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Abstract

We studied the social assets and liabilities in clergy members’ social networks within a religious organization to determine how their “social ledgers” were related to clergy performance. We examined this social ledger across three levels of analysis: direct positive and negative ties, being a third party to a negative tie, and the affective centrality of individuals within the total network. Both direct negative ties and third party negative ties were related to performance outcomes, whereas direct positive ties and affective centrality were not, suggesting that we move beyond social capital metaphors focusing on positive content relationships in social networks.
A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.

-Jesus, speaking to the squabbling men who would become the leaders of the church (John 13:34-35).

Research in the network paradigm has increased exponentially in recent years (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). This research tradition largely suggests that the structure of one’s social relationships provides the individual with distinct benefits, such as easing the search for a new job (Granovetter, 1973, 1983), increasing upward mobility in one’s career (Lin & Dumin, 1986; Podolny & Baron, 1997), improving information access within an organization (Burt, 1992), and increasing one’s power (Brass, 1984; Brass & Burkhardt, 1993). Although researchers may disagree as to which network characteristics provide the optimal advantages in a particular context (e.g. Burt, 1992; Coleman, 1988), these debates tend to center upon which network structure of friends and acquaintances – i.e., relationships with positive affective content – performs better in a given context.

Although early social exchange theorists and network researchers considered both the positive and negative affective content of relationships (e.g. Homans, 1961; Sampson, 1969; Tagiuri, 1958; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), research over the past three decades has focused almost exclusively on network relationships conveying positive content (Cornwell, 2005). We wish to steer the analysis of social networks toward a more Simmelian perspective that emphasizes that every group has both associative and dissociative forces, and that negative relationships are a natural, but extremely important, part of life in groups and organizations (Simmel, 1955).

We argue that social network research should account more fully and explicitly for both the benefits and liabilities provided by an individual’s social network. This paper seeks to contribute to a more balanced understanding of social networks in organizations; in order to do so, we eschew the social capital metaphor focused exclusively on positive relationships, and instead adopt a social ledger perspective (Labianca &
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Brass, 2006). Drawing upon the metaphor of the financial ledger, the social ledger is an accounting of social assets (or social capital) and social liabilities derived from positive and negative affect relationships in order to understand a variety of individuals’ outcomes in organizations.

The social network perspective we employ to study individuals' social ledgers steers us toward an examination of how ties are embedded in the broader web of social relationships throughout the network, rather than simply examining dyadic ties. That is, we examine not only the effects of direct positive and negative ties, but the effects of indirect ties as well. Our study's main contribution to network and conflict research is in empirically examining the effect of these direct and indirect positive and negative to test three theoretical mechanisms underlying the social ledger across three different levels of analysis – direct ties, third-party ties, and ties embedded within a whole network. The shift in levels of analysis from direct ties to third parties and up to the whole network level allows us to consider the question of how the social ledger can be beneficial, how it can be a liability, and how it can be beneficial in some cases while being a liability in others.

Our main research question is: how are individuals' social ledgers related to their performance outcomes? More specifically, we ask the following questions across the three levels of analysis: do individuals with more direct positive ties and fewer direct negative ties have better performance than those with fewer positive ties or more negative ties? Do individuals who have more third parties to negative ties have better performance than those with fewer? Do individuals who have positive ties with popular individuals and negative ties with unpopular individuals have better performance than those who do not?

Our work is intended to shed greater understanding about the “dark side” of social networks, which has been a relatively underdeveloped facet of network research. Researchers are beginning to view social networks as a double-edged sword, both enabling and hindering the individual (Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne, & Kraimer, 2001). To date, however, when researchers have explored the “dark side” of social networks, it has most often been conceptualized in terms of opportunity costs (Gargiulo & Benassi, 1999; Leana & Van
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Buren, 1999). Granovetter (1985), for example, noted that the obligations and expectations of strong, positive, long-lasting relationships may prevent a person from realizing greater opportunities by constraining the search for, and development of, new trading partners. Our focus, however, is on how positive and negative affective relationships in one's social network may deliver liabilities in more concrete ways, beyond simple lost opportunities that affect a network's ability to generate benefits.

We conducted a two-phase, multi-method case study of the social relationships between clergy members in a large, mainline Christian denomination. The organization explicitly values its social network and regards it as a major source of organizational advantage vis-à-vis other denominations. It adopted a specific name for this social network – “The Connection” – which emphasizes the organization's conscious attempt to strengthen the relationships among its clergy members1. The expressly stated mission of both the organization and its clergy is the reduction and elimination of negative ties, as is illustrated by Christ's oft-repeated command to his disciples to “love one another.”

THE DEFINITION AND NATURE OF NEGATIVE TIES

Negative ties are defined here as an enduring, recurring set of negative judgments and feelings toward another person. Negative ties do not represent the absence of a relationship between two parties; rather they represent an enduring dislike for the other party. Unlike the vast majority of the organizational conflict literature, which studies interpersonal conflict as isolated episodes (e.g., as negotiation episodes or prisoner’s dilemma episodes), we focus instead on long-term relationships in which one person has adopted a relatively stable pattern of dislike for the other (Labianca and Brass, 2006). Single isolated conflict episodes can occur between any two individuals at times, including the best of friends, without

1 The best analogy for “The Connection” is what academics would refer to as “The Academy.” When an academic working on a manuscript sends it off to members of the academy for a friendly review, he or she is tapping into support through the academy. Ministers need many types of support as well, including help with sermons, dealing with personal crises, and dealing with church management issues, and they turn to “The Connection,” as it is known in this denomination, for support. The bishop's office actively worked to strengthen the relationships among the clergy, recognizing that clergy people were under great personal and professional strain from their positions.
necessarily affecting the underlying long-term relationship, or its influence on social ledger outcomes, and
the focus on long-term affective relationships increases our ability to reliably collect data in a field setting on
the relationship, as well as being of interest from a theoretical perspective.

It is possible, and indeed likely, that negative ties (long-term affective relationship conflict) may
emerge from an initial conflict episode (Pondy, 1967; Jehn, 1995). If the individual cannot minimize or
resolve the effects of the conflict episode, negative ties may arise (Taylor, 1991). Nevertheless, not all
conflict episodes result in the development of negative ties, nor should conflict episodes be equated with
negative ties. For example, one can have a conflict episode with a friend at work (e.g., having a conflict
episode over the particulars of an advertising campaign) while the overall relationship remains strongly
positive. Following Simmel (1955), we are relatively unconcerned here with the specific episode that
triggered the negative tie; instead, we are more interested in understanding the outcomes of these
recurring negative ties.

