Congregational Rabbis, Self-Revelation as LGBTQ, and Religious Signaling: Trust and

Participation Among Congregants

Rabbi Jolan Shafir Lobb

Nina Moliver

## ABSTRACT

The increased social acceptance of LGBTQ individuals and behaviors has begun to conflict with

traditional Abrahamic proscriptions. According to signaling theory, religious communities codify

costly signals through rituals and ritual observances. We investigated levels of congregational

trust and participation in a sample of 324 individuals who attended congregations where rabbis

had self-revealed as LBGTQ. All major Jewish denominations were included. Intrinsic

religiosity was measured as a moderator. No significant differences were found in the level of

intrinsic religiosity based on the LGBTQ status of the rabbi. The level of intrinsic religiosity did

not alter the relationship between the status of the rabbi and the level of trust or participation

among congregants. Religious signaling is suggested as a special category of signaling.

Congregational Rabbis, Self-Revelation as LGBTQ, and Religious Signaling: Trust and

Participation among Congregants

Since the 1970s, people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning

(LGBTQ) have gained increasing levels of legal recognition and social acceptance in American

society (Garvey & Drezner, 2016). Medical professionals have determined that same-sex

orientation and transgender identity are not illnesses or aberrations but part of a spectrum of

normal human variation (Linley et al., 2016). This shift in social attitudes, however, has

presented new challenges for religious communities following the Abrahamic faith traditions of

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, to which an overwhelming majority of the world's religious

population collectively adheres (Liboro & Walsh, 2015; Seidler, 2016). Challenges arise

because the traditional texts of these faith traditions are typically interpreted to include varying

levels of prohibition against intimate same-sex relationships and transgender identity (Fischer,

1989; Kissil & Itzhaky, 2015). These challenges sometimes involve situations in which

members of the clergy become known to members of their congregation as LGBTQ (Creed,

Dejordy, & Lok, 2010).

The honesty of a leader and the willingness to take risks were believed to be essential in

developing willingness in others to place trust in the leader (Xiong, Lin, Li, & Wang, 2016).

Support for this speculation was found in a subsequent study of trust and organizational

citizenship behavior (OCB; Bowring, 2017). OCB refers to behavior performed toward an

organization or toward the individuals within that organization. OCB can be viewed as a

measure of trust and positive affect toward a leader, in that OCB reflects leadership effectiveness

(Williams & Anderson, 1991). Bowring (2017) found that when a leader self-revealed as

LGBTQ in a secular workplace, trust and OCB among followers were enhanced.

A religious setting may present a different context for examining the findings by Bowring (2017) and the claims by Xiong et al. (2016) because of the long-term opposition of religious texts and authorities to LGBTQ behaviors.  In a secular context, the sexual orientation or gender identity of a leader is less likely to be an issue because there is no agreed-upon religious doctrine to guide individuals toward their moral outlook.  In religious communities, however, religious doctrine may create obstacles to the full acceptance of a LGBTQ leader.

The role of a rabbi or minister typically requires considerable trust on the part of congregants and staff members (Anteby & Anderson, 2014; Harrison & Michelson, 2015).  In an investigation of the level of trust held toward individuals with different levels of religious behaviors (Hall, Cohen, Meyer, Varley, & Brewer, 2015), the level of trust was found to increase when the targeted individual adhered faithfully to standard religious requirements.  However, when the targeted individual violated religiously held proscriptions, such as when Catholics ate meat during Lent or Muslims ate pork at social gatherings, the extent of trust held by the participants declined.  This finding held true whether or not the targeted individual belonged to the same religious tradition as the participants did.

Researchers have not found a reliable correspondence between denominational membership and the level of religiosity (Beagan & Hattie, 2015; Simpson, Piazza, & Rios, 2016).  Within Jewish organizations, there is a wide range of attitudes toward individuals expressing LGBTQ orientations or identities (Weisskirch, Kim, Schwartz, & Whitbourne, 2016).  The Reform Jewish movement has publicly expressed support and endorsement of LGBTQ rabbis, and the Conservative Jewish movement has begun to accept openly LGBTQ candidates as rabbinical students (Abes, 2011).  Support for same-sex marriage among religious leaders may be instrumental in shifting attitudes within the faith community (Harrison & Michelson, 2015).

