



Work Outcome Preferences of Muslim and Jewish Managers in Israel: Analyzing the Differences According to the Individualism-collectivism Model

Moshe Sharabi* Ilan Shdema* Oriana Abboud-Armaly*

*Department of MA Studies in Organizational Development and Consulting, Yezreel Valley Academic College, D.N. Emek Yezreel, Israel.

Abstract

While there is an increasing number of Muslim managers in Western countries, to the best of our knowledge no study has compared their work values to those of managers of other religions. The present study compares work outcome preferences (WOPs) of Muslim and Jewish managers in Israel, a Western country where Muslims constitute a substantial but marginalized minority. The methodology involves questionnaires administrated to 100 Muslim and 253 Jewish managers. The findings indicate significant differences between Muslim and Jewish managers across all work outcome preferences examined. While both groups view income as the most important value, Muslims have emphasized, in addition, serving society and status and prestige, whereas among Jews interest and satisfaction and interpersonal connections are more highly valued. The value differences between the two ethno-religious groups can be explained mainly by cultural differences – individualism vs. collectivism. Implications are discussed in the context of labor market integration of minorities.

Keywords: Work Outcome Preferences (WOPs), Managers, Muslims, Jews, Culture, Israel.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Western economies are marked by increased diversity, with minority groups typically holding low-profile positions. Gradually, however, individuals within these groups gain access to managerial positions. The present study addresses the work values and outcomes of Muslim managers, as their share in such positions is increasing over time, and awareness of intercultural differences is important for organizations' performance. Despite the obvious importance of this issue, very few studies have compared the work values and ethics of Muslim and non-Muslim managers. For example, Arslan (2000) compared British and Turkish managers and found that the latter (who are predominantly Muslims) have higher Protestant work ethics than the former (who are mainly Christians). In an additional study, Arslan (2001) uncovered that Protestant British and Catholic Irish managers had a lower tendency to demand work and a higher orientation to leisure compared to Turkish Muslim managers. However, these studies, as well as others in Western countries, have not compared the work ethics of Muslim and non-Muslim managers in the same country; such a comparison is important because it relates to the same economy and labor market.

Jewish and Muslim managers in Israel differ not only in their religion but also in their culture and daily life practices. Better understanding the work outcome preferences (WOPs) of managers from these two ethno-religious groups is important, as many multinational corporations have recently invested in Israeli technology and opened subsidiaries in Israel (e.g., Motorola, Intel, IBM, Google, Microsoft, and Facebook), and they employ Muslims in increasing numbers.

Moreover, there is a growing number of immigrants from Islamic to Western countries, especially in the EU, as well as Israeli Jews immigrating mainly to North America and EU countries. Moreover, over the past decades, tens of millions of Muslims from Morocco, Turkey, Pakistan, and

other countries have settled in Europe as migrant workers, most recently joined by millions of refugees from Syria (Garcia-Zamor, 2017). These Muslim populations integrate into the host countries' labor markets, with some promoted to managerial levels (Cheung, 2014; Gabrielli & Impicciatore, 2022).

The Israeli case is relevant in this regard because, similarly to other Western countries, most Muslims comprise a distinct minority ethnic group characterized by lower socioeconomic status and subjected to political and economic marginalization. Their religious identity is prominent and related to or at least indicative of other marginalized identities, namely Arab and Palestinian (Amara & Schnell, 2004; Shdema et al., 2021). Consequently, they form a specific political ethno- class minority in Israel.

Modern Western organizations employ workers from different ethnicities and religions and ought to be sensitive to this diversity (e.g., Wrench, 2016). This multiplicity goes beyond religious customs and involves differences in work values (e.g., Parboteeah et al., 2009; Schwartz, 2013; Sharabi, 2012). Aside from diversity in holidays, food, clothing, and preferences among managers from those ethnoreligious groups, they also differ in their work values and ethics (e.g., Parboteeah et al., 2009; Wrench, 2016).