In most organizations, negative ties are often intentionally obscured, with individuals reluctant to
publicly expose their negative affect for each other, even while it privately affects their behavior toward one
another – a phenomenon which Newcomb (1947) referred to as “autistic hostility.” For example, an
individual need not be cognizant of a negative tie in order for it to affect his or her outcomes. Individuals
may harbor deep resentment towards others, actively working to subvert them through gossip or indirect
action, while never revealing the hostile relationship to the others. In addition, negative ties need not be
reciprocated in order to have a detrimental influence on one’s outcomes. As long as one member of the
dyad expresses stable negative affect and judgments of the other, a negative tie is present and can create
social liabilities, even if the other person decides to “turn the other cheek” and not express negative
judgments, or withdraws entirely from the relationship (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Finally, negative ties do not have to be directly experienced to be influential. The social distance of
an individual from a negative tie may also be an important predictor of social liabilities (Labianca and Brass,
2006). For example, being a friend with someone who is disliked by many others in a group may influence the attitudes of those others towards the focal person (Sparrowe et al., 2001). Conversely, if an individual has friends with negative ties, that individual may be more reluctant to draw upon his or her social network for fear of being drawn into that conflict (Smith, 1989). Furthermore, the repercussions of a single negative relationship might filter into the rest of the social network. For example, Smith (1989) describes how the entire network within the Kennedy administration was affected as the First Couple’s relationship deteriorated. As this example illustrates, understanding both the direct and indirect influence of negative ties leads to a better understanding of the benefits and liabilities of one’s social network.

Negative ties are a relatively low base-rate phenomenon, accounting for only between 1 and 8% of all reported relationships in organizations (Baldwin, Bedell, & Johnson, 1997; Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton, 2000; Labianca, Brass, and Gray, 1998). Evidence supporting the negative asymmetry hypothesis, however, suggests that negative ties may actually be more influential than positive ties in determining attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes. We generally expect our social environment to be positive and conflict-free, and, indeed, it generally is that way. When it is not, the negative encounters and the negative relationships they generate dominate our attention and drive our judgments and behaviors (Fiske, 1980; Helson, 1964; Jones & Davis, 1965; Jones & McGillis, 1976; Piaget, 1932; Rook, 1990; Sherif & Sherif, 1932).

2 Several theoretical mechanisms have been offered to explain negative asymmetry. Evolutionary psychologists suggest that the fight-or-flight mechanism central to humans’ physiological threat response is among the most powerful influences underlying negative asymmetry (Cannon, 1932; LeDoux, 1996). Because of this physiologically ingrained response to threats, we have difficulty not focusing our attention on negative relationships, which represent ongoing threats to the individual, with the consequence that these negative experiences are more likely to motivate later behavior.

While evolutionary psychologists have pointed to nature as the root cause of negative asymmetry, cognitive psychologists have focused on nurture. Cognitive psychologists suggest that negative behaviors were more likely to result in cessation of activity as a child (Piaget, 1932). Parents point out our socially or personally undesirable behaviors and teach us what not to do through punishment of undesirable behaviors. Thus, we are conditioned to attend to negative events and these responses continue to be imprinted on our adult consciousness. Others’ undesirable behaviors greatly impress upon us because we have been conditioned to focus upon them more closely than positive behaviors.

Discrepancy theorists suggest that negative ties are more influential than positive ties on judgments and behaviors because they create a very high discrepancy with our mostly positive, Pollyanna worldview. We generally expect our environment to be positive and conflict-free, and, indeed, it generally is that way. When it is not, the negative encounters and the negative relationships they generate dominate our attention and drive our judgments and behaviors.
1967). Ironically, because most ties in a person’s social network in the workplace are at least slightly positive, the rarity of negative ties makes them more discrepant, and thus relatively more influential in determining attitudes and behaviors than positive ties. This is another reason why it is important to study negative relationships in workplace social networks.

**MULTILEVEL VIEW OF NETWORK BENEFITS AND LIABILITIES**

Our social ledger perspective examines both an individual’s positive and negative ties to account for the possibility that the individual’s social network can be a double-edged sword, providing the individual with both social benefits and social liabilities. Social networks have been theorized to convey social benefits and liabilities through mechanisms operating at three different levels of analyses: direct negative and positive ties, being a third party to a negative tie, and affective centrality within the whole network. Our goal in this research is to examine these theoretical mechanisms simultaneously in an empirical setting.

*Direct Ties:* The simplest of the structural mechanisms involves *direct ties*. From a dyadic social ledger perspective, this represents a straightforward tallying of direct positive ties on the social assets side of the ledger, and direct negative ties on the social debits side of the ledger. The underlying assumption from this perspective is that positive ties are beneficial and negative ties are detrimental to an individual’s outcomes (e.g., Labianca & Brass, 2006). An abundance of studies from a social resources theory perspective have found that an individual’s number of positive ties results in benefits for that person (see Lin, 1999 for a review), whereas a relatively fewer number of studies have emphasized the detrimental effect of negative ties (Sparrowe, et al., 2001).

The number of direct positive ties in an individual’s network, often referred to as the extensity of ties, affects one’s access to social capital. Individuals with more extensive direct positive ties can seek information, referrals, and political support from a deeper pool of others, making it likely that they will have better performance (Burt, 1997; Lin, 1999; Lin & Dumin, 1986).
The number of direct negative ties may negatively affect performance outcomes in a number of ways. Negative ties might lead to negative gossip, a bad reference, or a negative performance review, which can severely limit one’s professional prospects (Burt & Knez, 1995; 1996). Negative ties might also fail to pass along information critical to one’s performance in a timely manner, or even provide intentionally misleading information, or they might fail to support someone politically, or intentionally undermine them politically, all of which can negatively affect performance (Labianca & Brass, 2006). The negative tie may also consume a significant and disproportionate portion of one’s cognitive and emotional energy (Broadbent, 1971; Easterbrook, 1959; Eysenck, 1976; Taylor, 1991), leaving less time and energy available for one’s job requirements. In sum, from a direct tie perspective, the number of negative ties in one’s network serves to close off access to the performance-enhancing benefits of social capital, while the number of positive ties serves to increase that access.

**H1:** The number of positive ties in an individual’s social network will be positively related to the individual’s performance.

**H2:** The number of negative ties in an individual’s social network will be negatively related to the individual’s performance.

**Third party:** The third party perspective, with its theoretical origins in Simmel’s (1955) triad arguments, suggests that having a positive tie to someone directly involved in a conflict can create benefits for the third party. A number of arguments can illustrate how individuals can benefit from being third party to a negative tie. Burt (1992) argued that one person can broker the relationship between the two individuals in conflict, playing one off on the other (Figure 1a). Since the parties in conflict do not communicate information to one another, the third party is able to leverage this privileged position to extract benefits from the brokering relationship, thus benefiting from the negative tie.