Among Orthodox Jews, however, considerable value is placed on heterosexual marriage and children, especially for Orthodox rabbis (Kissil & Itzhaky, 2015). There is therefore great social risk in self-revealing as LGBTQ in Orthodox congregations. Prohibitions against homosexual behavior are believed in the Orthodox community to be a divine commandment and not subject to human authority or choice (Sharabi, 2014). Homosexual behavior itself is perceived as a grave infraction of divine law, stemming from a perceived prohibition in Leviticus 18:22 understood as describing anal intercourse between males with a term customarily translated as "abomination."

White (1995) and Greenberg (2004) were two clergy members committed to fundamentalist, traditional branches of their faith traditions. Both clergy members self-revealed as gay after becoming ordained. Both authored books describing their tortured experiences of admitting to themselves and others that their nature as LGBTQ individuals could not be changed. According to White (1995), an evangelical Protestant minister ostracized from his religious community after self-revealing as gay: "Our gay Christian brothers and sisters are suffering in silence, leaving the church in anger and disappointment, and even taking their own lives" (p. 306).

With the growing social acceptance of LGBTQ behaviors in American society, religious organizations that perpetuate hostility and mistrust toward clergy members who have self-revealed as LGBTQ may in fact be putting their own religious communities at risk (Ariel, 2007). The risks may entail organizational ruptures and a large loss of membership, not only from LGBTQ individuals but also from allies who support increased diversity and acceptance within the congregation (Garvey & Drezner, 2016; Yanay-Ventura & Yanay, 2016). According to Greenberg (2004), an Orthodox rabbi: "For most gay Jews and many others as well, gayness is

not up for reconsideration.… For many Jews homosexuality is not on the line; Judaism is. The challenge of gay inclusion tests any tradition's capacity to engage with diversity" (pp. 30-31). Thus, a failure to integrate LGBTQ Jews fully into synagogue life may drain the community not only of members but also of vitality in the tradition itself. Conversely, however, members adhering to traditional interpretations of religious texts may lose trust in clergy members or in congregations that accept LGBTQ behaviors. Understanding the implications of LGBTQ self-revelation among clergy members may therefore be important for the survival of entire religious denominations (Ariel, 2007; Greenberg, 2004).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Bowring, 2017) can be viewed as a measure of trust and positive affect toward a leader, in that OCB reflects leadership effectiveness (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Bowring (2017) found that when a leader self-revealed as LGBTQ in a secular workplace, trust and OCB among followers were enhanced. The findings were helpful but did not account for the role of religiosity in perceptions of the personal risk behavior on the part of the leader.

**Signaling theory.** A signal is an action, typically costly, that reveals information. The theory of how these signals are sent, received, and understood is the domain of signaling theory (Timming & Perrett, 2016). There is a wide range in the types of signals and the media for these signals used and understood in everyday activity. When the information conveyed is accurate, whether useful or not, it is considered honest, but when the information contributes to a deception, it is considered dishonest. Sometimes, the cost of the signal is part of demonstrating the value of the signal being sent, or perhaps the value of the individual sending the signal, such as elegant plumage on male birds during courtship rituals (Doré & Ochsner, 2015; Power, 2017).

Religion holds a special place in signaling theory partly because religion can increase the confidence of both senders and receivers of signals that the meaning of the signal will be properly interpreted (Singh & Chatterjee, 2017). Being a member of a religious community serves to enhance the likelihood of accurate signal transmission because the community shares a common core of experiences and beliefs. Religious communities also codify some costly signals through rituals and ritual observances (Landau, Kay, & Whitson, 2015). At the same time, those signal senders who perform these ritual behaviors, such as Sabbath observance and dietary observances, are perceived as also promoting the values of the group related to self-esteem (Timming & Perrett, 2016).

Signaling theory may explain why being openly self-identified as LGBTQ can increase trust in an organization. The self-revelation can be seen as an honest signal of trustworthiness and even leadership (Bowring, 2017; Hall et al., 2015). The question investigated for the current study was whether religiosity and the acceptance of traditional understandings of the teachings of scriptures overrode the predictions from signaling theory, whereby self-revelation as LGBTQ might increase trust, behaviors supportive of the religious community, and attendance at religious services. The current study expands on a special category of signaling, namely *religious signaling* (Lobb, 2020).