This unique study attempts to reveal the WOPs of Jewish and Muslim managers raised in different cultures. While Jewish-Israeli society is closer to the individualistic pole of the spectrum, Muslim society in Israel leans closer to the collectivistic pole (Kaufman et al., 2012; Peleg & Messerschmidt-Grandi, 2019). The study will examine the impact of individualistic vs. collectivistic culture on the importance of valued work outcomes among these managers, shedding light on the ability of each culture to shape and modify work-related values. Furthermore, since there are demographic differences between Jewish and Muslim managers (e.g., educational level, residential area, and religiosity), the study will examine their influence on WOPs in the two groups.

The Israeli case is worth studying given its similarities to other Western economies. At the same time, it is unique given the ongoing, intractable conflict between Jews and Muslim Arabs in Israel and neighboring countries, in addition to the similarities between Islam and Judaism as based on religious law, as opposed to Christianity which is more faith-based. To the best of our knowledge, no studies have compared work values between Jewish and Muslim managers in or out of Israel, and this study attempts to fill this gap.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Work Values: Individualism vs. Collectivism

Cultures and countries have been found to differ in their individualistic/collectivistic orientation (Hofstede, 1980, 2001, 2011; Schwartz, 2013; Triandis, 2018). Triandis (2018) suggested that collectivism was a social pattern based on closely connected individuals who viewed themselves as part of a shared collective (family, colleagues, tribe, or nation), motivated by the norms of the collective and the duties it imposed upon them. These societies prioritized collective goals over their own personal objectives, hence their emphasis on relationships among members of the collective. Conversely, individualism was defined as a social pattern based on loosely connected individuals who viewed themselves as independent of the collective. Individualistic societies were motivated by their preferences, needs, individual rights, and contracts made with others. Their members prioritized their personal goals over the goals of others or those of the collective and emphasized rational analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of cultivating relationships with others.

In his seminal study, Hofstede (1980) detailed social norms associated with individualism, namely, caring for the self and the nuclear family; self-awareness; self-orientation; self-identification; the individual's emotional independence from organizations/institutions; emphasis on private enterprise and achievement; valuing the right for private life and opinions; autonomy; variety; leisure; financial and personal security; a need for friendships; decisions made on an individual level; and the universal application of criteria. He found that the highest values of the individualism index were in the US and the lowest in Venezuela, while Israel ranked slightly above

average.

According to Triandis (2018), a crucial factor that influenced individualism was relative societal wealth, which operated together with other important factors, such as social complexity, social and geographical mobility, and exposure to mass media. Hofstede (1980, 2001, 2011) characterized the source and background of international differences according to his original individualism index. The main characteristics of individualistic societies were higher economic development, high social mobility, strong development of the middle class, less traditional agriculture, more modern industry, intense urbanization, nuclear family rather than clan or tribal structure, and pragmatic educational system for the majority of the population, large multinational organizations, and greater dependence on private initiatives for survival.

Individualism and collectivism have been associated with work values. Individualism has been related to the opportunity for promotion, independence, and self-actualization (Hofstede, 1980, 2011; Triandis, 2018); to autonomy, creativity, curiosity, challenge, and attainment (Schwartz, 2013); to self-sufficiency (including financial rewards) and financial security (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 2013); and to a preference for personal needs, rights and abilities and personal success (Triandis, 2018). Collectivism has been related to good personal and social relations, sociability, and internal dependence and unity (Triandis, 2018); group membership and relations (Hofstede, 1980, 2011); and tradition, conservatism, commitment, obligation, general security, conformism, and obedience to authority (Schwartz, 2013; Triandis, 2018).

Work Outcome Preferences

WOPs refer to systematic information about the outcomes individuals seek in their work. This dimension can help answer fundamental questions, such as why people work, what motivates them to expend greater or lesser effort, and what relative importance they attribute to work (Sharabi et al., 2019). The WOP measure draws on the typology of six general meanings of work, as developed by Kaplan and Tausky (1974) based on a review of the literature on the functions and meanings of work (see also MOW International Research Team, 1987). These include status and prestige, income, time absorption, interpersonal contacts, service to society, and interest and satisfaction. These WOPs are believed to be important determinants of attitudes and behavior (Roberson et al., 1989). In the context of the present study, this issue appears particularly salient given the very low rate of Muslims in managerial roles in Israeli organizations (Israel Central Bureau of Statistics [ICBS], 2020; Shdema, 2020).