While Burt presumed that the third party knows both of the other parties, this triangulation is not necessary for the third party to benefit. Regardless of whether any brokering is occurring, the third party might better capitalize upon environmental resources if they are not preoccupied by conflict while others...
are (Figure 1b). Simmel (1955) argued that when two parties are in conflict, energy is consumed by the conflict. Those involved in direct negative ties might waste energy on the conflict, keeping them from achieving their goals in other areas, thus creating a social liability. This, in turn, creates opportunities for third parties to capitalize on these liabilities, whether intentionally or unintentionally. These types of benefits to third parties are often seen in the popular board game “RISK.” The third party who maintains good relationships with opponents while they battle with one another allows the third party to quietly build their strengths while their opponents are distracted and eventually capitalize on weakened opponents in later rounds.

The third party to a conflict might also benefit by brokering relationships of others to the parties in conflict (Figure 1c). That is, if people want to avoid dealing directly with one of the individuals in conflict, they go to the third party instead. For instance, with international trade sanctions in place, many countries were unwilling to conduct business with Iraq. Those countries who were willing to trade with Iraq (e.g. Syria) were able to benefit by trading with other countries and then, in turn, trading these goods with Iraq. These countries benefit by both increased trade volume and by raising prices due to the lessened competition in the marketplace.

Interestingly, most individuals would likely want to stay away from being a third party to a conflict, for fear that the conflict will escalate and draw them in, to their detriment (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Smith, 1989). Simmel and Burt, however, suggest that it is in just this type of risky third party behavior that great returns can be derived. Thus, the third party perspective suggests that having a positive third party tie to a person involved in a negative tie will improve the third party's performance outcomes, even as the negative tie potentially harms the performance of those directly involved. This situation increases the third party's
access to social capital and its attendant benefits and may have positive performance implications for individuals.

H3: Being a third party to a negative tie will be positively related to the third party's performance.

**Affective Centrality:** The affective centrality perspective combines all direct and indirect positive and negative ties in a network using balance theory principles (Cartwright & Harary, 1956; Heider, 1946; 1958). Balance theory suggests that the value of a positive or negative tie is dependent upon how the object of that tie is regarded by others in the network (see Table 1). Whereas the direct tie perspective argues that negative ties are generally detrimental, balance theorists have often argued that even negative ties can be, on occasion, of benefit to the individual. For example, being disliked by an unpopular person has been theorized to increase one's status in a group (e.g., Bonacich & Lloyd, 2004).

Similarly, having popular friends adds more to one's own popularity. Having a positive tie with someone who is very well liked or respected in the network may increase one's access to social capital, thus increasing performance outcomes (See Appendix A). Kilduff and Krackhardt (1994) use the example of a prominent banker not providing a loan directly to a supplicant, but rather strolling through a market arm-in-arm with the person to give the impression of friendship, which leads others in the marketplace to offer loans to the person. This type of status transmission can have a transitive effect – a highly popular individual adds to the popularity of not only his friends, but indirectly to the status of the friends of his friends (Bonacich & Lloyd, 2004).

We will refer to this concept as “affective centrality” (it is the eigenvector centrality of the individual in the positive and negative affective network). From this perspective, an individual with higher affective centrality within a network will have better performance than an individual with lower affective centrality. In essence, this individual is playing a better social game than others – making friends with all the popular
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people and steering clear of or disliking all the unpopular people (we apologize if this brings back bad memories of high school). Appendix A contains operational details and a further description of the affective centrality measure.

\[ H4: \text{An individual's affective centrality will be positively related to the individual's performance.} \]

**RESEARCH METHOD AND SETTING**

We conducted a multi-method case study of the social relationships among the clergy of a religious organization. The organization values the positive social relationships among its clergy, regarding this as one of its primary organizational strengths. Weak ties are actively cultivated through frequent social opportunities. For example, most organizational meetings begin with a 30-minute social time in which refreshments are served. Strong ties are similarly cultivated through longer-term initiatives such as classes on leadership, study, and spiritual development.

Among the explicitly stated missions of this organization is the eradication of negative ties. A speech delivered by an organizational leader during the 2004 annual meeting testifies to this commitment:

Our training and experience have taught all of us that unless a conflict is addressed early on, it has the potential to escalate, with more and more people getting dragged into it and being driven to opposite extremes. So, we had a candid, constructive conversation about the tension and emotions that had surfaced. We decided that rather than ignoring or avoiding what was happening, we should acknowledge it and transform it into an opportunity for healing, learning, and positive change.

This organization seeks to minimize social liabilities through an intentional organizational focus on forgiveness and reconciliation.

Social relationships are particularly powerful in this organization, because each clergy member has a voice in establishing the formal theological and social agenda for the denomination. Differences of opinion on these sensitive issues often resulted in strong positive or negative relationships developing among clergy. Clergy members often form political alliances or coalitions to forward particular agenda items in the denomination’s legislative body. Clergy members often hold radically different opinions on
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these issues, forming coalitions to help push the issue in one direction or another (e.g., Yukl, 1994).

Further, since there was typically one and only one clergy member assigned to a given church, these clergy were critically reliant on relationships with other clergy in the denomination for professional advice, assistance, and support in order to run their church effectively.

Organizational Background

The organization under study is the regional division of a large mainline Christian denomination. The most basic organizational unit of the organization is the local church, comprised of between 25 and 10,000 volunteer members. In almost every case, a single professional clergy member—commonly referred to as a minister, pastor, or preacher—oversees each church.

Clergy have multiple and various responsibilities. First, they must oversee the worship services, deliver a 20-minute inspirational message (sermon) each week, and perform appropriate religious rituals for different services. Second, they are the primary administrative officers of the church and convene committees comprised of volunteer members that deal with finance, human relations, fundraising, building maintenance, and administration. Third, clergy spend a great deal of time performing psychological and spiritual counseling for the members of the church, ranging from newly engaged couples to families who have lost a family member. Fourth, clergy are expected to be active in the community, recruiting new members as well as serving as the community’s moral voice. Clergy members work around the clock, seven days a week, coordinating with volunteers during the week, conducting services on Sundays, and helping church members at any time during a crisis. Because of their all-encompassing role as leader, spokesperson, recruiter, and figurehead of the local church, the success or failure of any church is typically attributed to the clergy person assigned by the bishop to lead it.