**Methods**

The purpose of this study was to compare trust in the rabbi, community supportive behavior (CSB), and intrinsic religiosity based on clergy LGBTQ status. The LGBTQ status of a clergy member referred to whether the clergy member has self-revealed as LGBTQ or was believed to be heterosexual. Intrinsic religiosity was measured as a possible moderator of the relationship of clergy LGBTQ status to trust and CSB. The level of intrinsic Jewish religiosity

was measured on the Jewish Religiosity Scale (JRS; Pirutinsky et al., 2009).  Rather than assuming a correspondence between the level of religiosity and denominational membership, researchers have found a need to measure the level of religiosity more directly (Simpson, Piazza, & Rios, 2016).  CSB, in this study, was understood to refer to OCB as applied to a religious congregation.

The participants consisted of an "opt-in" sample of 324 individuals participating in congregations affiliated with all major Jewish denominations.  Recruitment took place through the Internet and snowball sampling.  Congregations were identified from the denominational information provided on the congregational website.  The LGBTQ status of the rabbi was determined based on information on the website of the congregation.  For each denomination, two categories of congregations were identified: congregations in which the rabbi had self-revealed as LGBTQ (including 48 individuals) and congregations in which the rabbi was believed to be heterosexual (including 276 individuals).

The following research questions were presented:

**Research Question 1.**  Is there a significant difference in the level of intrinsic religiosity for members of a Jewish congregation based on the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi?

**Research Question 2.**  Does the level of intrinsic religiosity moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of trust in the rabbi held by members of a Jewish congregation?

**Research Question 3.**  Does the level of intrinsic religiosity moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of CSB held by members of a Jewish congregation?

The participants self-identified as attending Jewish congregations affiliated according to denomination. Respondents were told that they would be asked to complete a survey of congregational participation and trust as pertaining to rabbis. Although the LGBTQ status of the rabbi was identified from the congregational website, participants were also asked about the sexual orientation and gender identity of the rabbi in the survey as part of demographic information. Permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Northcentral University before recruiting participants.

Three instruments were used: the Jewish Religiosity Scale (JRS; Pirutinsky et al., 2009; see Appendix A), the Trust in Leadership scale (TILS; Dirks, 2000; see Appendix B), and the Conscientiousness subscale of the OCB scale (OCBS; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), adapted for this study to measure behaviors within a religious context (see Appendix C). The entire questionnaire took less than 20 minutes to complete.

The JRS was designed to measure the extent of intrinsic Jewish religiosity. The TILS was designed to measure the extent of trust that followers experienced in their leaders. The scale was modified to use Jewish terminology where appropriate, such as substituting the term rabbi for the term leader. The Conscientiousness subscale of the OCBS was adapted for this study to measure CSB, with the measures modified to represent behaviors that support and build a religious congregation rather than a secular or business organization.

Participation was anonymous and voluntary. Congregants were shown a letter of informed consent explaining the study and informing them of their rights, including anonymous participation, complete anonymity of data, the right to decline to participate without consequence or harm, the right to refuse to answer any question, and the right to withdraw from the study at any time. Participants completed the informed consent form and then completed a survey online

accessed through a link provided using Survey Monkey. Participants were given 2 weeks to complete their questionnaires.

After data collection, the electronic data were downloaded from Survey Monkey to SPSS (Version 22) statistical software. The data were checked for accuracy, outliers, and the assumptions needed to conduct parametric statistics.

**Results**

There were 298 congregations identified. Survey data were collected between August 21 and September 16, 2018. Questions were asked about demographics, religiosity, leadership trust, and CSB. The data file was cleaned of unusable records, including omission of the name of the congregation attended by the participant. The cleaned sample consisted of 324 participants. Of these participants, 48 belonged to congregations with a clergy member who had self-revealed as LGBTQ (Revealed group), as determined by the website of the congregation or other publicly available information. The remaining 276 participants (controls) belonged to congregations with no evidence that the rabbi had self-revealed as LGBTQ.

In the Revealed group, 70.8% of the participants were female. Among controls, 67.4% were female. In both groups, almost two thirds of the participants were over 50 years old, with the large majority of the 50+ group over 60 years old. No participants in the Revealed group attended Orthodox synagogues, and only three (6.3%) attended Conservative synagogues. However, 42 controls (15.2%) attended Orthodox synagogues, and 122 (44.2%) attended Conservative synagogues. In the Revealed group, 24 participants (50%) attended Reform synagogues. Table 1 shows the demographic data according to the LGBTQ status of the rabbi. Table 2 shows the distribution of the gender of all controls, according to the denomination of the congregation.

