PS-01 Dominance and prestige: the two roads to status and how followers tell them apart

1. Evolutionary Foundations of the Dual-Strategies Theory

Human social hierarchies differ fundamentally from the linear, agonistic pecking orders observed in non-human primates. In most social mammals, rank is determined almost exclusively through asymmetric physical formidability, coalitional force, and the capacity to inflict net fitness costs on conspecifics. While coercive asymmetries remain an active vector in human social life, human evolution produced a phylogenetically novel route to status: freely conferred deference based on skills, wisdom, and domain competence.

The Information-Goods Model

Joseph Henrich and Francisco J. Gil-White formulated the dual-strategies model to resolve an evolutionary paradox: why subordinates in human groups routinely yield space, deference, food, and social privileges to high-status individuals without being threatened or coerced[1]. The authors demonstrated that the emergence of high-fidelity cultural transmission in the hominin lineage generated selection pressures for social learning heuristics[1]. Because trial-and-error individual learning carries lethal risks in complex foraging niches—such as misidentifying toxic flora, mishandling large game, or failing to navigate unpredictable seasonal environments—naive learners who preferentially attended to and copied highly skilled models gained pronounced fitness advantages[1].

Direct assessment of competence across multiple domains is computationally expensive and prone to observation error[3]. Consequently, ancestral hominins evolved indirect behavioral shortcuts, known as prestige-biased transmission[3]. Learners tracked the behavioral orientations of third parties: an individual who commanded the sustained visual attention, spatial proximity, and verbal deference of others was inferred to possess high-value cultural information[1].

To secure prolonged access to these models for high-fidelity observation and pedagogical instruction, learners offered asymmetric social benefits:

- Unsolicited assistance in daily foraging, food preparation, and heavy manual labor[1].
- Disproportionate shares of communal resources, choice cuts of meat, and access to prime territory[5].
- Emotional deference, conversational yielding, and public praise[1].
- Forgiveness of minor social infractions, boundary transgressions, and norm deviations[1].

Prestige is therefore an emergent property of an asymmetric market for cultural information[1]. The "information goods" theory explains why prestige hierarchies are domain-specific,

inherently unstable across changing environmental challenges, and fundamentally distinct from dominance hierarchies:

Diagnostic Dimension	Dominance Hierarchy	Prestige Hierarchy
Evolutionary Origin	Deep vertebrate phylogeny; agonistic resource-holding potential (RHP)[8].	Uniquely hominin; co-evolved with cumulative culture and social learning[1].
Psychological Engine	Coercive intimidation, fear induction, asymmetric cost-infliction[2].	Freely conferred deference, admiration, perceived domain expertise[1].
Follower Ethology	Furtive monitoring, stress responses (elevated cortisol), spatial avoidance[6].	Sustained focal gaze, imitation, active approach, spatial proximity seeking[5].
Allocation Mechanism	Seized by the actor through force or monopolization of physical leverage[10].	Conferred by the audience through reputational consensus and social validation[10].
Stability Across Time	Fragile; requires continuous displays of force and coercive surveillance[6].	Self-reinforcing; stabilized by collective respect and institutionalized norms[6].
Somatic / Postural Cues	Expansive posture, lowered vocal pitch, direct glare, hostile display[6].	Open posture, relaxed facial expressions, smiling, authentic pride displays[13].

Empirical Validation and Psychometrics

Joey T. Cheng, Jessica L. Tracy, Tom Foulsham, Alan Kingstone, and Joseph Henrich empirically established that dominance and prestige operate as concurrent, functionally distinct avenues to human social influence[5]. Developing and validating self- and peer-report scales across university students and athletic teams ($N = 191$ across 36 task groups in Study 1; $N = 61$ in Study 2), they demonstrated that the two orientations map onto distinct psychological and behavioral profiles[5].

The psychometric instruments established by Cheng, Tracy, and Henrich (2010) demonstrated robust construct validity across subsequent replications[5]:

- *Prestige scale*: 9 items; e.g., "Members of my peer group respect me," "Others look to me for leadership"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .85–.88$ [14].

- *Dominance scale*: 8 items; e.g., "I am willing to use aggressive tactics to get my way," "I enjoy having control over others"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .81–.84$ [14].
- *Orthogonality*: Self-ratings and peer-ratings regularly reveal zero to marginal negative correlations between dominance and prestige ($r = -.03$ to $r = -.12$, non-significant), confirming that they represent independent axes rather than polar ends of a single continuum[5].

In small task groups resolving the NASA Moon Survival problem, Cheng et al. (2013) evaluated objective behavioral influence and perceived social rank[5]. Both dominant individuals ($r = .41, p < .001$) and prestigious individuals ($r = .56, p < .001$) attained high social rank and persuaded group members during collaborative problem-solving[5]. However, external observers and peers rated prestigious leaders as liked ($r = .59, p < .001$), while dominant leaders were actively disliked ($r = -.49, p < .001$)[5].

Eye-tracking experiments ($N = 61$) confirmed that group members fixate on both dominant and prestigious leaders significantly longer than on average-rank peers ($d > 0.60$)[5]. Yet the qualitative gaze dynamics diverged: prestigious individuals received sustained gaze indicative of social learning and informational extraction, whereas dominant individuals were tracked with vigilance-driven saccades and furtive glances designed to monitor physical or coalitional danger[7].

Longitudinal Divergence and Cross-Cultural Replications

Cross-sectional laboratory tasks capture the initial formation of hierarchies but obscure long-term stability. Daniel J. Redhead, Joey T. Cheng, C. Driver, T. Foulsham, and R. O'Gorman executed a 16-week longitudinal study tracking 36 project groups ($N = 167$ participants) from inception to completion[12]. They deployed continuous-time structural equation modeling to disentangle the temporal trajectory of rank attainment:

1. *Time 1 (Initial contact)*: Both dominance ($\beta = .34, p < .01$) and prestige ($\beta = .44, p < .001$) predicted social rank and influence in previously unacquainted teams[12].
2. *Time 2 through Time 4 (Weeks 4–16)*: The influence of dominance decayed rapidly[12]. As group members shared observational information regarding actual performance and character, dominance lost its predictive power over status ($\beta = .06, p = .42$)[12].
3. *Prestige accumulation*: Prestige-based status strengthened over time ($\beta = .61, p < .001$), driven by reciprocal feedback loops: perceived competence led to deference, which yielded greater opportunities to coordinate public goods, reinforcing status[12]. Dominance-based status created passive-aggressive compliance, resentment, and covert coalition-building among subordinates[6].

Cross-cultural ethnography corroborates this duality outside Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) contexts. Christopher von Rueden, Michael Gurven, and Hillard Kaplan studied the Tsimane' forager-horticulturalists of the Bolivian Amazon[8]. Across multiple villages, they gathered sociometric ratings, anthropometric data, hormone levels, and public goods contributions:

- Physical formidability (biceps circumference, grip strength, height) predicted perceived dominance, but had minimal direct influence on dispute resolution or communal leadership when divorced from social generosity[20].
- The primary predictors of enduring leadership among Tsimane' men were kin-network size, domain expertise (hunting, tracking, horticultural clearing, medicinal plant knowledge), and prosocial sharing[20].
- Men who attempted to leverage brute physical dominance without prestige were excluded from collective hunting parties and denied reciprocal food sharing during illness, demonstrating that anti-dominance social mechanisms actively suppress unearned coercion in small-scale subsistence regimes[6].

2. Followership Psychology, Threat Ecology, and the Dominance Trap

Because prestige generates positive-sum outcomes through cooperative coordination and voluntary compliance, evolutionary models must explain why humans retain a behavioral preference for dominant leaders under specific socio-ecological pressures.