PHASE 1: QUANTITATIVE SURVEY

We began with a series of interviews which we used to learn about the organization and then to create a survey. The survey was administered to all the clergy members in one regional division of the
denomination during a regularly occurring administrative meeting. The regional administrator allowed us sufficient time at the beginning of the meeting to explain, administer, and collect the surveys. Of the 85 clergy members in the region, 59 were in attendance at the meeting. All of the clergy members in attendance completed the survey, resulting in an overall response rate for the region’s clergy of 69%. Descriptions of all of the variables used in the analysis are found in Table 2.

| Independent Variables |

The independent variables of interest were drawn from the sociometric portion of the survey instrument. Individuals were asked to scan a roster of the clergy in their region to identify the ministers in the denomination with whom they had contact at least once per year and were further asked to report two characteristics about those relationships. First, they were asked to rate the frequency of the interaction on a five-point Likert scale: daily or more (5), weekly (4), monthly (3), few times a year (2), once per year (1). Second, they were asked to indicate their feelings for the clergy listed: strongly like (5), somewhat like (4), neither like nor dislike (3), somewhat dislike (2), strongly dislike (1).

From these responses, we created variables to capture both the direct and indirect ties in an individual’s network. We first assessed the direct ties by calculating the number of positive incoming ties and the number of negative incoming ties reported about each individual. We combined the “somewhat like” and “strongly like” responses into a single matrix of positive ties (1 = positive tie, 0 = not) and calculated the number of positive ties reported about each individual. Similarly, we combined the “somewhat dislike” and “strongly dislike” responses into a single matrix of negative ties (1 = negative tie, 0 = not) and calculated the number of negative ties reported about each individual. Thus, the dyadic level direct positive and negative ties variables represent the extent to which the focal minister is liked or disliked.
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by his or her fellow ministers.  

We then used the positive tie and negative tie matrices to capture the indirect relationships in an individual's network and calculated two variables of interest – a third party variable and an affective centrality variable. The third party variable indicates whether an individual has a positive tie with someone who is involved in a negative relationship with a third person. To calculate this variable, we combined the positive tie and negative tie matrices by first transposing the positive tie matrix and then multiplying it by a dichotomized negative tie vector (1 = negative tie, 0 = no negative tie) that had been copied to form a square matrix. By summing across the rows of this matrix, we captured the number of third party negative ties an individual had in his or her social network.

Affective centrality calculates the value of one's network by assessing how the rest of the network members regard the people with whom an individual has ties. Affective centrality is higher if one's positive ties are with well-liked people in the network and lower if one's positive ties are with relatively less affectively prominent people in the network. Recent research suggests that affective centrality can be used as a measure to test balance theory by capturing whether people have positive or negative ties with people who are well regarded or disliked by others in the network (Bonacich & Lloyd, 2004). Thus, a person may benefit by having a negative tie with someone generally disliked by the network but may suffer disproportionately by having a negative tie with someone generally well-liked (See Appendix A). The converse also holds true. To obtain our affective centrality score, we calculated eigenvector centrality on the original matrix of affective relationships, recoded so that the negative relationships were all negatively valued (-2, -1), the neutral relationships were zeros, and the positive relationships were positively valued.

---

3 We operationalized direct ties as incoming ties only for a number of reasons. First, including symmetrized direct ties, third party ties, and affective centrality in a single model introduced severe multicollinearity problems into our models. This effect is not surprising, considering we are analyzing a single network from three distinct perspectives. Second, using only incoming ties minimized the potential for single source bias because we obtained some variables from the respondent and others from the other network members. Third, if we dropped affective centrality from the model, the multicollinearity problems in our model were eliminated and our models yield similar results using symmetrized ties as using incoming ties. Thus, using only incoming ties for the direct measures is an effective choice to address the problem of multicollinearity without affecting our results.
Dependent Variables

We used annual archival data about each church to determine the performance of each clergy member who was appointed to that church. We obtained data about each church from denominational records during the year in which our survey was administered (Year 1) and for the year immediately preceding data collection (Year 0). We operationalized change in all performance variables by subtracting Year 1 performance from Year 0 performance to create the change variable, then we controlled for Year 0 performance in all equations.

Church leaders considered increase in church membership the most important measure of performance. Rooted in Jesus’ command to “go make disciples,” the addition of new members to a local church is typically seen as the most critical metric of success at both the local church and the denominational level. In addition to recruiting members, inspiring them to actively participate in the church’s ministries is also considered important. Church leaders indicated that membership in church groups (e.g. religious education classes, youth groups, and men’s and women’s groups, etc.) was an important measure of performance as a proxy for overall church activity. Members of the denominational hierarchy indicated that both of these performance measures were directly attributable to the minister.

Control Variables

We sought to control for differences in individual characteristics for the clergy members surveyed. Research has shown that people generally engage in different network strategies based on gender (Ibarra, 1992) and race (Ibarra, 1995). Our background research suggested that gender and racial similarities and differences might be a particularly important source of social network ties among the members of the clergy, so we included both race and gender as dichotomous control variables in the analysis. As
mentioned above, we also controlled for performance from the previous year (Year 0) on all archival performance variables.

Results

Network data were analyzed using UCINET 6.97 for Windows, (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002), and regression models were analyzed using hierarchical OLS regression. In the first step, we entered only the control variables. In each successive step, we entered the effects of direct positive ties, direct negative ties, the third party variable, and affective centrality, respectively. In all models, we analyzed the variance inflation factors (VIFs) to ensure that multicollinearity within the regression models would not be a problem. Results showed that the VIFs for all variables were well within recommended levels (under 4 for all variables in all analyses). Likewise, we examined the Durbin-Watson statistic and residuals and found that autocorrelation was not a problem in our models.

Model A5 demonstrates our results in relation to growth in church membership. This variable accounts for whether new members are attracted to joining the church. Both positive ties and affective centrality are not significant in relationship to church membership. The number of people joining a church does not appear to be related to how well the church’s minister is liked by other clergy nor how well positioned he/she is in the overall clergy social network. Therefore, we find no support for either Hypothesis 1 or Hypothesis 4. We do, however find support for Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3. Both negative incoming ties (t = -2.743, p<.01) and the third party variable (t = 1.782, p<.1) are related to membership changes in the hypothesized directions. If a minister is disliked by other clergy members, church membership is negatively affected. If a minister is a third party to a conflict, however, church membership is positively influenced.
Model B5 demonstrates similar results in relation to growth in group membership. This variable accounts for whether existing members are willing to participate in activities offered by the church. Similar to our results for church membership, we find that neither Hypothesis 1 nor Hypothesis 4 is supported. The number of people participating in church groups does not appear to be related to how well the church’s minister is liked by other clergy nor how well positioned he/she is in the overall clergy social network. We continue to find support for Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 in this model. Negative incoming ties (t = -2.849, p < .01) and the third party variable (t = 2.092, p<.05) are both related to group membership in the hypothesized direction. If a minister is disliked by other clergy members, members’ participation in church groups is negatively affected. Participation in church groups is positively influenced, however, if clergy members are third party to a conflict.