**Variable distributions.** The mean level of intrinsic Jewish religiosity was 4.83 (*SD* = 1.24), median = 5.00. The mean level of trust in leadership was 5.96 (*SD* = 1.12), median = 6.33. The mean level of CSB was 5.26 (*SD* = 0.93), median = 5.40. Table 3 displays the distribution of the variables for all participants.

Following are the results for the three research questions presented in this study. For all research questions, an alpha level of .05 was used to test for significance.

**Research Question 1.** Is there a significant difference in the level of intrinsic religiosity for members of a Jewish congregation based on the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi?

Because the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi is a dichotomous variable and intrinsic religiosity was normally distributed, an independent-samples *t* test was used to answer the research question. Levene's test showed that equal variances could be assumed, $F(322) = 0.54$, $p = .46$. For the Revealed group, intrinsic religiosity had a mean value of 4.59 (*SD* = 1.15, *N* = 48). For controls, intrinsic religiosity had a mean value of 4.87 (*SD* = 1.25, *N* = 276). The difference between the means was not significant, $t(322) = -1.45$, $p = .15$. The null hypothesis was not rejected. There was not a significant difference in the level of intrinsic religiosity for members of a Jewish congregation based on the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi.

**Research Question 2.** Does the level of intrinsic religiosity moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of trust in the rabbi held by members of a Jewish congregation?

A moderating variable is a variable that alters the strength or the direction of a relationship between two other variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Moderation is generally measured with a multiple linear regression, with the interaction between two predictor variables used as the third predictor variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

The statistical assumptions for multiple linear regression include normal distribution of the residuals, linearity, equality of variances, and an absence of outliers and multicollinearity. These assumptions were not met for Research Question 2, as demonstrated by a histogram and a P-P plot. The histogram showed a strong negative skew and a strong kurtosis. The minimum value of 1.44 was an outlier, defined as more than three standard deviations from the mean value of 5.97 ($SD = 1.27$).

To answer the research question, the method was followed as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986). Two subgroups were created based on the level of religiosity. The religiosity subgroups were defined by using the median value of 5.00 on the JRS Likert-type scale as a cutoff point. For the low-religiosity subgroup, there were 28 records in the Revealed group and 130 controls, and the highest value on the Likert-type scale was 4.91 ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.90$). For the high-religiosity subgroup, there were 20 records in the Revealed group and 146 controls, and values ranged from 5.00 to 7 ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.54$).

Because the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi is a dichotomous variable and the outcome variable of trust in the rabbi, as measured by the TILS, was not normally distributed, a Mann-Whitney $U$ test was used to answer the research question. Table 4 shows the results for the Mann-Whitney $U$ test for each group.

The mean score for trust in the rabbi in cases with low religiosity was 5.89 ($SD = 1.13$), and the mean score for trust in the rabbi in cases with high religiosity was 6.02 ($SD = 1.11$). The difference in trust in the rabbi between the Revealed group and controls for the low-religiosity subgroup was not significant, Mann-Whitney $U$ (1, $N = 158$) = 1464.0, Wilcoxon $W = 9979.0$, $Z = -1.62$, $p = .10$. The difference in trust in the rabbi between the two groups for the high-

religiosity subgroup was not significant, Mann-Whitney $U$ (1, $N$ = 166) = 1326.0, Wilcoxon $W$ = 12057.0, $Z$ = -0.67, $p$ = .51.

For both low and high religiosity, there was no significant difference in the level of trust in the rabbi based on the LGBTQ status of the rabbi. Thus, according to this analysis, the level of religiosity did not have a strong effect on the strength and direction of trust in the rabbi based on whether the rabbi was self-revealed as LGBTQ or was presumed heterosexual. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The level of intrinsic religiosity did not moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of trust in the rabbi held by members of a Jewish congregation.

**Research Question 3.** Does the level of intrinsic religiosity moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of CSB held by members of a Jewish congregation?

The statistical assumptions for a multiple linear regression were met for Research Question 3. However, for consistency with Research Question 2, the comparison method, as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986), was used to test for moderation. The religiosity subgroups were defined as explained for Research Question 2.

Because the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi is a dichotomous variable and the outcome variable of CSB was normally distributed, independent-samples $t$ tests were used to answer the research question. The mean score for CSB in cases with low religiosity was 5.07 ($SD$ = 0.94), and the mean score for CSB in cases with high religiosity was 5.45 ($SD$ = 0.88). Table 5 shows the results for the comparison between the Revealed group and controls for the low-religiosity and high-religiosity subgroups.