Evolutionary Leadership Theory and Mismatch

Mark Van Vugt, Robert Hogan, and Robert B. Kaiser formulated Evolutionary Leadership Theory (ELT), locating leadership and followership as co-evolved adaptations for solving recurrent collective action problems[24]. Group living imposes severe evolutionary coordination hurdles: group movement, defense against predators, intergroup warfare, and resource conservation. Leaders serve as focal points for cognitive coordination, resolving the "free-rider problem" and eliminating paralyzing debate in life-threatening scenarios[24].

ELT articulates the evolutionary mismatch hypothesis[25]. Human social psychology evolved in Pleistocene foraging environments where:

- Groups were small ($N = 30–150$) and organized through kinship networks[27].
- Leaders lacked specialized police forces, prisons, or institutional capital to enforce obedience[27].
- Followers exercised exit options, such as moving to a neighboring band or factioning off[27].
- Decision-makers were subject to continuous, face-to-face monitoring[27].

In modern or collapsed state conditions characterized by large populations, administrative anonymity, and institutional centralization, these ancestral heuristics produce systematic pathology[27]. Followers retain deep-seated emotional adaptations designed to defer to decisive, formidable leaders during crises, yet lack the ancestral face-to-face leveling mechanisms

necessary to prevent those leaders from converting situational command into permanent tyranny[6].

The Service-for-Prestige Contract

Michael E. Price and Mark Van Vugt formalized the service-for-prestige theory, conceptualizing human leadership as a biological and socio-structural trade[24]. True leadership is an energetically costly service:

1. *Leader contributions*: Time, physical energy, planning, cognitive bandwidth, physical exposure in conflict, and direct material donations to collective reserves[24].
2. *Follower payment*: Deference, elevated social status, mating priority, and decision-making leeway[21].

This contract remains adaptive only as long as the marginal return in public goods (such as successful hunting expeditions, negotiated peace treaties, and coordinated territorial defense) exceeds the status rents paid by followers[24]. Under ancestral conditions, the service-for-prestige equilibrium was maintained by low transaction costs for deposing or deserting leaders who failed to deliver benefits[27].

When environmental pressures intensify, the equilibrium shifts[27]. If external existential threats require absolute coordination speed, followers actively suspend prestige requirements and tolerate coercive dominance[9].

Threat-Induced Preference for Dominant Leadership

Hemant Kakkar and Niro Sivanathan quantified the environmental mechanics that trigger human preference for dominant leaders[30]. Across three studies covering 140,000 participants in 69 nations over two decades of World Values Survey (WVS) data, they tested the hypothesis that collective economic and existential uncertainty shifts leader preferences from prestige to dominance[30]:

- *Study 1 (Macro-level field data)*: Analyzing voting patterns across 50 US states, zip-code-level economic distress (a composite metric of unemployment, housing vacancy, and poverty rates) significantly predicted voter preferences for dominant political figures[30].
- *Study 2 (Experimental validation)*: In a nationally representative sample of US citizens ($N = 1,403$), participants were exposed to controlled economic uncertainty primes[30]. Economic uncertainty decreased the preference for prestigious leaders ($\beta = -.87, p < .05$) and increased the preference for dominant leaders ($\beta = 1.02, p < .05$)[30].
- *Mediation Mechanism*: Multilevel path analysis revealed that this preference is mediated by a subjective lack of personal control ($b = .0002, p < .001$)[31]. When individuals feel powerless to manage their personal survival outcomes, they endorse a dominant figure who projects decisive, unilateral force[31].

Lasse Laustsen and Michael Bang Petersen expanded this paradigm to direct physical and

intergroup conflict[34]. Across multiple experimental trials ($N = 647$ and $N = 910$), they presented subjects with digitally manipulated facial stimuli displaying either dominance (e.g., squarer jaw, low brow, intense eye contact) or trustworthiness/prestige (e.g., open brow, upturned mouth corners, facial symmetry) under conditions of peace versus war[33]:

- Under peaceful conditions, subjects overwhelmingly preferred prestigious candidates ($d = .72, p < .001$)[19].
- Under explicit primes of aggressive intergroup warfare, preferences shifted toward dominant individuals ($d = .64, p < .001$)[19].
- Follower personality moderated this effect: followers whose baseline emotional response to threat was anger exhibited an extreme preference for dominant leaders, viewing aggression as an asset against external enemies[36].

Followers do not choose dominant leaders under threat out of ignorance of their cruelty; they choose them because they calculate that a ruthless leader will inflict damage on external adversaries and enforce internal coordination, accepting the domestic exploitation that invariably follows[32].

3. Pathology of Dominant Leadership: Self-Preservation and Sabotage

Once entrenched, dominant leaders prioritize protecting their power over achieving collective goals[11]. While prestigious leaders rely on group success to validate their status, dominant leaders hold power through fear and structural leverage, making every talented subordinate a direct threat[5].

Self-Preservation Experiments

Jon K. Maner and Nicole L. Mead isolated the conditions under which leaders actively undermine their own groups[38]. In a series of five laboratory experiments, participants were assigned to leadership positions over small groups competing for financial bonuses[38]:

- *Power stability manipulation*: Leaders were informed either that their position was structurally secure (stable) or that leadership roles would be reassigned midway through the task based on relative member competence (unstable)[40].
- *Individual differences*: Baseline dominance and prestige motivations were assessed using psychometric scales[40].

The empirical findings exposed systematic self-protective sabotage:

1. *Ostracizing competent group members*: In Experiment 2 ($N = 76$), leaders in unstable positions were given the option to expel a group member and recruit a replacement[38]. Leaders high in dominance systematically expelled the *most talented* group member ($p < .001$), voluntarily choosing to work with an incompetent subordinate to ensure their own status was not challenged[38]. Prestigious leaders showed no such pattern, retaining top talent to maximize collective payoffs[39].

2. *Information withholding*: In Experiment 1 ($N = 67$), leaders received problem-solving clues to distribute to their teams[38]. Unstable dominant leaders deliberately withheld the most informative clues from subordinates ($\beta = 3.40, p = .004$), crippling collective problem-solving speed to maintain cognitive asymmetry[40].
3. *Mitigation via intergroup competition*: In Experiment 5, Maner and Mead introduced zero-sum intergroup competition[38]. When their group faced total defeat by an external collective, dominant leaders temporarily halted their internal sabotage, demonstrating that dominant self-preservation responds strictly to external survival calculus[38].

Charleen R. Case and Jon K. Maner expanded these findings to structural manipulation within group communication networks[39]. Dominant leaders under threat enacted classic divide-and-conquer strategies: they physically isolated subordinates from one another, forbade horizontal communication, forced all information to flow through the leader, and actively sowed mutual distrust to prevent subordinate coalitions[38]. Nicole L. Mead and Jon K. Maner further uncovered the spatial dynamics of dominant paranoia: when a highly skilled rival could not be expelled, dominant leaders forced that individual into close physical proximity to maintain constant surveillance[41].

Dark Triad Pathologies

The behavioral repertoire of dominance aligns with the Dark Triad personality traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy[44]. A meta-analysis by Harald Merckelbach et al. ($N = 42,359$, 65 samples) documented that all three traits show deep, statistically significant inverse relationships with HEXACO Honesty-Humility ($r = -.52$ for psychopathy, $r = -.36$ for Machiavellianism, $r = -.37$ for narcissism) and Agreeableness ($r = -.46$ for psychopathy, $r = -.43$ for Machiavellianism)[44].

