too close: Status distance as a determinant of interpersonal helping in organizations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, *2*(2), 155–174.

Ellemers, N., & Van Rijswijk, W. (1997). Identity Needs Versus Social Opportunities: The Use of Group-Level and Individual-Level Identity Management Strategies. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *60*(1), 52–65. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787011

Flynn, F. J. (2003). How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of favor exchange on social status and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(5), 539–553.

Fragale, A. R., Rosen, B., Xu, C., & Merideth, I. (2009). The higher they are, the harder they fall: The effects of wrongdoer status on observer punishment recommendations and intentionality attributions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(1), 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.05.002

Frank, R. H. (1985). *Choosing the right pond: Human behavior and the quest for status* (pp. x, 306). Oxford University Press.

Groysberg, B., Polzer, J. T., & Elfenbein, H. A. (2011). Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth: How High-Status Individuals Decrease Group Effectiveness. *Organization Science*, *22*(3), 722–737. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0547

Hayes, A. F., & Matthes, J. (2009). Computational procedures for probing interactions in OLS and logistic regression: SPSS and SAS implementations. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*(3), 924–936. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.3.924

Hendrix, W. H., Stephen Cantrell, R., & Steel, R. P. (1988). Effect of social support on the stress-burnout relationship. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *3*(1), 67–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01016749

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1991). Personality and status. In *Personality, social skills, and psychopathology* (pp. 137–154). Springer.

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, *65*, 117–127. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0042501

Homans, G. C. (1950). *The human group Harcourt*. Brace, and World New York.

House, R. J., & Rizzo, J. R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *7*(3), 467–505. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(72)90030-X

Huberman, B. A., Loch, C. H., & ÖNçüler, A. (2004). Status As a Valued Resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *67*(1), 103–114. https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250406700109

Hurwitz, J. I., ZANDER, A. Y. H., & Hymovitch, B. (1960). *Some effects of power on the relations among group members*. Homans, GC, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms, Harcourt Brace, New York ….

Johnson, P. O., & Neyman, J. (1936). Tests of certain linear hypotheses and their application to some educational problems. *Statistical Research Memoirs*, *1*, 57–93.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (2012). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk. In *Handbook of the Fundamentals of Financial Decision Making: Vol. Volume 4* (pp. 99–127). WORLD SCIENTIFIC. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814417358_0006

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, *110*, 265–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

Kim, H. Y., Pettit, N. C., & Reitman, L. E. (2019). Status moves: Evaluations and effectiveness of status behaviors. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *22*(1), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217716749

Leslie, L. M. (2017). A Status-Based Multilevel Model of Ethnic Diversity and Work Unit Performance. *Journal of Management*, *43*(2), 426–454. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314535436

Little, L. M., Major, V. S., Hinojosa, A. S., & Nelson, D. L. (2015). Professional Image Maintenance: How Women Navigate Pregnancy in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(1), 8–37. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0599

Loch, C., Yaziji, M., & Langen, C. (2001). The fight for the alpha position: Channeling status competition in organizations. *European Management Journal*, *19*(1), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(00)00067-0

Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social Hierarchy: The Self-Reinforcing Nature of Power and Status. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 351–398. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211628

Nelson, P. D., & Berry, N. H. (1965). The Relationship Between an Individual's Sociometric Status in Different Groups Over a Two-Year Period. *The Journal of Psychology*, *60*(1), 31–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1965.10545260

Owens, D. A., & Sutton, R. I. (2014). Status contests in meetings: Negotiating the informal order. In *Groups at Work* (pp. 313–330). Psychology Press.

Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E. G., Lieberman, M. A., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The Stress Process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *22*(4), 337–356. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136676

Pettit, N. C., & Lount, R. B. (2010). Looking down and ramping up: The impact of status differences on effort in intergroup contexts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.08.008

Pettit, N. C., Yong, K., & Spataro, S. E. (2010). Holding your place: Reactions to the prospect of status gains and losses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 396–401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.12.007

Phillips, K. W., Rothbard, N. P., & Dumas, T. L. (2009). To Disclose or Not to Disclose? Status Distance and Self-Disclosure in Diverse Environments. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*(4), 710–732. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.34.4.zok710

Pugh, M. D., & Wahrman, R. (1983). Neutralizing Sexism in Mixed-Sex Groups: Do Women Have to Be Better Than Men? *American Journal of Sociology*, *88*(4), 746–762. https://doi.org/10.1086/227731

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker: An account of a research program conducted at the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago*. Harvard University Press.

Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2005). When the pressure is up: The assessment of social identity threat in low and high status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *41*(2), 192–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2004.06.002

Scheepers, D., Ellemers, N., & Sintemaartensdijk, N. (2009). Suffering from the possibility of status loss: Physiological responses to social identity threat in high status groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1075–1092.

Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). *Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice*. New York: Wiley.

Spataro, S. (2012). Not all differences are the same: Variation in the status value of demographic characteristics within and across organizations. *Journal of Business Diversity*, *12*(3), 67–80.

Spataro, S. E., Pettit, N. C., Sauer, S. J., & Lount Jr, R. B. (2014). Interactions among same-status peers: Effects of behavioral style and status level. *Small Group Research*, *45*(3), 314–336.

Sutton, R. I., & Hargadon, A. (1996). Brainstorming Groups in Context: Effectiveness in a Product Design Firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(4), 685–718. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393872

Swift, C. O., & Campbell, C. (1998). Psychological Climate: Relevance for Sales Managers and Impact on Consequent Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *6*(1), 27–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.1998.11501786

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge university press Cambridge.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In *Political psychology* (pp. 276–293). Psychology Press.

Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C., Austin, W. G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organizational Identity: A Reader*, *56*(65), 9780203505984–16.

Tiedens, L. Z., & Fragale, A. R. (2003). Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 558–568. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.558

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being Different: Relational Demography and Organizational Attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*(4), 549–579. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393472

Tsui, A. S., & O'reilly, C. A. (1989). Beyond Simple Demographic Effects: The Importance of Relational Demography in Superior-Subordinate Dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*(2), 402–423. https://doi.org/10.5465/256368

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases: Biases in judgments reveal some heuristics of thinking under uncertainty. *Science*, *185*(4157), 1124–1131.

van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A SOCIAL IDENTITY MODEL OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN ORGANIZATIONS. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 243–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25006-1

Wagner, W. G., Pfeffer, J., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1984). Organizational Demography and Turnover in Top-Management Group. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *29*(1), 74–92. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393081

Appendix A

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations among study variables

	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Mean friendship	3.84	0.76	--										
2. Education (1=eng. degree)	0.38	0.49	-.08	--									
3. Formal Job Level	2.16	0.70	-.06	-.08	--								
4. Tenure (months)	73.90	99.63	-.01	-.41 **	.20 **	--							
5. Job Satisfaction	0.00	1.00	-.02	-.10	.00	.01	--						
6. Culture - Competitiveness	4.95	1.27	.01	-.17 *	.00	.14	.27 **	--					
7. Culture - Aggressiveness	4.69	1.34	-.05	-.14	.04	.15 *	.23 **	.54 **	--				
8. Culture - Rewards	3.84	1.65	.01	.05	.02	-.04	.28 **	.30 **	.34 **	--			
9. Informal Status	4.81	0.84	.63 **	-.18 *	.23 **	.18 *	.04	-.03	-.05	-.04	--		
10. Status Distance	1.07	0.34	-.16 *	-.01	.21 **	.05	.03	-.01	.04	-.04	-.07	--	
11. Job Stress	3.34	1.46	.01	-.25 **	.12	.38 **	-.33 **	.04	.06	-.18 *	.17 *	-.06	--

*p<.05; **p<.01

Appendix B

Table 2

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results for Effects of Status Level, Status Distance, and their Interaction on Job stress[a.]

	Main Effect		Moderation	
Control Variables	Model 1		Model 2	
Friendship	-0.23		-0.25	
Education (engineering degree)	-0.32		-0.33	
Job Level	0.01		0.02	
Tenure	0.00	**	0.00	
Job Satisfaction	-0.54	**	-0.55	
Culture - Competitiveness	0.08		0.07	
Culture - Aggressiveness	0.14		0.14	
Culture - Reward Orientation	-0.12		-0.12	
Status level	0.35	*	0.54	**
Main Effect				
Status distance	-0.36		-0.48	†
Interaction				
Status level x status distance			-0.49	*
R^2	0.35		0.37	
ΔR^2	0.03		0.02	
F	3.50	*	4.17	*

†p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01

Appendix C

Figure 1

Interaction between Status Level and Status Distance on Job stress