Levene's test for equality of variances showed that equal variances could be assumed for both the low-religiosity group ($F = 0.37$, $p = .55$) and the high-religiosity group ($F = 2.94$, $p = .09$). The difference in CSB between the Revealed group and controls for the low-religiosity subgroup was not significant, $t(156) = -1.10$, $p = .28$. The difference in community supportive behavior between the Revealed group and controls for the high-religiosity subgroup was also not significant, $t(163) = -0.81$, $p = .42$. For both low religiosity and high religiosity subgroups, there was no significant difference in the level of CSB based on the LGBTQ status of the rabbi. Thus, according to this analysis, the level of religiosity did not have a strong effect on the strength and direction of CSB based on whether the rabbi was self-revealed as LGBTQ or was presumed heterosexual. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The level of intrinsic religiosity did not moderate the relationship between the LGBTQ status of the congregational rabbi and the level of CSB held by members of a Jewish congregation.

**Discussion**

A religious community shares a common core of experiences and beliefs. Therefore, being a member of a religious community enhances the likelihood that a signal sent by an individual will be understood accurately (Lobb, 2020). Religious communities also codify some costly signals through rituals and ritual observances (Landau et al., 2015). At the same time, those signal senders who perform these ritual behaviors, such as Sabbath observance and dietary observances, are perceived as promoting the values of the group related to self-esteem (Timming & Perrett, 2016).

Signaling theory may explain why being openly self-identified as LGBTQ can increase trust in an organization. The openness involved in revealing one's sexual orientation takes courage, which followers may regard as a signal of trustworthy leadership. In the current study,

a special category of signaling, namely *religious signaling*, was investigated. A rabbi who has self-revealed as LGBTQ sends signals on two levels. On one level, self-revelation as LGBTQ informs people that the clergy member is honest about who he or she is, thereby signaling trustworthiness as a credential for leadership (Bowring, 2017; Hall et al., 2015). On another level, however, as part of being a rabbi, the signal is sent that the rabbi is fully committed to the religious tradition (Lobb, 2020). Thus, a departure from traditional norms in terms of LGBTQ self-revelation is accompanied by a commitment to a full range of religious behaviors as expected by the denomination that the rabbi represents as a member of the clergy. If identifying as LGBTQ is perceived as a departure from the teachings of the faith, it nevertheless may be accompanied by faithful adherence to a wide range of other traditional teachings. In that case, LGBTQ identification may be taken more seriously as something that needs respect and attention in a religious context.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

This study had several limitations. Because participation was voluntary, the results may have been limited by nonresponse bias, wherein individuals who completed the questionnaire may have had different views from those of individuals who declined participation. Additionally, the study was limited by the lack of in-depth exploration of the reasoning behind the answers offered by participants. The study was limited by the decision to include only Jewish congregations and not congregations of other Abrahamic faiths. Participation was skewed in favor of older participants, particularly participants above 60 years old. Random sampling was not possible in this kind of survey.

An important limitation of this study was the lack of Orthodox congregations with openly LGBTQ rabbis. This limitation was an inevitable fact rooted in the refusal of the Orthodox

movement to allow openly LGBTQ rabbis to serve.  Should an Orthodox rabbi self-reveal as LGBTQ, either the individual would be required to resign as rabbi or the congregation would lose its Orthodox affiliation.  As a result of this fact of Jewish life, it was not possible to compare trust in the rabbi and CSB between the groups for members of Orthodox congregations.  Members of Orthodox congregations constituted 15% of all respondents and belonged entirely to the congregations where the rabbi was presumed heterosexual.  For future studies, statistical adjustments should be made to account for this limitation.

Follow-up research to the current study could include a replication of the research questions but with the inclusion of the gender of the rabbi as a control variable.  Certainly the differences in religiosity between liberal members and more traditional members is an area of interest for future studies.  A qualitative study on the dynamics within both groups of congregations (congregations with openly revealed LGBTQ rabbis and congregations where the rabbis are presumed heterosexual) may offer some deeper understanding of the issues covered in this study.

The topics covered in this study are complex and subtle, and the results were not given to simple interpretation.  For that reason, the current study should be regarded as primarily a pilot study indicating the need for future research.  Qualitative research on the shifting dynamics in religiosity and its relationship to identity, trust, and signaling theory is needed to examine these constructs with greater depth, including their relationship to religious signaling.  Researchers will need to understand how these constructs relate to the congregational dynamics.