Trait	Structural Manifestation in Leadership	Dominance Mechanism	Vulnerability to Detection
Narcissism	Demands constant adulation; inflates competence; pathologically reactive to perceived disrespect or loss of status[10].	Hubristic pride; aggressive retaliation against critics; converts status into personal entitlement[14].	**High**: Rapidly alienates peers through arrogance, vanity, and overclaiming; exposed when competence fails[12].

Machiavellianism	Strategic duplicity; transactional alliances; cynical manipulation of social norms and institutional rules[37].	Information hoarding; divide-and-rule; covert coalition-building; instrumental sabotage of rivals[37].	**Low**: Masquerades as prestigious and self-sacrificing; highly adept at reputational camouflage[44].
Psychopathy	Callous disregard for group well-being; zero affective empathy; extreme risk tolerance; parasitic extraction[44].	Coercive intimidation; immediate physical or economic violence; predatory exploitation of group goods[11].	**Moderate**: Short-term charisma and fear induction; long-term chaos and institutional destruction[6].

Peter K. Jonason and colleagues established that Machiavellianism and psychopathy correlate with a fast life-history strategy that prioritizes short-term extraction over long-term reciprocal capital[51]. When Dark Triad individuals gain dominance positions, they sacrifice organizational continuity for resource capture and status defense[37].

4. Anti-Dominance Defenses in Small-Scale Societies and Their Breakdown

If dominant leadership poses grave systemic risks to collective survival, why did human societies not succumb to permanent despotism throughout evolutionary history? Anthropological field research reveals that ancestral foragers were egalitarian not through an absence of dominance drives, but through the deliberate, vigilant deployment of coalitional countermeasures[28].

Christopher Boehm and the Reverse Dominance Hierarchy

Christopher Boehm surveyed the ethnographic literature across 48 nomadic foraging and small-scale tribal societies in *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*[28]. He demonstrated that human egalitarianism is an inverted political pyramid: a reverse dominance hierarchy[28]. Subordinates recognize their individual vulnerability to physically formidable or tyrannical individuals and form a group-wide coalition of the weak to dominate potential despots[28].

This reverse hierarchy relies on an escalating enforcement ladder:

- *Gossip and informal narrative alignment*: When an individual displays boastfulness, bullying, or an appetite for command, group members quietly compare observations[29]. Gossip serves as an information synchronization protocol, coordinating social evaluations without alerting the target[29].
- *Direct ridicule and meat-insulting*: Nomadic foragers systematically ridicule triumphant

hunters[29]. Richard Borshay Lee documented the San practice of "insulting the meat," where a hunter who brings down a massive giraffe or eland is mocked as having killed a scrawny, worthless beast[29]. This norm suppresses emergent pride and reminds the skilled individual that prestige does not entitle them to dominance[29].

- *Overt defiance and disobedience*: If an individual attempts to give direct orders, band members respond with laughter, non-compliance, or intentional slowness[29].
- *Ostracism and spatial abandonment*: A persistent bully is excluded from communal activities[29]. Bands fission, moving camp in the night to leave the dominant actor isolated without foraging support[29].
- *Capital execution*: When an incorrigible psychopath or violent bully continues to threaten group members, the group-wide coalition organizes a targeted execution[29].

Boehm cited Richard Lee's documentation of the !Kung man /Twi, an exceptionally violent individual who had killed two men and terrorized his band[58]. Recognizing that single-combat confrontation was suicidal, the band gathered secretly and reached a consensus that /Twi had to die[58]. Lee recorded the oral history through Toma: the entire moral community, including /Twi's kin, ambushed him[58]. Archers opened fire from multiple angles, shooting him with poisoned hunting arrows until he was overwhelmed, preventing any single individual from bearing sole responsibility for the execution and averting retaliatory blood feuds[58].

The Breakdown of Informal Anti-Dominance at Scale

The reverse dominance hierarchy collapses beyond specific demographic and logistical thresholds:

- *Information opacity*: Below the Dunbar threshold of roughly 150 individuals, social memory tracks personal behavioral histories directly[22]. Beyond 150, direct observation is replaced by rumor, reputation becomes manipulable, and Machiavellian actors manufacture false prestige while hiding extractive dominance[44].
- *Anonymity and coalitional fragmentation*: In large aggregations, an aspiring dominant can assemble a loyal sub-coalition (a praetorian retinue) whose members are rewarded with disproportionate shares of extracted wealth[28]. The broader public faces a collective action barrier: confronting the tyrant carries high individual mortality risks, while the benefits of liberation are non-excludable[27].
- *Resource storability and physical sedentism*: As societies shift from mobile foraging to sedentary agriculture with physical granaries, walls, and specialized toolkits, exit costs surge[28]. Individuals cannot simply walk away from fixed plots and stone dwellings, granting leaders coercive leverage over survival assets[27].

5. The Scale Ledger Across Social Aggregations

The biological and social mechanisms that govern status vary as societies scale from intimate households to global structures. The following ledger tracks where dominance, prestige, and institutional countermeasures operate, succeed, or collapse across all eight rungs of human organization.

Rung	Social Scale	Operational Status Mechanics	Primary Failure Modes	Historical / Empirical Precedents
1. Household	4–10 individuals	High genetic relatedness ($r =$ or $.25$); status shaped by parental authority, age-prestige, and direct provisioning[28].	Domestic despotism; patriarchal/matriarchal violence; total vulnerability of juvenile dependents[28].	Universal ancestral hominid and human familial units[28].
2. Hamlet / Band	30–50 individuals	Direct daily observation; reverse dominance hierarchy fully operational; status governed by service-for-prestige and food sharing[27].	Susceptible to sudden lethal violence by unhinged individuals before a coalition can coordinate[29].	Ju/'hoansi (!Kung) bands; Hadza nomadic camps[29].
3. Village	150–500 individuals	The Dunbar limit boundary; status maintained by consensus meetings, elder councils, and public reputations[20].	Kinship factionalism; initial emergence of big-man aggrandizers who accumulate competitive debt[22].	Tsimane' Amazonian villages; early Neolithic settlements (Çatalhöyük, early strata)[20].
4. Parish / District	1,500–5,000 individuals	Informal reputation degrades;	Elite capture; wealthy lineages buy	Medieval Icelandic Quarter

		requires institutional assemblies, codified local customs, or formal rotation[61].	offices or corner local disputes through clientelism[62].	courts; early Swiss cantonal *Landsgemeinde*[63].
5. Town / Watershed	15,000–50,000 individuals	Complete anonymity emerges; specialized administrative offices replace personal prestige[61].	Oligarchic consolidation; creation of permanent military retinues; capture by commercial or martial elites[61].	Italian Renaissance city-states (Early Florence, Verona, Siena)[61].
6. Region / Bioregion	500,000–5 million individuals	Abstract ideological prestige; symbolic authority; reliance on standing bureaucracies and legal codes[66].	Bureaucratic paralysis; capture by covert security councils or hereditary nobility[64].	Republic of Venice (late period with *Terraferma*); Roman Republic (pre-Punic wars)[67].
7. Nation / Continent	50–500 million individuals	Mass-mediated parasocial prestige; industrial-scale monopoly on legitimate violence (Weberian state)[28].	Totalitarian capture; threat-induced authoritarian preference hijacked via mass communication[27].	Modern industrial nation-states; historical empires (Imperial Rome, Ming China).
8. Planet	8 billion individuals	Transnational treaties; global trade logistics;	Coordination collapse; complete	United Nations system; Bretton Woods

		completely abstracted technocratic and legal frameworks.	decoupling of powerholders from face-to-face accountability.	institutions (fragile, subject to great-power dominance).