The Israeli Society and Labor Market

Israel's dominant culture is Jewish and secular with a Western orientation. Yet, about one-fifth of its population are Arabs, 83.6% are Muslims, 9% Christians, and 7.4% Druze (ICBS, 2022). Since its establishment in 1948, Israel has undergone immense changes: its population has increased more than tenfold; its economy has shifted from a local agricultural-industrial one to an advanced service and technology economy well embedded in the global economy; and its political system has changed from being dominated by socialism-collectivism to a neoliberal-capitalist one. Under these circumstances, a clear transition from collectivistic to individualistic values has taken place (Liverani, 2014; Sharabi et al., 2020).

Jews and Muslims in Israel's Labor Market

The integration of Arabs (especially Muslims) in the predominantly Jewish-Israeli economy has been limited mainly to low-income occupations. In the first decades of statehood, the Arab workforce was integrated mainly in agriculture, but over time the number of farmers decreased, while the number of those employed as hired workers in the Israeli labor market increased (Khatab, 2005). In 2021, the Israeli labor market was dominated by Jews, with 66.3% labor market participation, compared to 44.1 among Arabs (ICBS, 2022). Jews' average income in 2017 was NIS 9,800 (\$2,762) compared to 5,700 among Arabs (ICBS, 2020). According to Miaari and Khatab (2013), 13%-20% of these differences were attributable to "ethnic penalty" rather than other

“justifiable” explanations (i.e., living in rural areas, low education level). The gaps were especially evident in senior positions: in 2019, 12% of Jews held management positions compared to only 4% of Arabs (ICBS, 2020). Arab women in particular were substantially less integrated: in 2016, their participation in the labor force was only 28%, and those employed usually had low-status jobs (ICBS, 2020).

Arabs in Israel are discriminated against in a range of aspects, two of which are relevant to the present study. First, they benefit from lower state and private investment in employment hubs within Arab localities (Kasir & Yashiv, 2020; Schnell & Shdema, 2016). Second, some areas of employment, such as the defense industry and other security-related fields, including much of Israel’s thriving hi-tech sector, are closed to most Muslims as they usually do not have adequate security classification (Schnell & Shdema, 2016; Sharabi et al., 2020).

Bottosh (2020) found that while the gaps were narrowing in occupations such as sales, services, and administration, they were widening in engineering, academia, and management. Furthermore, the percentage of engineers and technicians was 13 on the national average compared to 5.6 in Arab society, whereas the percentage of workers in industry and construction was 12.9 nationally, compared to 30.9 in Arab society. Similarly, the national percentage of unprofessional workers was 5.9, compared to 13.7 in Arab society.

The fact that about 90% of Arabs lives in Arab localities provides an additional explanation. Most Arab localities are in Israel’s geographical periphery and ranked low compared to Jewish localities in socioeconomic terms. Under these circumstances, positions within Arab localities are scarce and typically limited to low-status roles. As a result, about 70% of the Arab labor force commutes to predominantly Jewish employment hubs (ICBS, 2020; Shdema, 2013; Shdema et al., 2019). Furthermore, labor market integration is affected by the slower modernization process within Arab society, especially among Muslims with more traditional, patriarchal values (Kaufman et al., 2012; Schnell & Shdema, 2016).

Muslim and Jewish Managers in the Labor Market

So far, there has been no information on the proportion of Muslim managers specifically, but only on the entire Arab population. However, as Muslims constitute the majority in Arab society, we will treat data comparing Jews and Arabs in the labor market as applicable to the Muslim majority. At the beginning of the millennium, 1.5% of Arabs held managerial positions, compared to 5.8% of Jews (Jerby & Levi, 2000). Twenty years later, roughly 9% of Jews held managerial positions, compared to about 3.5% among Arabs. Regarding gender differences, while 12.8% of Jewish men held managerial positions, only 5.7% of women did; in Arab society, the percentages were 4.9 and 2 (ICBS, 2020). Moreover, in 18 government ministries in Israel and large government companies, there was not even one senior Arab manager (Pilot, 2017).