Finally, it is recommended that future researchers conduct similar studies in congregations of other religions.  The Jewish religion has its own distinct understanding of religiosity and its own distinct methods for interpreting and rereading ancient texts.  These

features of Judaism may dispose congregants to be more open to LGBTQ self-revelation on the part of the leader than congregants strongly adhering to tradition might be in other religions.

**Conclusion**

In this study, no significant differences were found between congregations whose rabbi had self-revealed as LGBTQ and congregations whose rabbi was presumed heterosexual. The simplest and most straightforward interpretation of this finding is that the LGBTQ status of the rabbi is of little concern to congregants throughout the North American Jewish community. However, a closer inspection of the data will undoubtedly reveal innumerable nuances that will make easy conclusions impossible. For a congregational rabbi, self-revelation as LGBTQ may need to be understood as a religious signal requiring further exploration. It will be important to look at religious service attendance, degree of observance within the home, other aspects of congregational participation, and personal commitment to following Jewish law before meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

References

Abes, E. S. (2011). Exploring the relationship between sexual orientation and religious identities for Jewish lesbian college students. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, *15*(2), 205-225. doi:10.1080/10894160.2010.510773

Anteby, M., & Anderson, C. (2014). The shifting landscape of LGBT organizational research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *34,* 3-25. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2014.08.001

Ariel, Y. (2007). Gay, Orthodox, and trembling: The rise of Jewish Orthodox gay consciousness, 1970s-2000. *Journal of Homosexuality, 52,* 91-109. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v52n03_05

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173-1182. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

Beagan, B. L., & Hattie, B. (2015). Religion, spirituality, and LGBTQ identity integration. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *9*(2), 92-104. doi:10.1080/15538605.2015.1029204

Bowring, M. A. (2017). Can I trust you? Exploring the ways in which sexual orientation disclosure affects the relationship between LGB leaders and their followers. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.)*, *34*(2), 170-181. doi:10.1002/cjas.1435

Creed, W. D., Dejordy, R., & Lok, J. (2010). Being the change: Resolving institutional contradiction through identity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(6), 1336-1364. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2010.57318357

Dirks, K. T., (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (2000), 1004-1012. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.1004

Doré, B.P., & Ochsner, K.N. (2015). Social cognitive neuroscience: A review of core systems. *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology 1,* 693-720. doi:10.1037/14341-022

Fischer, C. B. (1989). A bonding of choice: Values and identity among lesbian and gay religious leaders. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *18*(3/4), 145-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v18n03_08

Garvey, J. C., & Drezner, N. D. (2016). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer alumni financial giving to and participation with undergraduate alma maters. *College Student Affairs Journal, 34*(2), 29-42. doi: 10.1353/csj.2016.0009

Greenberg, S. (2004). *Wrestling with God & men: Homosexuality in the Jewish tradition.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hall, D. L., Cohen, A. B., Meyer, K. K., Varley, A. H., & Brewer, G. A. (2015). Costly signaling increases trust, even across religious affiliations. *Psychological Science*, *26*(9), 1368-1376. doi:10.1177/0956797615576473

Harrison, B. F., & Michelson, M. R. (2015). God and marriage: The impact of religious identity priming on attitudes toward same-sex marriage. *Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *96*(5), 1411-1423. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12169

Kissil, K., & Itzhaky, H. (2015). Experiences of the Orthodox community among Orthodox Jewish gay men. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *27*(3), 371. doi:10.1080/10538720.2015.1051686

Landau, M. J., Kay, A. C., & Whitson, J. A. (2015). Compensatory control and the appeal of a structured world. *Psychological Bulletin 141*(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038703

Liboro, R., & Walsh, R. (2015). Understanding the irony: Canadian gay men living with HIV/AIDS, their Catholic devotion, and greater well-being. *Journal of Religion & Health, 55*, 650–670. doi:10.1007/s10943-015-0087-5

Linley, L., An, Q., Song, R., Valverde, E., Oster, A. M., Qian, X., & Hernandez, A. L. (2016). HIV testing experience before HIV diagnosis among men who have sex with men -- 21 jurisdictions, United States, 2007-2013. *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report, 65*, 999–1003. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6537a3

Lobb, J.S. (2020). Member trust and self-revelation by rabbis as LGBTQ. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR), 51*(1), 133-148. Retrieved from https://www.gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/11045