The support provided for Hypothesis 2 (negative ties), and the lack of support for Hypothesis 1 (positive ties) across both dependent variables is consistent with the negative asymmetry arguments that suggest that negative ties are more consequential than positive ties for outcomes. The support provided for Hypothesis 3 suggests that Simmel's arguments about the benefits that accrue to third parties are applicable in an organizational setting.

It is also worth noting that two of our control variables – race and gender – are significant in the models of group membership models but not in those related to church membership. This suggests that women and minority clergy tend to improve the participation in church groups, even though there is no effect on overall church membership. Neither women nor minorities had significantly more negative ties than others surveyed.

---

Insert Table 4 about here
Study 2: Qualitative Follow-up

Miles and Huberman (1994) note that qualitative research is appropriate both for rich case-study description and for understanding causal relationships. We decided to conduct a follow-up qualitative analysis for both of these reasons: to better understand the nature of negative ties in this setting and to better understand the results of our hypothesis testing (both those that were supported and those that were not supported).

We believe that such a qualitative analysis is valuable in that it helps us understand and describe the negative ties. Since our quantitative results demonstrated that the negative side of the social ledger was more predictive of performance than the positive side, understanding the nature and source of these negative ties seemed particularly critical. Qualitative methods help bring these relationships to life, beyond the mere quantitative or pictorial representation of those relationships used in social network analysis without enough regard to the content of the ties. Social network researchers risk over-distancing themselves from the nature of the human phenomena they seek to describe if human interactions become solely reduced to quantifiable data in terms of nodes and ties.

Second, qualitative analysis helps us better describe the causal mechanisms behind the results of our hypotheses tests. Different theories argue that the direct, third party, and whole network ties should all explain performance outcomes of individuals in the network. Our quantitative analysis, however, found that only direct negative ties and third party ties were significantly related to performance. We hoped that qualitative methods would help us better understand the causal drivers behind our results in this setting, as well as help to explain why some of our hypotheses tests may have not been supported.

Data Sources

The data we used in our qualitative analysis came from two sources: semi-structured interviews and transcripts from denominational meetings. Multiple types of respondents and multiple data sources provided the opportunity to triangulate perspectives on the relationships between clergy. An advantage of
conducting the follow-up qualitative analysis was that we could use the survey data to recruit interview participants that ensured theoretical sampling of the types of relationships we sought to capture. This data is particularly valuable considering the relative rarity of negative ties, and we could target our interviews to effectively study the effects of negative ties.

We conducted 20 interviews with clergy members at various levels of the denomination. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Protocols for our interviews can be found in Appendix B. Eight respondents were a part of the sample surveyed, eight were clergy members serving churches but not surveyed, and four were members of the denominational hierarchy. Of the eight interview respondents for which we had survey data, three had reported negative ties about others, three had negative ties reported about them (a fact not revealed to the participants), five were third parties to a negative tie, and respondents demonstrated good variance in affective centrality. Respondents for whom we did not have survey data were included to help ensure that our results were generalizable beyond the particular region studied, and they were explicitly asked to characterize and describe their relationships with other clergy. Members of the denominational hierarchy were asked to respond not only about their own relationships with other clergy but also about their impressions of relationships between clergy for whom they had supervisory responsibility. Since these hierarchical leaders often mediated relationships between clergy (both positive and negative), they were in a good position to comment about other clergy relationships.

We also obtained transcripts from a series of 6 organizational meetings that were explicitly called to discuss the nature of the relationships between clergy. A recent conflict over electing delegates to the worldwide denominational meeting had prompted these meetings that addressed both the positive and negative aspect of clergy relationships in an effort to improve relationships. Approximately 150 clergy (approximately 10% of the denomination’s clergy in this large state) attended these meetings.

Data was first coded using template analysis, in which we used our theoretical model as a template by which to parse and analyze our qualitative data (King, 2004). This method was appropriate given that
our qualitative analysis sought to explain and describe our a priori theoretical model. Data was then placed into a content-analytic summary table that enabled easy analysis and comparison of our data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Taken together, these sources of qualitative data permitted us to explore the nature of clergy interactions at multiple levels. An analysis of these data allowed us to delve further into how the social ledger functioned among the social networks of clergy in The Connection.

Sources of Negative Ties

The first goal of our qualitative analysis was to describe the nature and source of negative ties in this organization. Consistent with our quantitative results, most clergy members did not believe that direct negative ties happened frequently but agreed that they were particularly influential when they did happen. One clergy member with 40 years of experience said,

“The relationships that are most detrimental are when other clergy directly seek to undermine your ministry. I don’t think it happens that often, but it does happen. It may be because of competition for the same position or because of personal differences between the clergy.”

Clergy members identified two primary sources for negative ties – conflict that arose as a result of joint participation in a religious ceremony and conflict that arose from political behavior between clergy.

Several clergy members indicated that their negative ties developed as a result of performing religious ceremonies in conjunction with another clergy member (e.g. wedding, funeral, etc.). An outside clergy member was oftentimes invited to perform a significant religious function at another clergy member’s church. This situation arose when the outside clergy member was either a family member of service participants or if the outside clergy member had previously served that church. This situation often created difficulties, because it was not necessarily clear which clergy member was “in charge” of the ceremony. Although the clergy member appointed to the church was officially the lead, the service participants typically looked to the invited clergy member with whom they had a previous relationship. Conflicts arising during these ceremonies often developed into lasting negative relationships between clergy members.
Two different clergy members both testified to the potential problems that result from this shared leadership of a ceremony:

“Because I serve near my last church, I am still asked to go back to perform weddings pretty often. I have to deal with these situations very carefully. I play by the rules, but with one minister I used to have a real problem and I had to dot all my ‘i’s and cross all my t’s.’ He was very threatened by me coming back. It could have been a bad situation.”

“My niece was being baptized at the church, and I went to participate. First, the other minister made insensitive comments to my family. The whole service was about him, not the family or the child. Second, he tells me to show up 15 minutes beforehand to review the service with me. He doesn’t show up, comes in right before the service starts, calls me into the restroom to discuss it while he is peeing, and tells me ‘don’t worry, I’ll handle things.’ Third, he never introduces me to the congregation or explains why I am there, and when he finally does, he gets my wife’s name wrong. People were asking me on the way out of the service who I was. It was just slipshod performance.”