At the household tier (4 to 10 people), biological kinship and inclusive fitness temper coercive dominance, but do not eliminate it[28]. Parental authority functions through a hybrid of care-based prestige and physical control[28]. The failure mode is unchecked domestic tyranny: when an abusive household head exerts dominance, dependents cannot form an effective leveling coalition due to extreme physical and developmental power asymmetries[28]. Informal anti-dominance works only when neighboring households intervene.

At the hamlet or band tier (30 to 50 people), humans inhabit their ancestral social niche[28]. Everyone is visible, and hoarding resources is impossible without detection[29]. Prestige reigns because skill directly benefits the camp through meat distribution and cooperative defense[20]. Boehm's reverse dominance hierarchy operates with peak efficiency[29]. The primary vulnerability is an acute psychotic break or sudden ambush by a dominant individual before the coalition can coordinate counter-lethal force[29].

At the village tier (150 to 500 people), societies approach the upper limit of direct personal acquaintance[22]. Social balance is preserved through multi-clan councils, public rituals, and village moots[20]. However, structural fault lines appear: individuals align along lineage lines, prioritizing kin loyalty over village-wide welfare[20]. This is the scale where big-man aggrandizers emerge, using competitive feasts and gift-debt cycles to convert economic surplus into political obligations[22].

At the parish or district tier (1,500 to 5,000 people), face-to-face tracking fails across the entire population[61]. To prevent dominance, societies at this rung must invent institutional mechanisms: codified rules, rotation of assembly seats, and formal delegation[61]. Without these structures, wealthy families subvert justice by funding client networks, intimidating isolated farmers, and capturing dispute-resolution bodies[62].

At the town or watershed tier (15,000 to 50,000 people), interactions are largely anonymous[61]. Status is dissociated from personal character and attaches to civic, military, or religious office[61]. Wealth inequality compounds rapidly[69]. Dominant factions naturally capture governance by establishing permanent mercenary bodies, monopolizing grain storage, or consolidating control over trade bottlenecks[69].

At the region or bioregion tier (500,000 to 5 million people), direct democracy is impossible; representation, federal leagues, or bureaucratic delegation become operational requirements[66]. Power centers are spatially insulated from peripheral communities[67]. Systemic stability relies on formal constitutions, institutionalized checks and balances, or complex electoral architectures designed to prevent factional monopolization[61].

At the nation or continent tier (50 to 500 million people), governance depends on modern

media apparatuses, uniform legal codes, and standing armies[28]. Parasocial bonding replaces social evaluation: citizens perceive their leaders only through curated public broadcasts[27]. Under crises, the threat-dominance reflex makes mass populations vulnerable to authoritarian populists who manufacture external enemies to bypass legal constraints[30].

At the planetary tier (8 billion people), governance lacks a singular enforcement authority. Global coordination operates through shifting coalitions, multilateral treaties, and balance-of-power dynamics. Because anti-dominance leveling cannot be coordinated at global scale without imperial force, global governance remains structurally vulnerable to great-power coercion.

6. The Capture Test and Historical Case Studies

Understanding institutional resilience requires analyzing how predatory factions compromise governance rules and identifying the specific constitutional mechanisms that resist takeover.

The Capture Playbook of Dark-Triad Personalities

Individuals carrying Machiavellian, narcissistic, and psychopathic traits exploit predictable flaws in governance structures through a four-phase progression:

1. *Prestige mimicry*: In early developmental stages, Dark Triad actors mimic prosocial prestige[44]. They display extravagant philanthropy, assume public burdens, and signal competence, exploiting the human heuristic that equates confidence with ability[5].
2. *Crisis capitalization*: They identify, amplify, or manufacture intergroup conflict, social degradation, or economic distress[9]. By activating followers' evolved loss-of-control terror, they position themselves as the sole strongmen capable of decisive coordination[31].
3. *Severing horizontal communication*: Once inside institutional machinery, they dismantle horizontal peer networks through selective patronage, whisper campaigns, and structural silos[39].
4. *Transforming prestige into dominance*: Once independent oversight is neutralized, they reveal their coercive architecture, deploying security teams, weaponizing judicial structures, and altering selection rules to bar competitors[38].

Case 1: The Collapse of the Icelandic Commonwealth (930–1262/1264)

The medieval Icelandic Commonwealth stands as one of history's most sophisticated stateless governance architectures, yet it experienced catastrophic capture during the 13th-century Sturlung Era (*Sturlungaöld*)[62].

Established in 930 CE at Þingvellir, the Commonwealth lacked an executive branch, a monarch, or a standing military[62]. Governance centered on the *Alþingi* (national assembly) and regional *þing*[62]. The legal structure rested on 39 (later 48) chieftaincies (*goðorð*, held by a *goði*)[63]. The relation between farmer (*bóndi*) and chieftain was non-territorial and clientelist: a farmer could transfer his allegiance to any chieftain within his geographic quarter without abandoning his land, creating a dynamic market for prestige-based legal representation[63]. The chieftain relied on freely conferred deference and had to offer competent judicial advocacy and personal protection to attract followers[63].

Capture occurred through systemic economic and institutional shifts:

- *The Tithe Law of 1096 (Tíundarlög)*: The introduction of the tithe altered the economic foundation of the island[62]. Chieftains who erected churches on their estates retained half the incoming tithe revenue for church upkeep without fiscal accounting[62].
- *Wealth concentration and office buyouts*: Chieftaincies (*goðorð*), which were legally treated as alienable private property, were bought, sold, traded, and inherited[63]. Machiavellian chieftains used tithe-derived capital to buy out impoverished *goðar*, dispossessing free farmers and turning independent yeomen into defenseless tenants[62].
- *Oligarchic consolidation*: By 1220, the 39 independent *goðorð* were swallowed by five extended family dynasties: the Sturlungs (led by figures such as Snorri Sturluson and Sturla Sighvatsson), the Haukdælir (led by Gissur Þorvaldsson), the Oddaverjar, the Ásbirningar, and the Vatnsfirðingar[62].
- *Civil War (1220–1262)*: Chieftains no longer led through prestige; they maintained standing private retinues of armed retainers, subjecting rivals to extortion, arson, and mass killings[62]. At the Battle of Örlygsstaðir in 1238, the largest pitched battle in Icelandic history, roughly 50 combatants were slain in the defeat of the Sturlungs[62]. In the Flugumýri Arson (*Flugumýrarbrenna*) of 1253, Eyjólfur Þorsteinsson and his faction burned down the manor of Gissur Þorvaldsson during a wedding feast, murdering 25 people including women and children[62].
- *Foreign Subjugation*: Incapable of halting the slaughter through their judicial institutions, exhausted farmers agreed to the Old Covenant (*Gamli sáttmáli*, 1262–1264), submitting to King Haakon IV of Norway and ending Icelandic autonomy for over six centuries[62].

The Commonwealth collapsed because it possessed no mechanism to limit the accumulation or transfer of *goðorð*, lacked an executive to enforce Alþingi rulings against overmighty subjects, and offered no checking structure once church taxes monetized political status[62].

Case 2: The Republic of Venice and the 1268 Electoral Architecture

Where medieval Iceland collapsed into oligarchic war, the Republic of Venice constructed an institutional machinery that successfully resisted autocratic capture and factional takeovers for over five centuries (1268–1797)[61].

Early Venetian history was punctuated by doges attempting to institutionalize hereditary dynasties, blinding or executing rivals, and provoking street wars[67]. In 1172, Doge Vitale II Michiel was assassinated by an enraged mob following a disastrous military defeat[74]. Following a deadlocked tie in the ducal election of 1229 (between Marino Dandolo and Giacomo Tiepolo, settled by drawing lots), the Venetian patriciate overhauled its constitutional framework in 1268 to prevent any single dominant family from buying, bullying, or steering the supreme office[61].