Pirutinsky S., Rosmarin D. H., Pargament, K. I., Midlarsky, E., Pirutinsky, S., Rosmarin, D. H., … Midlarsky, E. (2009). Does negative religious coping accompany, precede, or follow depression among Orthodox Jews? *Journal of Affective Disorders, 132*, 401–405. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.03.015

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(2), 107-142. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

Power, E. A. (2017). Discerning devotion: Testing the signaling theory of religion. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 38*, 82-91. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.07.003

Sharabi, A. (2014). Deep healing: ritual healing in the teshuvah movement. *Anthropology & Medicine*, *21*(3), 277-289. doi:10.1080/13648470.2014.907023

Simpson, A., Piazza, J., & Rios, K. (2016). Belief in divine moral authority: Validation of a shortened scale with implications for social attitudes and moral cognition. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *94,* 256-265. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.032

Singh, D., & Chatterjee, G. (2017). The evolution of religious belief in humans: a brief review with a focus on cognition. *Journal of Genetics*, *96*(3), 517-524. doi:10.1007/s12041-017-0794-7

Timming, A. R., & Perrett, D. (2016). Trust and mixed signals: A study of religion, tattoos and cognitive dissonance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *97,* 234-238. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.067

Weisskirch, R. S., Kim, S. Y., Schwartz, S. J., & Whitbourne, S. K. (2016). The complexity of ethnic identity among Jewish American emerging adults. *Identity*, *16*(3), 127. doi:10.1080/15283488.2016.1190724

White, M. (1995). *Stranger at the gate: To be gay and Christian in America.* New York, NY: Penguin.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305

Xiong, K., Lin, W., Li, J. C., & Wang, L. (2016). Employee trust in supervisors and affective commitment: The moderating role of authentic leadership. *Psychological Reports*, *118*(3), 829-848. doi:10.1177/0033294116644370

Yanay-Ventura, G., & Yanay, N. (2016). Unhyphenated Jewish religious feminism. *Women's Studies International Forum, 55*, 18–25. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2016.01.001

Table 1

*Distribution of Participants, by Rabbi Status*

| Characteristic | LGBTQ ($n = 48$) | Controls ($n = 276$) |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 10 (20.8%) | 87 (31.5%) |
| Female | 34 (70.8%) | 186 (67.4%) |
| Other | 4 (8.3%) | 3 (1.1%) |
| Age | | |
| 18 to 30 | 1 (2.1%) | 20 (7.2%) |
| 31 to 40 | 7 (14.6%) | 26 (9.4%) |
| 41 to 50 | 7 (14.6%) | 50 (18.1%) |
| 51 to 60 | 9 (18.8%) | 63 (22.8%) |
| Over 60 | 23 (47.9%) | 116 (42.0%) |
| Type of congregation | | |
| Orthodox | 0 (0.0%) | 42 (15.2%) |
| Conservative | 3 (6.3%) | 122 (44.2%) |
| Reform | 24 (50.0%) | 79 (28.6%) |
| Reconstructionist | 2 (4.2%) | 13 (4.7%) |
| Humanist or other | 1 (2.1%) | 4 (1.4%) |
| Renewal | 7 (14.6%) | 4 (1.4%) |
| Independent | 11 (22.9%) | 12 (4.3%) |

*Note.* $N = 324$.

Table 2

*Distribution by Denomination and Participant Gender, Controls*

| Denomination | Male ($N = 87$, 31.5%) | Female ($N = 186$, 67.4%) | Other ($N = 3$, 1.1%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Orthodox | 15 (5.4%) | 27 (9.8%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Conservative | 39 (14.1%) | 82 (29.7%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Reform | 19 (6.9%) | 59 (21.4%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| Reconstructionist | 6 (2.2%) | 7 ,(2.5%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Humanist or other | 1 (0.4%) | 2 (0.7%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Renewal | 3 (1.1%) | 1 (0.4%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Independent | 3 (1.1%) | 8 (2.9%) | 1 (0.4%) |

*Note.* $N = 276$.