Clergy also indicated that the promotion and appointment process also led to negative relationships when clergy were competing for assignments to the most attractive churches. One clergy member expressed a sentiment that was echoed throughout our qualitative data,

“Our system is really set up in a way that encourages intense competition and bitter politics. A small group of people [in the church hierarchy] is making decisions about your future, a decision in which you have very little input. Not only does this decision affect your job, but it also affects your family, the house you live in, and the school your children go to. A lot is riding on the process, and so people do whatever they can to influence the decision makers.”

Negative relationships also resulted from clergy members advocating particular political or theological agendas (homosexual rights, gender equality, etc.).

Respondents indicated that different clergy members participated differently in this political process. Some were keenly aware of and active in this political side, whereas others were less interested in this component. Because of the different degrees of political behavior, clergy members indicated that it was possible to be involved in a negative tie without necessarily being aware of it. Further, because the ethos of the organization called for all clergy to “love one another,” the appearance of an amicable relationship was maintained even while clergy masked hostility for one another. A senior clergyman noted:
“Clergy are a lot like politicians. They are smiling to your face as they stick the knife in your back. It's difficult to always see it coming because [clergy members] are supposed to like one another.”

Others indicated that clergy members may also be the source of a negative tie without even realizing it. A clergy person who worked as a professional counselor pointed out that

“Clergy are by definition self-centered people. Don't get me wrong, I don't necessarily think this is a bad thing. If you are going to get up and speak to a group of hundreds of people every week and think that they care about what you have to say, you have to think fairly well of yourself. So, oftentimes clergy end up doing damage simply because they are oblivious to others. They can talk and act without full awareness of how it's affecting others.”

Thus, although most clergy members indicated that political behavior did occur and that negative ties often resulted as a part of that behavior, it was often difficult to recognize such behavior when it was happening.

In sum, consistent with our quantitative results, most clergy interviewed believed that negative relationships with other clergy were somewhat rare. At the same time, most indicated that even if they had not been involved in a negative relationship they knew of colleagues who had that experience. They also indicated that it was highly likely that one or the other party in the negative relationship was not aware of the negative feelings towards him or her.

**Performance outcomes of the social ledger**

The second goal of our qualitative analysis was to describe the causal mechanisms that drove the effect of the social ledger on performance as described by the clergy in their voices. The clergy members believed that their social networks influenced their performance in terms of the performance variables we selected. Their responses tended to indicate that different aspects of the social ledger influenced performance in distinct ways, consistent with our quantitative results. First, we explore the causal mechanisms behind our hypotheses that were supported by our regression models. Second, we use our qualitative data to attempt to explain the reasons why our other hypotheses were not supported.
**Direct Negative Ties and Performance:** We hypothesized that direct negative ties would be negatively related to performance (H2), which was supported by our quantitative analysis of growth in church membership and members' participation in church groups. As the leader of the church, the clergy person is responsible for motivating people towards both of these goals – attraction to and affiliation with the church in terms of formal membership, and participation in and commitment to the church in terms of participation in small groups within the church. Our qualitative data indicated that these negative ties tended to impact these measures of clergy performance in two ways – through a reputational effect within the community and through a lowered energy level for performing certain job responsibilities.

The reputational effect could influence clergy performance by damaging the clergy member's standing within the community where their church was located, particularly if the conflict between clergy happened publicly. Since multiple churches were often located in the same community, clergy often had members of their churches who shared the same schools, lived in the same neighborhoods, and ate in the same restaurants. If conflict happened while clergy members were jointly present in these settings, other members of the community could become aware of these issues – either directly or through subsequent rumor within the community. One female clergy person reported one such interaction with a fellow clergy member who objected to women in ministry.

“I went to a restaurant with prospective church members after a service. Another pastor was at the restaurant and said loud enough for everyone to hear, ‘she probably had to buy them lunch to get them to come to hear her preach. Who wants to hear a woman preach?’ I told him right there and then if he ever did that again, I would take his pulpit and his church. One whisper from me about sexual harassment, and he would be gone real quick. I told him never to speak to me again. Later that week, he said ‘Morning, preacher’ to me as a greeting. I told him that constituted speaking to me. He got the point.”

Since attraction to a particular local church was often a function of a personal relationship with the pastor who served that church, such reputational effects could significantly damage their ability to attract new members. This reputational damage could be inflicted even if the focal clergy member didn’t know about the negative tie.
Further, these negative ties could influence performance of the clergy by sapping the energy necessary to perform their job responsibilities, particularly attracting new members. Nearly all clergy view their position more as a calling than as a career. Thus, negative relationships impacted not only their work environment but also the clergy member's self image. Two separate clergy members reflected on how a negative relationship had affected their ministry. One individual observed a dissonance between expectations and the reality of relationships within the clergy:

“When I moved into this church I was freshly ordained, ordination meant the world to me. I felt like I had joined an exclusive fraternity, and I had paid my dues. I thought it was a privilege to be a part of this connection. When I developed such a difficult relationship with some of my fellow clergy, it really shook me to the core.”

Another minister experienced lowered self-confidence as a result of interaction with a fellow clergy person:

“The negative relationship I had with a fellow clergy made me feel inadequate, like I was not fulfilling my expectations as a clergy. Part of me could rationalize that this wasn't the case, that it was just a bad relationship. Part of me couldn't.”

Nearly all clergy members who reported having a negative relationship indicated that it significantly affected their ability to perform their religious duties.

**Third Parties and Performance:** Our third party hypothesis posited that a clergy member who was once removed from a negative tie would have positive performance outcomes as a result of those relationships (H3), and these results were supported by our quantitative analysis. Although our interviews indicated that clergy underperformed as a result of the detrimental effects of direct negative ties, our interviews did not suggest that clergy members were aware of benefiting from third party effects. However, clergy members did report that significant problems in neighboring churches frequently resulted in an influx of members to their church as a result of those problems. Church members often chose to leave a church in the wake of scandal and seek another church to join, but it was not clear that these effects were necessarily a direct result of negative relationships between clergy.
When dealing with indirect effects of the social ledger, it is possible that people are unaware of how more complex, indirect relational interactions affect their performance. Previous research has suggested that the greater social distance between two individuals results in a less accurate perception of the social network (Kilduff & Krackhardt, 1994), and clergy may simply be unaware of third party effects that occur in more subtle ways. The discrepancies between the qualitative and quantitative portions of our study suggest the need for further research on perceptions of social networks (e.g. DeSoto, 1960; Janicik, 1995; Krackhardt & Kilduff, 1999).