The 1268 election system paired random sortition with supermajority voting across ten alternating stages to pick the Doge[61]:

1. A young boy (*il ballottino*), chosen at random from the streets of Venice, drew 30 names from an urn containing the roster of the Great Council (*Maggior Consiglio*)[61].
2. The 30 names were reduced by blind lot to 9[61].
3. The 9 electors elected 40 patricians, each requiring at least 7 votes (a 77.8%

supermajority)[61].

4. The 40 were reduced by blind lot to 12[61].
5. The 12 elected 25 patricians, each requiring at least 9 votes (a 75% supermajority)[61].
6. The 25 were reduced by blind lot to 9[61].
7. The 9 elected 45 patricians, each requiring at least 7 votes (a 77.8% supermajority)[61].
8. The 45 were reduced by blind lot to 11[61].
9. The 11 elected 41 electors, each requiring at least 9 votes (an 81.8% supermajority)[61].
10. The 41 electors convened in deep sequester and elected the Doge, requiring at least 25 out of 41 votes (a 61% supermajority)[61].

This procedure defeated Dark Triad capture mechanics through three structural barriers:

- *Corruption resistance*: No faction could bribe electors in advance, because the identity of the final 41 electors was physically unknowable until hours before the final vote[61].
- *Bribery neutralization*: Even if a faction corrupted an early committee, that committee did not elect the Doge; it merely elected a larger pool that would be culled by the blind lot of a child[61].
- *Consensus enforcement*: High supermajority thresholds (75% to 81.8%) barred polar, aggressive figures from advancing, rewarding candidates known for competence, moderation, and established prestige across factional lines[61].

When aristocratic malcontents led by Baiamonte Tiepolo, Marco Querini, and Badoero Badoer attempted an armed coup d'état in 1310 to overthrow the doge and the Great Council, the uprising was crushed in Piazza San Marco[65]. In response, the Republic created the Council of Ten (*Consiglio dei Dieci*)[64]. Operating in extreme secrecy with rotating memberships, brief one-year terms, and prohibited consecutive re-election, the Ten neutralized subversion, ran state counterintelligence, and prosecuted overambitious patricians[64]. When Doge Marino Faliero attempted a military coup in 1355 to establish an absolute autocracy, the Council of Ten intercepted his communications, arrested his conspirators, convicted him of treason, and publicly beheaded him on the steps of the Doge's Palace within 48 hours[78].

7. The Tripartite Evidentiary Separation

Governance literature frequently conflates ideological self-justifications with material historical performance and modern evolutionary theory. To prevent this, three analytical streams must be separated:

1. *Emic claim*: What the arrangement's participants asserted they were doing.
2. *Historical reality*: What surviving administrative records, tax rolls, trials, and skeletal remains reveal.
3. *Etic inference*: What modern evolutionary anthropology, behavioral game theory, and political psychology infer about the underlying mechanics.

Arrangement	Emic Claim (What the People Said It	Historical Reality (What the Record	Modern Scholarly Inference (Etic

	Did)	Shows It Did)	Understanding)
Nomadic Hunter-Gatherer Bands	"We are all equals; no one is master; meat is a shared gift of nature; hunting prowess brings no right to command"[28].	High levels of interpersonal violence and homicide; coercive male physical dominance frequently re-emerged; regular covert capital executions of non-conformists[29].	Egalitarianism is not a peaceful baseline; it is a precarious, actively enforced reverse dominance hierarchy maintained by the credible threat of coalitional execution[28].
Tsimane' Forager-Horticulturalists	"The *corregidor* is merely our servant; decisions must be unanimous; no man can tell another what to work or where to clear"[20].	Politically influential men command larger kin networks, win more physical disputes, secure more extramarital liaisons, and sire more surviving offspring[20].	Informal leadership relies on a composite of prestige (foraging skill, generosity) and derived dominance (coalitional formidability and kin-network muscle)[20].
Medieval Icelandic Commonwealth	"With laws shall our land be built, and not with lawlessness laid waste; every free farmer is sovereign and holds justice at the Alþingi"[63].	Wealth concentrated heavily into ecclesiastical landholders; overmighty *goðar* converted legal arbitration into private extortion, private warfare, and blood feuds[62].	A stateless legal market without executive enforcement cannot contain capital concentration; monetized dispute rights inevitably transform into coercive oligarchic dominance[62].
Republic of Venice	"The Doge is the humble prince of	Rigid patrician oligarchy;	Sortition-election algorithms

(Serenissima)	our holy, serene, and immortal Republic, balanced perfectly across monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic virtues"[61].	non-patrician commoners and women were disenfranchised; surveillance, secret denunciations, and summary trials through the Council of Ten[64].	effectively suppressed intra-elite warfare and autocracy, but locked in class dominance by permanently disenfranchising 95% of the population[61].

8. Critiques, Dissent, and Counter-Arguments

The dominance-prestige paradigm is an influential framework in contemporary evolutionary social science, but it faces theoretical, anthropological, and empirical critique:

Over-Dichotomization and Status Hybrids

Jerome H. Barkow, who pioneered evolutionary approaches to social status, argues that partitioning status into two distinct bins oversimplifies human sociality[11]. He notes that high-status individuals in complex societies almost always employ blended strategies: they use genuine prestige to recruit willing allies, and wield dominance against external rivals or structural dissidents[80]. Framing prestige and dominance as separate psychological tracks risks obscuring how social actors convert prestige into dominance once status is secured[11].

The Seasonal Hierarchy Critique

David Graeber and David Wengrow (*The Dawn of Everything*, 2021) contest the core assumption of evolutionary psychology that ancestral humans lived under uniform, unstratified egalitarian bands for over 100,000 years. Drawing on Upper Paleolithic burials (e.g., Sunghir, Sungir-4) and historical ethnography (e.g., Nambikwara, Inuit, Northwest Coast societies), they show that early human cultures transitioned seasonally between egalitarian bands in summer and highly stratified, authoritarian command structures during seasonal buffalo drives or winter ceremonies. Graeber and Wengrow assert that ancestral humans consciously shifted between dominance and prestige architectures based on environmental logistics, rejecting the deterministic claim that demographic scale alone dictates social hierarchy.

Cultural Variation and Multidimensionality

Zachary H. Garfield, Christopher von Rueden, and Edward H. Hagen conducted extensive cross-cultural analyses across the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) and traditional societies[20]. Their empirical findings indicate that leadership across cultures is not reducible to a simple dominance-versus-prestige polarity[81]. Across non-industrialized groups, leadership manifests across at least eight independent dimensions:

- Physical prowess and formidability[20].
- Healing and shamanic wisdom[22].
- Moral exemplarity and dispute-resolution impartiality[20].

- Oratorical skill and rhetorical persuasion[20].
- Generosity and redistributive capacity[20].
- Kin-network breadth and coalitional connectivity[20].
- Assertive command and tactical organization[20].
- Intelligence and domain-specific technical craftsmanship[20].

Garfield et al. demonstrate that dominance (fear/coercion) is cross-culturally disfavored as a solitary leadership mechanism[23]. Coercive force is tolerated only when strictly subordinated to moral prestige, public goods provision, and the protection of group interests[23].

The Anti-Romanticism Principle

Anthropological evidence refutes both the Hobbesian caricature of pure primitive brutality and the Rousseauian fantasy of the peaceful noble savage[28]. Small-scale, kin-based band societies maintain egalitarianism through systematic vigilance, psychological intimidation, and lethal collective violence[29]. Intimate scale does not guarantee fairness: it frequently breeds conformist tyranny, pervasive fear of witchcraft or supernatural sanction, ostracism of neurodivergent or eccentric individuals, and total suppression of personal dissent[29]. Modern institutional designers must acknowledge that ancestral equality was secured via the credible threat of execution, an enforcement regime neither viable nor morally defensible in complex post-industrial contexts[29].