Table **3**

*Distributions of Jewish Religiosity, Trust in Leadership, and Community Supportive Behavior,*

*Original Full Sample*

| Variable | *N* | *M* | *SD* | Med. | Skew (*SE*) | Kurtosis (*SE*) | Min. | Max. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intrinsic religiosity | 324 | 4.83 | 1.24 | 5.00 | -0.557 (0.14) | -0.22 (0.27) | 1.18 | 7.00 |
| Trust in leadership | 324 | 5.96 | 1.12 | 6.33 | -1.57 (0.14) | 2.52 (0.27) | 1.33 | 7.00 |
| Community supportive behavior | 323 | 5.26 | 0.93 | 5.40 | 0.48 (0.14) | -0.18 (0.27) | 2.40 | 7.00 |

*Note.* Med. = median; *SE* = standard error; Min. = minimum; Max. = maximum.

Table 4

*Mann-Whitney U Tests, Trust in the Rabbi According to LGBTQ Status and Level of Religiosity*

| | | LGBTQ (*n* = 48) | | | | Controls (*n* = 276) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level of Religiosity | *N* | *M* (*SD*) | Mean rank | Sum of ranks | *N* | *M* (*SD*) | Mean rank | Sum of ranks |
| Low (*n*= 158) | 28 | 6.21 (0.92) | 92.21 | 2582.0 | 130 | 5.83 (1.17) | 76.76 | 9979.0 |
| High (*n* = 166) | 20 | 6.19 (1.22) | 90.20 | 1804.0 | 146 | 5.99 (1.10) | 82.58 | 12057.0 |

*Note. N* = 324.

Table 5

*Independent-Samples T Tests Comparing Community Supportive Behavior Between LGBTQ*

*Revealed Group and Controls, by Level of Religiosity*

| Level of Religiosity | *M (SD)* | *t* | *df* | Mean difference | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low (*n*= 158) | 5.07 (0.94) | -1.10 | 156 | -0.22 | .28 |
| High (*n* = 165) | 5.45 (0.88) | -0.81 | 163 | -0.17 | .42 |

*Note. N* = 323.

Appendix A: Jewish Religiosity Scale

These 11 items were rated using a 7-point Likert-type scale, with values ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

1. My religion influences everything I do.
2. I believe that the Torah was given to Moshe by G-d at Sinai.
3. I try to observe halacha [religious law] as carefully as possible.
4. I believe G-d directs and controls the world.
5. My religious observance is primarily out of social expectation. [reverse-scored]
6. I believe G-d loves all of G-d's creations.
7. I feel that G-d is always accessible to me.
8. I feel G-d listens to my prayers.
9. I feel Divine intervention (hashgacha) within my life.
10. I believe in G-d.
11. I say Brochos/Brachot [blessings] with Kavaana [devotion].

Appendix B: Trust in Leadership Scale

These eight items were rated using a 7-point Likert-type scale, with values ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

1. Most team members trust and respect the rabbi.
2. I can talk freely to the coach about difficulties I am having in the congregation and know that they will want to listen.
3. If I shared my problems with the rabbi, I know they would respond constructively and caringly.
4. I have a sharing relationship with the rabbi. I can freely share my ideas, feelings, and hopes with the rabbi.
5. I would feel a sense of loss if the rabbi left to take a position elsewhere.
6. The rabbi approaches their job with professionalism and dedication.
7. Given the rabbi's past performance, I see no reason to doubt the rabbi's competence.
8. I can rely on the rabbi not to make my participation (as a member) more difficult by poor advice.
9. Other rabbis consider my rabbi to be trustworthy.

Appendix C: Conscientiousness Subscale of the OCB Scale

These 25 items were rated using a 7-point Likert-type scale, with values ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Conscientiousness is measured with items 3, 18, 21, 22, and 24.

1. I help others who have heavy workloads
2. I am the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs greasing
3. I believe in always giving an honest day's work when I help the congregation
4. I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters
5. I try to avoid creating problems for other members or staff
6. I keep abreast of changes in the congregation
7. I tend to make "mountains out of molehills"
8. I consider the impact of my actions on other members or staff
9. I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important
10. I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me
11. I attend functions that are not required, but help the congregation image
12. I read and keep up with congregation announcements, memos, and so on
13. I help others who have been absent
14. I do not abuse the rights of others
15. I willingly help others who have congregation related problems
16. I always focus on what's wrong, rather than focusing on the positive
17. I take steps to prevent problems with other members or staff
18a. My attendance at services is above the norm
18b. My attendance at congregation events is above the norm
19. I always find fault with what the congregation is doing
20. I am mindful of how my behavior affects other members or staff
21. I do not take extra breaks when working or volunteering
22. I obey congregation rules and regulations even when no one is watching
23. I help orient new people even though it is not required
24. I am one of the most conscientiousness people in this organization