Clergy members did suggest, however, that being once removed from negative ties was beneficial in another way. Typically, when a clergy member was directly involved in a negative relationship, a clergy member frequently sought emotional support from another clergy person. Respondents consistently indicated that they felt indebted to the clergy member who helped them deal with the negative tie. They were willing to go above and beyond in their relationships with those clergy members, because of that clergy person's willingness to help. One respondent indicated,

“I had some church members move near the church of the minister who helped me deal with the fallout from a particularly difficult relationship with another clergy. I did not hesitate to suggest that they should check out his church. He is just a great guy and I think the world of him, so it was easy to recommend. I think they ended up joining there.”

These clergy also seemed more willing to help, support, and trust the clergy member who helped them deal with the negative tie, so clergy who are once removed from such a negative tie may receive a number of benefits for years to come. Over time, these benefits might accumulate to create the positive performance effects we found in the quantitative analyses.

Direct Positive Ties and Performance: We hypothesized that direct positive ties would be positively related to performance, but this hypothesis was not supported by our quantitative results. One possible explanation for our lack of support for this hypothesis may be that direct positive ties seem to influence the emotional support clergy received as opposed to performance benefits. Clergy consistently
reported receiving emotional support from other clergy via their positive direct ties. They relied on these relationships to share the challenges of the position with others who experienced similar joys and challenges from their work. When asked how the positive ties supported them emotionally, one clergy person replied,

“We celebrate the victories together. We listen to each other complain. We cry together. Really the only one who can understand what you are going through is another clergy person. I really value those relationships.”

Clergy indicated, nearly universally, that they used the positive ties with other clergy to provide emotional support and found that this emotional support was one of the most valuable benefits of these relationships.

Another reason for this may have been that, because of similar job requirements, that clergy found it difficult to support one another at the times most critical to performance. The Sunday morning worship service was regarded as the highlight of the church week. Since each of the clergy had responsibilities for their own church on Sunday mornings, most often sole responsibility, it may have been difficult for clergy to support or observe one another directly during these critical times, lest their own job responsibilities suffer. Clergy may have been willing and able to provide one another with broad explicit knowledge and advice to support each other’s Sunday morning activities, such as sermon topics and worship order. This type of support may have only been of limited value without these clergy members being able to directly observe and participate in these times, assessing and supporting the more tacit elements of the service.

**Affective Centrality and Performance:** We hypothesized that affective centrality would be positively related to performance (H4), but this hypothesis was also not supported for either of our performance measures. One explanation may be that our inability to find a relationship between affective centrality and performance outcomes might indicate that balance theory does not work on the negative side as well as it does on the positive side. Other researchers have found similar results in an examination of the Sampson monastery data (Doreian & Krackhardt, 2001). Our research might be part of an emerging pattern that perhaps suggests that this aspect of balance theory may need to be reconsidered.
Seeking to understand this non-finding, we asked clergy whether they believed that relative prominence or isolation in the clergy relationships influenced performance in any way. Although clergy reported a high degree of awareness of the relative position of clergy within the social network, these interactions may not influence performance at the local church level because they are hidden from the view of local parishioners. One clergy member responded,

“Most laypeople are pretty much oblivious to the interactions that go on between clergy. Those relationships tend to affect other types of activities such as voting on clergy for other types of positions or on future appointments. They don't really influence what happens in our churches. Thank goodness.”

Most clergy seemed to interpret a clergy's position in the wider social network in terms of political behavior. Since clergy were appointed to their positions by members of the denominational hierarchy, respondents consistently indicated that clergy tended to affiliate with those well-positioned in the network and avoid those who were widely disliked in an effort to better their chances of being appointed to a desirable church. Thus, one explanation for our lack of support for our affective centrality hypothesis may be that affective centrality influences which clergy are appointed by the denomination’s hierarchy to serve a particular church, but not their performance in terms of attracting members or getting them committed once they arrive at their appointed church.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The vast majority of social network and social capital research has been overly focused on positive ties and at the expense of understanding the negative ties that are a normal part of group and organizational life. The results of our study underscores the importance of moving beyond only studying positive ties to include the broader social ledger in future social network research.

Our results take these observations one step further, however. We do not find that negative ties explain performance in addition to positive ties, but we find evidence for the negative asymmetry
hypothesis – that negative ties actually prove more influential than positive ties in understanding certain network outcomes. Our hypotheses related to negative ties are supported, whereas those related to positive ties are not. We would caution that these results should not be interpreted to suggest that positive ties are unimportant for understanding organizational outcomes. Indeed, our qualitative data suggest that they may be valuable for outcomes other than performance. Nevertheless, failing to account for negative ties in the analysis of most social network data, researchers may be overlooking some of the most critical relationships that explain performance outcomes in a social network. Future social network research should account for both the positive and negative ties in a social network to most completely account for the performance outcomes of networks.

Further, our research extends the understanding of the role of negative ties in social networks. Most previous research has interpreted negative ties at their most basic level – the direct impact of dyadic negative ties is detrimental to performance. This research challenges this one-dimensional understanding of negative ties, exploring the influence in the wider social network to find that the impact of negative ties is more complex than most studies have envisioned. Consistent with earlier tertius gaudens arguments (Simmel, 1955), we have shown that negative ties may be beneficial for those who are not directed involved in the negative ties, but rather are third parties to the negative tie. Thus, negative ties may be beneficial for those who are well positioned to capitalize on the benefits which may result from the ongoing dislike between two people in a network.

Further, although balance theory suggests that negative ties should also be positively influential if one dislikes someone who is unpopular in a network, our analysis was not able to support these expected findings. Although the lack of evidence should not be interpreted as disconfirmation of balance theory, by contributing to a cumulative research theme that has had similar difficulties confirming balance theory hypotheses on the negative side of the social ledger, this consistent lack of evidence should begin to raise some interesting questions for future research on balance theory in field settings.
Implications for Practice: The dominant thinking in most organizations is that conflict can be good, providing the opportunity to challenge and test ideas and assumptions before they are operationally implemented. Yet, our research emphasizes the importance of differentiating this type of task-related conflict from the specific type of long-term relationship conflict we study here. Task-related conflict may indeed be beneficial, but our results demonstrate that long-term relationship conflict is negatively related to outcomes for those who are directly involved - whether or not individuals are aware that they are involved in this conflict.

A takeaway from this research for the practicing manager is to avoid being directly involved in conflict. Further, since the presence and source of this conflict may not be immediately apparent, it may be beneficial to actively seek out advice on where negative ties might lie in their networks and then to resolve or eliminate conflicts which may be in a manager’s social network. Nevertheless, the manager should not distance him/herself entirely from conflict, for there may be benefits to be had from being a third party to an ongoing conflict. At a higher level of analysis, we show that identifying a negative tie and then becoming a third party can be beneficial. Whether the manager actively plays parties against one another or simply takes advantage of opportunities that those in conflict are unable to, conflict may also bring opportunities for those on the sidelines. Thus, the most successful managers must maintain a delicate balance in relation to conflict, surreptitiously capitalizing on others’ conflict, without being drawn into it directly.