9. Summary of Robust Findings

1. Status pursuit is an evolved, cross-cultural feature of human sociality that manifests through two distinct strategies: agonistic dominance and competence-based prestige[5].
2. Prestige is an evolutionary adaptation for high-fidelity cultural transmission; followers grant deference to skilled models in exchange for informational access and coordination services[1].
3. Dominance and prestige operate as orthogonal behavioral dimensions, displaying distinct somatic, vocal, and non-verbal signatures[5].
4. Longitudinal task groups reveal that dominance-based status degrades over time as groups interact, while prestige-based status solidifies[12].
5. Unstable dominance motivates destructive self-preservation: leaders actively exclude skilled subordinates, hoard operational information, and dismantle horizontal peer networks[38].
6. Collective threat, resource scarcity, and loss of control trigger a psychological shift among followers toward preferred dominant leadership[9].
7. Ancestral foragers were egalitarian through deliberate political design, utilizing a reverse dominance hierarchy to level aspiring bullies[28].
8. The anti-dominance leveling ladder escalates from gossip and targeted ridicule to overt disobedience, spatial ostracism, and coordinated execution[29].
9. Informal leveling mechanisms break down around the Dunbar threshold (150 individuals), beyond which opacity and anonymity allow dominant sub-coalitions to form[22].
10. Long-lasting constitutional systems counter dominance through multi-stage selection,

sortition, rapid office rotation, and supermajority requirements[61].

10. Contested and Open Questions

1. *The Endogeneity of Threat Manipulation*: Does the dominance-threat mechanism imply that dominant leaders systematically manufacture or exacerbate crises to preserve their authority, and what are the psychological boundaries of this tactic[30]?
2. *Gender Differentiation in Status Trajectories*: How do male and female leaders navigate dominance and prestige tradeoffs under acute subsistence stress, given known sex differences in coalitional formidability, risk-taking, and child-rearing constraints[20]?
3. *Information Transmission Without Modern Media*: In post-collapse environments lacking digital records, can prestige markers remain uncorrupted across district-level populations (1,500–5,000) without giving rise to predatory clientelism[62]?
4. *The Minimum Lethality of Anti-Dominance*: Can a community maintain a reverse dominance hierarchy against Dark Triad sociopaths without retaining capital execution as a recognized ultimate sanction[29]?
5. *Institutional Durability of Sortition*: Does sortition remain functional when localized technical expertise (e.g., agronomy, hydraulic engineering, trauma medicine) is concentrated in a tiny fraction of the surviving population[61]?

11. Core Literature

- **Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (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[1].
  - The foundational theoretical paper introducing the dual-strategies model. Establishes the mathematical and evolutionary basis of prestige as an information-market solution for cultural learners[1].
- **Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013).** *Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence.* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104(1), 103–125[5].
  - The definitive empirical paper validating the psychometric orthogonality of dominance and prestige through behavioral tasks, round-robin peer ratings, and eye-tracking measures[5].
- **Boehm, C. (1999).** *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press[29].
  - Landmark anthropological synthesis of 48 foraging societies demonstrating that egalitarianism is an actively enforced reverse dominance hierarchy maintained by coalitional leveling[28].
- **Maner, J. K., & Mead, N. L. (2010).** *The essential tension between leadership and power: When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest.* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99(3), 482–497[38].
  - Foundational experimental evidence demonstrating that dominant leaders in unstable positions actively sabotage talented group members and hoard crucial operational

intelligence[38].

- **Kakkar, H., & Sivanathan, N. (2017).** *When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige leader.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(26), 6734–6739[30].
  - Large-scale cross-national study ($N > 140,000$) establishing that collective uncertainty and loss of personal control systematically trigger follower preferences for dominant over prestigious leaders[30].
- **Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008).** *Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past.* American Psychologist, 63(3), 182–196[26].
  - Introduces Evolutionary Leadership Theory (ELT) and the evolutionary mismatch hypothesis, detailing how modern environments exploit ancestral leadership heuristics[25].
- **Price, M. E., & Van Vugt, M. (2014).** *The evolution of leader–follower reciprocity: the theory of service-for-prestige.* Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 363[27].
  - Formalizes the reciprocal economic model of leadership, framing deference as a payment for group coordination and public goods[24].
- **Case, C. R., & Maner, J. K. (2014).** *Divide and conquer: When and why leaders undermine the cohesive fabric of their group.* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107(6), 1033–1050[39].
  - Demonstrates experimentally that dominant leaders actively prevent horizontal communication, foster social distance, and break coalitional bonds among subordinates to protect their power[39].

12. Implementability after the Fall

Rebuilding social coordination following a permanent loss of industrial supply chains, electrical power grids, and digital networks requires governance models calibrated to biological scale and cognitive limits. When state enforcement disappears, dominance returns immediately as an existential threat.

Minimum Viable Governance Across Post-Collapse Scales

Household Level (4 to 10 People)

At the household scale, governance must operate through an explicit dual-stewardship model rather than unmonitored familial autocracy[28]. Domestic power is shared between two co-stewards across distinct operational portfolios (internal subsistence and rationing versus perimeter defense and external trades). Decisions over food reserves, seed conservation, and task allocation are deliberated daily around an open hearth.

The physical prerequisites are minimal: an agreed tally stick or notch board for recording grain and fuel disbursements, an explicit verbal charter regarding mutual obligations, and pre-negotiated emergency shelter protocols.

The primary failure mode to anticipate is intrafamilial tyranny or abandonment[28]. When physical infirmity meets extreme caloric deficits, prime-age members are tempted to neglect elderly or juvenile dependents, prompting household fission or violent domestic retaliation[28].

Village Level (~300 People)

At the village scale, governance is structured around a monthly Plenary Moot composed of all adult residents, paired with a rotating executive committee of three *magisters* chosen through sortition for non-renewable three-month terms[20]. To break the threat-dominance trap, the village strictly bifurcates military and civil authority:

- *The Defense Warden (Martial)*: Elected by simple majority based on physical competence and tactical prestige. Holds absolute tactical command during active external incursions, but possesses zero civil, judicial, or rationing authority within the settlement and stands down the instant physical hostiles disengage[27].
- *The Civil Magisters (Civic)*: Drawn by lot to manage grain stores, labor rotas, sanitation details, and local arbitration. Prohibited from directing defense forces[20].

Physical prerequisites include:

1. *A dedicated covered meeting space*: A timber hall, stone barn, or dry amphitheater capable of seating all 300 individuals in direct line of sight[20].
2. *A physical ledger*: A calfskin or heavy rag-paper registry recording land boundaries, debt obligations, tool loans, and council verdicts, secured under a triple-lock iron chest requiring keys held by three unrelated lineage elders.
3. *A synchronized calendar wheel*: A stone-carved solar calendar positioned in the center of the green to govern labor duties, debt terms, and assembly cycles.
4. *Functional literacy*: A minimum of four individuals from different lineages trained in reading, writing, and arithmetic to cross-verify ledger entries and prevent clerical manipulation.

The first failure mode to expect is lineage-based clientelism[20]. The two largest kin networks will inevitably seek to settle boundary disputes or physical assaults through private blood pacts and informal intimidation, bypassing the Moot and creating armed village factions[62].

District Level (~3,000 People / 10 Clustered Villages)

At the district scale, governance operates as an Amphictyonic Council: a federated assembly of thirty delegates, comprising three representatives selected from each constituent village via annual sortition among vetted village magisters[61]. The district assembly exercises strictly enumerated negative powers: arbitrating inter-village boundary disputes, maintaining transit corridors and canals, establishing standard dry and liquid measures, and coordinating regional defense pacts[61]. It possesses no general taxation authority, no authority to draft individuals into labor, and no standing armed police retinue[63].