Limitations: The setting in which this research was conducted was unique, which leads to questions of whether the results found here are readily generalizable to other organizational settings. “The Connection” in this denomination is organized around a strong central authority, yet each clergy member maintains a significant degree of autonomy. We believe that there are several organizational settings that are similar in structure, including franchise owners and insurance agents, and represent the clearest analogues to this study’s setting. Future research into the effects of the social ledger in other organizational settings is necessary to determine the generalizability of our findings. Another limitation is
that our quantitative network analysis only captures a snapshot of the organization at a single point in time. Thus, we are not able to examine how negative ties influence performance and support over time through longitudinal analysis (although we have used the qualitative analyses, in part, to gain an understanding of how these ties operate over time). It is possible that some negative ties may behave differently over time, and this remains a fruitful avenue for future research.

In conclusion, our study does not negate prior social capital or social network research, but taking a social ledger perspective has shown that understanding negative ties is important for predicting performance. By examining the social ledger in a multilevel manner, we have also shown that what is detrimental for those directly involved in negative relationships can produce benefits for those indirectly tied to those people. Only by moving beyond the social capital metaphor can we understand the mixed blessing associated with individuals' social ledgers in the workplace.
**Figure 1: Examples Of Third Parties (Node C) Can Benefit From Being Indirectly Related To Negative Ties.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Third party benefits by mediating parties in conflict</th>
<th>B: Third party benefits by capitalizing on untapped benefits</th>
<th>C: Third party benefits by brokering relationships to other parties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Diagram A" /></td>
<td><img src="" alt="Diagram B" /></td>
<td><img src="" alt="Diagram C" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance theory tenet</td>
<td>Affective centrality implication</td>
<td>Anticipated outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of friends are</td>
<td>A direct positive tie to a popular individual (one with many positive ties) increases one’s</td>
<td>Creates social benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of enemies are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enemies are enemies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemies of friends are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enemies are enemies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemies of enemies are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Variable Type</td>
<td>Variable Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Church Membership</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Number of members reported by a church in a given year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group Membership</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Number of members in all church sub-groups (e.g. education classes, support groups, gender- and age-specific groups, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change in Church Membership</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Year 1 Church Membership minus Year 0 Church Membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Change in Group Membership</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Year 1 Group Membership minus Year 0 Group Membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender</td>
<td>dichotomous</td>
<td>Whether respondent is male (1) or female (0).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Race</td>
<td>dichotomous</td>
<td>Whether respondent is minority (1) or white (0).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Direct Positive Ties</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Number of people who report a positive affective relationship with the respondent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Direct Negative Ties</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Number of people who report a negative affective relationship with the respondent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Third Party</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Number of people with whom they have a positive affective relationship who are in turn involved in a negative affective relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Affective Centrality</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>Measure of whether the people with whom they have a positive relationship are positively regarded by the rest of the network, and the people with whom they have a negative relationship are negatively regarded by the rest of the network (See Figure A).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Change Church Membership</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>70.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.945**</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.877**</td>
<td>.903**</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change Group Membership</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>.945**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.821**</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>.317*</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Race</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.298*</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.286*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Membership Year 0</td>
<td>482.80</td>
<td>766.40</td>
<td>.877**</td>
<td>.821**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Group Membership Year 0</td>
<td>275.72</td>
<td>508.55</td>
<td>.903**</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Direct Positive Ties</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.317*</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.298*</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.596**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Direct Negative Ties</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.736**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Third Party</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.736**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.612**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Affective Centrality</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.286*</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.596**</td>
<td>-.380**</td>
<td>-.612**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 59, * p<.05    ** p<.01
### Table 4: Results Of Regression Analyses On Church And Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Church Membership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
<td>-7.84</td>
<td>-8.13</td>
<td>-7.95</td>
<td>-20.44</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-14.06</td>
<td>-12.88</td>
<td>-10.06</td>
<td>-14.64</td>
<td>-14.74</td>
<td>-38.76**</td>
<td>-35.70*</td>
<td>-32.47*</td>
<td>-38.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>29.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Membership Y0</td>
<td>.081***</td>
<td>.081***</td>
<td>.081***</td>
<td>.084***</td>
<td>.084***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership Y0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.136***</td>
<td>.133***</td>
<td>.134***</td>
<td>.140***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Positive Ties</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Negative Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25.45+</td>
<td>-56.84**</td>
<td>-56.85**</td>
<td>-28.94+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14*</td>
<td>4.24+</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>58.84***</td>
<td>43.72***</td>
<td>37.34***</td>
<td>33.75***</td>
<td>28.33***</td>
<td>51.03***</td>
<td>39.65***</td>
<td>33.77***</td>
<td>31.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta F</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.40+</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.19+</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta R2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 59,  + p<.1   * p<.05  ** p<.01  ***p<.001
Appendix A

To demonstrate affective centrality, we consider an example from Bonacich and Lloyd (2004) in Figure A. Network 1 displays all of the nodes and their affective centrality scores in a network with no negative ties. Network 2 introduces a negative tie into the network by changing the relationship between nodes C and E from positive to negative and displays the new affective centrality scores that result from this change. The affective centrality for Node E is reduced substantially (from .74 to -.35), because Node E now has a negative relationship with the most popular node in the network. Node D also experiences a reduction in affective centrality (from .74 to .35), not because of any change in any of this node’s direct relationships, but because Node D has a positive relationship with Node E, who has now become the most unpopular node in the network. Thus, affective centrality captures one’s status in a network by considering how the members of a node’s social network are related, positively or negatively, to other nodes in the network, and, in turn, how those other nodes are related to the network’s members.

![Figure A: Affective Centrality in Networks](Source: Bonacich and Lloyd (2004))
APPENDIX B: QUALITATIVE PROTOCOL FOR PHASE 2 INTERVIEWS

1) How would you describe your positive relationships with other clergy members (number, strength, acquaintance, etc.)? Do these relationships influence your effectiveness as a minister (in terms of church growth or participation in programs)? How?

2) Are there ministers that you would say that you "dislike" or that you have a negative relationship with? Do you think that these relationships influence your effectiveness as a minister? How?

3) Do you have friends in the ministry that have had negative relationships with other clergy members? What sort of role have you played? Have these relationships affected you indirectly? Does your involvement with this relationship influence your performance as a minister in any way?

4) How would you describe the relationships between other ministers as a whole? Can you give me examples of how these wider relationships affect your ministry? Do they affect your performance as a minister in any way?
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