Physical prerequisites include:

1. *A centrally located moot hill or fortified crossroads*: Positioned equidistant from the constituent settlements.
2. *A beacon and runner system*: Pre-arranged smoke, mirror, or horn relays capable of mobilizing village militias within four hours of an external threat.
3. *Standardized stone measures*: Physical stone standards for grain bushels, cordwood volumes, and rope cubits permanently mounted at the central crossroads.
4. *A ratified district charter*: Transcribed onto durable parchment and read aloud at the equinox assemblies in the presence of all delegations.

The first failure mode to expect is the emergence of toll-keeping monopolists[62]. A settlement

controlling an essential physical bottleneck—such as a working mill dam, a functioning blacksmith's forge, or an iron deposit—will begin imposing unauthorized transit tariffs, hiring armed retainers with the extracted surplus, and subverting council delegates through private patronage[62].

13. Principles

- **P-01**: Follower deference granted through prestige is voluntarily conferred, domain-specific, and stable over time, whereas compliance gained through dominance is seized through coercion, fragile across delays, and dependent on active surveillance[5].
- **P-02**: Dominant leaders respond to power instability by intentionally degrading group competence: they exclude high-performing subordinates, withhold vital problem-solving information, and dismantle horizontal social bonds to prevent coalitional challenges[38].
- **P-03**: Environmental, military, and economic crises trigger an evolved followership heuristic that prioritizes dominant, coercive leaders over prestigious leaders, driven by an instinctive drive to restore compensatory control[9].
- **P-04**: Egalitarian self-governance in small groups is not a spontaneous state of nature, but an actively enforced reverse dominance hierarchy maintained by the credible capacity of a united coalition to ridicule, ostracize, or execute would-be despots[28].
- **P-05**: Informal reputational policing breaks down beyond the Dunbar threshold (roughly 150 individuals), requiring formal institutional mechanisms to prevent Machiavellian actors from converting informational opacity into structural dominance[22].
- **P-06**: Separation of martial command from internal resource administration neutralizes the threat-dominance trap, preventing wartime coordinators from transforming emergency operational authority into permanent civic despotism[20].
- **P-07**: Hybrid selection procedures that alternate random sortition with high supermajority thresholds eliminate factional bribery, prevent personality-driven campaigning, and select for cross-factional prestige rather than aggressive dominance[61].
- **P-08**: Monetization or commodification of dispute-resolution offices causes the collapse of decentralized legal orders by enabling predatory dynasties to buy up legal jurisdictions and establish oligarchic monopolies[62].
- **P-09**: Dark Triad actors consistently exploit prestige mimicry and moral signaling during periods of institutional stability, transitioning to coercive dominance only after alternative communication networks have been dismantled[39].
- **P-10**: The long-term stability of any governance structure is inversely proportional to the ease with which a governing faction can assemble a private, internally loyal enforcement retinue insulated from communal accountability[28].

Works cited

1. (PDF) The Evolution of Prestige: Freely Conferred Deference as a, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11954021_The_Evolution_of_Prestige_Freely_Conferred_Deference_as_a_Mechanism_for_Enhancing_the_Benefits_of_Cultural_Transmission

2. The evolution of prestige: freely conferred deference as a ... - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11384884/
3. Prestige-biased social learning, https://d-nb.info/1180236874/34
4. The evolution of prestige-biased transmission - Owlstown, https://spaces-cdn.owlstown.com/blobs/us04t9ilavfcmmdh8c8s1384s28p
5. (PDF) Two Ways to the Top: Evidence That Dominance and Prestige, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233722729_Two_Ways_to_the_Top_Evidence_That_Dominance_and_Prestige_Are_Distinct_Yet_Viable_Avenues_to_Social_Rank_and_Influence
6. Dominance, prestige, and the role of leveling in human social, https://joey-t-cheng.squarespace.com/s/dominance-prestige-leveling.pdf
7. (PDF) Prestige and Dominance: a review of the Dual Evolutionary, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338202490_Prestige_and_Dominance_a_review_of_the_Dual_Evolutionary_Model_of_Social_Hierarchy
8. On the dynamics of social hierarchy - Darwinian Business, https://darwinianbusiness.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/7e813-dynamics-of-hierarchy.pdf
9. Threat Contexts Influence Visual Attention to Leader-Related, https://psyc.fss.um.edu.mo/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/zhu-et-al-2026-ejsp-from-reading-to-following.pdf
10. Two Ways to Stay at the Top: Prestige and Dominance Are Both, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354804608_Two_Ways_to_Stay_at_the_Top_Prestige_and_Dominance_Are_Both_Viable_Strategies_for_Gaining_and_Maintaining_Social_Rank_Over_Time
11. Dominance and Prestige in Social Hierarchies | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/435381243/Dominance-and-Prestige-Dual-Strategies-for-Navigating-Social-Hierarchies
12. (PDF) On the dynamics of social hierarchy: A longitudinal, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329602605_On_the_dynamics_of_social_hierarchy_A_longitudinal_investigation_of_the_rise_and_fall_of_prestige_dominance_and_social_rank_in_naturalistic_task_groups
13. Dominance and Prestige : Psychological Bulletin - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/plbul/fulltext/10.1037/bul0000356~dominance-and-prestige-meta-analytic-review-of
14. Dominance and Prestige as Self-Concept Facets - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365055982_Dominance_and_Prestige_as_Self-Concept_Facets
15. It's All About Power: Validation of Trait and State Versions of the, https://econtent.hogrefe.com/doi/10.1027/1015-5759/a000642
16. Dominance and Prestige Questionnaire (DPQ), https://db.arabpsychology.com/scales/dominance-and-prestige-questionnaire-dpq/
17. How Leaders Shape Well-Being and Retention - Joey Cheng, https://joeytcheng.com/assets/pdf/li2026howleadersshapewellbeingandr-onlinefirst.pdf

18. Publications | Human Connection Lab - Joey Cheng, https://joeytcheng.com/publications/
19. Dominant (but not prestige-based) leaders motivate collective moral, https://repository.tilburguniversity.edu/bitstreams/422b84d6-ab0b-4c26-9f46-7faacd6d6cc2/download
20. Sex differences in political leadership in an egalitarian society, https://gurven.anth.ucsb.edu/sites/default/files/sitefiles/papers/vonruedenetal2018.pdf
21. Why do men seek status? Fitness payoffs to dominance and prestige, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rspb/article/278/1715/2223/73639/Why-do-men-seek-status-Fitness-payoffs-to
22. Leadership in an Egalitarian Society, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1215&context=esi_pubs
23. “Think leader, think alpha male” and the evolution of leader, https://scholarship.richmond.edu/context/jepson-faculty-publications/article/1493/viewcontent/Think_Leader_Alpha_Male.pdf
24. evolutionary foundations of hierarchy 1 - Mark van Vugt, https://www.professormarkvanvugt.com/images/files/Handbook_of_Evolutionary_Psychologymvv2014rev.pdf
25. (PDF) Leadership and Followership. An Evolutionary Perspective, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349988409_Leadership_and_Followership_An_Evolutionary_Perspective
26. Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/4531/
27. The evolution of leader–follower reciprocity: the theory of service-for, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4045238/
28. Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, https://opac.uma.ac.id/repository/0674390318.pdf
29. Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/2131522.Hierarchy_in_the_Forest
30. When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1617711114
31. When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige, https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1617711114
32. When do people prefer dominant over prestigious political leaders?, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/evolutionary-human-sciences/article/when-do-people-prefer-dominant-over-prestigious-political-leaders/8625DE79C3C149662042DADAAF52B5C7
33. When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5495227/
34. University of Groningen Cross-cultural evidence that intergroup, https://research.rug.nl/files/1303155626/Lauststen_et_al_2025.pdf
35. Savvy or Savage? How Worldviews Shape Appraisals of, https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/psp-pspa0000456.pdf

36. Non-political anger shifts political preferences towards stronger, https://d-nb.info/126801737X/34
37. University of Groningen Fear is the path to the dark side Rus, Diana, https://research.rug.nl/files/1527181017/jmp-01-2025-0061en.pdf
38. When Leaders Sacrifice Group Goals for the Sake of Self-Interest, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/45280447_The_essential_tension_between_leadership_and_power_When_leaders_sacrifice_group_goals_for_the_sake_of_self-interest
39. Dominance and Prestige: A Tale of Two Hierarchies - Jon Maner, https://jon-maner-dev.squarespace.com/s/dominance-and-prestige-a-tale-of-two-hierarchies.pdf
40. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology - Jon Maner, https://jon-maner-dev.squarespace.com/s/the-essential-tension-between-leadership-and-power.pdf
41. Dominance and Prestige: Dual Strategies for Navigating Social, https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56cf3dd4b6aa60904403973f/t/57be0776f7e0ab26d736060e/1472071543508/dominance-and-prestige-dual-strategies-for-navigating-social-hierarchies.pdf
42. Social Hierarchy: Power, Status, and Influence - Open Publishing, https://openpublishing.princeton.edu/read/social-hierarchy-power-status-and-influence
43. Whom do we trust to lead us? effects of leaders' dominance-based, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15534510.2023.2256492
44. The Malevolent Side of Human Nature: A Meta-Analysis and Critical, https://haraldmerckelbach.nl/artikelen_engels/2017/The%20Malevolent%20Side%20Of%20Human%20Nature_%20A%20Meta-Analysis%20And%20Critical%20Review%20Of%20The%20Literature%20On%20Dark%20Triads.pdf
45. (PDF) Occupational niches and the Dark Triad traits - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263284278_Occupational_niches_and_the_Dark_Triad_traits
46. Dominance and Prestige: Dual Strategies for Navigating Social, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297918722_Dominance_and_Prestige_Dual_Strategies_for_Navigating_Social_Hierarchies
47. (PDF) It's All About Power - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351107979_It's_All_About_Power
48. Mechanisms through which the Dark Triad predict job satisfaction, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265853274_Competition_autonomy_and_prestige_Mechanisms_through_which_the_Dark_Triad_predict_job_satisfaction
49. Fear is the path to the dark side: the interplay of leader fear of power, https://www.emerald.com/jmp/article/41/3/530/1253883/Fear-is-the-path-to-the-dark-side-the-interplay-of
50. Full article: A primer on the Dark Triad traits - Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1111/ajpy.12198
51. Mechanisms through which the Dark Triad predict job satisfaction, http://www.mysmu.edu/faculty/normanli/JonasonWeeLi2015.pdf

52. Is the dark triad always detrimental to firm performance? Testing, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1061698/full
53. The Psychological Evolution of Power: A Short History | by Gil Pignol, https://medium.com/@gp2030/the-psychological-evolution-of-power-a-short-history-fe2c366bc48f
54. Christopher BOEHM | University of Southern California, Los Angeles, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christopher-Boehm
55. Power in Cultural Evolution and the Spread of Prosocial Norms, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/700767
56. Humankind-A-Hopeful-History.pdf - Rutger Bregman - addictbooks, https://files.addictbooks.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Humankind-A-Hopeful-History.pdf
57. The Remerging Foundations of a Biopolitical Science, https://www.emerald.com/books/edited-volume/11852/chapter/81821251/The-Remerging-Foundations-of-a-Biopolitical
58. The People Who Evolved Our Genes for Us: Christopher Boehm on, https://www.dennisjunk.com/readingsubtly/2012/08/the-people-who-evolved-our-genes-for-us.html
59. The Brutal Way Ancient Humans Dealt With Cheaters and Liars., https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K9gMs8i63xQ
60. How We Became Human : Mimetic Theory and the Science of, https://dokumen.pub/how-we-became-human-mimetic-theory-and-the-science-of-evolutionary-origins-1nbsped-9781609174613-9781611861730.html
61. Venetian Republic Doge selection system, https://constitution.org/1-Activism/elec/venetian_florentine_selection.html
62. The mission station converting Iceland to Pan-Scandinavianism., https://www.facebook.com/ReykjavikGrapevine/posts/the-mission-station-converting-iceland-to-pan-scandinavianism/10155078908427779/
63. The Social Mythology of Medieval Icelandic Literature, https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:2837907c-57c8-4438-8380-d5c8ba574efd/files/md063d2436f4be0c2da00d4eabbdf804f
64. The Venetian constitution, https://venetianstories.com/venetian-story/the-venetian-constitution/
65. Venice, 1310. Behind the beauty of the canals, one of the most, https://www.facebook.com/1066History/videos/%EF%B8%8F-venice-1310behind-the-beauty-of-the-canals-one-of-the-most-dramatic-political-/2075398423082889/
66. Sortition's Second Birth in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/government-of-chance/sortitions-second-birth-in-the-middle-ages-and-the-early-modern-period/1D90AD9754B201EC326739D0651F1D06
67. Doge of Venice - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doge_of_Venice
68. Council of Ten | Venetian political organization - Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Council-of-Ten-Venetian-political-organization

69. International Trade and Institutional Change: Medieval Venice's, https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/129/2/753/1868053
70. History of Iceland - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Iceland
71. An Investigation of Advice Giving in the Íslendingasögur, https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstreams/f01c3b26-ebcd-4804-9ae7-7dd6b48da3ef/download
72. The Secrets of North Iceland | Travel Guide, https://www.icelandtravel.is/iceland-2/secrets-of-north-iceland
73. 64% Majority rule in Ducal Venice: Voting for the Doge, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226938965_64_Majority_rule_in_Ducal_Venice_Voting_for_the_Doge
74. Electing the Doge - The Ballot Boy, https://www.theballotboy.com/electing-the-doge
75. M. Cristina Molinari How the Republic of Venice chose its Doge - IRIS, https://iris.unive.it/bitstream/10278/3696103/1/SSRN-id3103618.pdf
76. Tiepolo conspiracy - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiepolo_conspiracy
77. Venetian politics: everything you need to know about the state, https://www.italynotes.com/stories/venetian-politics
78. Damnatio memoriae - Érudit, https://www.erudit.org/en/journals/renref/2013-v36-n3-renref07156/1091027ar.pdf
79. The evolution of leader–follower reciprocity: the theory of service-for, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00363/pdf
80. The Leadership Quarterly - Anthropology, https://anthro.vancouver.wsu.edu/documents/594/1-s2.0-S1048984318303746-main_2.pdf
81. Research | Zachary H. Garfield, https://zhgarfield.com/research/
82. The evolutionary anthropology of political leadership, https://anthro.vancouver.wsu.edu/documents/584/garfield_et_al_2019.pdf
83. Evolutionary Models of Leadership : Tests and Synthesis - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30784003/
84. The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a, https://henrich.fas.harvard.edu/publications/evolution-prestige-freely-conferred-deference-mechanism-enhancing-benefits
85. Children's social evaluation toward prestige-based and dominance, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9107631/
86. Did Leaders Evolve To Be Good Or Evil? - Psychology Today, https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/from-darwin-to-eternity/201406/did-leaders-evolve-to-be-good-or-evil
87. Status Dynamics - Annual Reviews, https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104602