Recently, Shdema (2020) addressed two essential barriers hindering Arab's integration in the labor market, especially in managerial positions: education level and socioeconomic status. His study tracked graduates of leading Arab schools and revealed that this elite group managed to acquire managerial positions at a much higher rate compared to the rest of the Arab population: almost 30% of them held managerial positions, including 19.9% junior positions and 9% senior positions (responsible for at least 20 employees). Within this particular population, the proportion of people with managerial positions was significantly higher even than in the Jewish population. These data suggest that Arabs in Israel, or at least some of them, are gradually undergoing a process of acquiring managerial positions.

Ethnicity, Culture, and Values in Israel

Jews in Israel have undergone a gradual change in values. Like other populations in the Western world, they have moved from a collectivistic and altruistic society in their early years to an individualistic society, particularly since the late 1970s (Sharabi, et al., 2019). Similarly, to other Western countries, this has been attributed to several factors. Hofstede (2001) suggested that high

individualism evolved due to rapid economic growth, a high degree of social mobility, strong development of a middle class, support of private enterprise, less traditional agriculture, modern industry, and progressive urbanization – all of which took place in Israel. Triandis (2018) addressed the level of wealth as an important factor influencing individualism, and indeed, in the past two decades, Israel's GDP increased from 20,000 to about 43,000 USD (ICBS, 2022). Another factor addressed by Triandis (2018) was the exposure to international communication networks and mass media, the influence of which was certainly felt in Israel. Today, Jewish society places great emphasis on the various dimensions of individualism, cultivating personal independence, and autonomy while granting a high degree of social tolerance (Sharabi et al., 2019). As part of an Americanization process, Jewish-Israeli culture has become increasingly individualistic and materialistic at the expense of collectivistic and altruistic values (Harpaz, 2008; Sharabi et al., 2019).

Unlike Jewish society, Muslim-Arab society in Israel is more conservative, emphasizing tradition, the welfare and safety of the group, rigid hierarchy, and little autonomy—all fundamentally collectivistic characteristics (Sharabi et al., 2019). The Muslim subculture in Israel is more religious and homogenous (nearly all Sunni) than Jewish society (Kaufman et al., 2012; Sharabi, 2012). Muslims in Israel have been only partially and slowly affected by the broader socioeconomic changes affecting Israel (Kaufman et al., 2012; Shdema et al., 2019).

The above cultural differences were reflected in Schwartz's (2013) findings that while Muslims in Israel were generally connected to the conservatism and hierarchy dimensions (associated with collectivism), Israeli Jews (similar to US society) were connected to mastery and affective autonomy dimensions (associated with individualism).

Work Outcome Preferences of Jewish and Muslim Managers: Hypotheses

Ralston et al. (2012) compared managers' values in seven Middle Eastern countries (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Pakistan, Turkey, and the UAE) and found that the Israeli managers had the highest individualism and universalism values and the lowest collectivism values compared to managers from the other six, Islamic countries. These findings confirmed their hypotheses regarding historical and sociocultural influences and contemporary economic and political factors that may influence business ideology. Note also that the highest collectivism values were found among managers from Islamic countries within the Arab world (Algeria, Egypt, and the UAE).

Based on these findings and on our previous analysis of cultural differences, we can assume that the work values of Jewish managers in Israel would be closer to the individualistic pole, while those of Muslim managers would lean toward the collectivistic pole. Accordingly, Muslim managers tend to be more conservative, traditional, and religious than Jewish manager, and would thus emphasize general security; internal dependence, good personal and social relations, and sociability (see Hofstede, 1980, 2011; Schwartz, 2013; Triandis, 2018). Therefore, the collectivistic values of serving or contributing to society through work and interpersonal relationships would gain high importance among Muslim managers. Indeed, Guiso et al. (2003) argued that Muslim executives exhibited conservative behavior, especially in running a business, thus compromising company performance since the value of brotherhood (one of the ethical principles in Islam) could lead to avoidance of competition among Muslim executives. Therefore, Muslim managers in a collective society where religion occupies a prominent place and guides the behaviors of the individual could refrain from achieving work results or a competitive advantage if, in their view, this could harm another Muslim manager (Ali & Weir, 2005; Guiso et al., 2003). Accordingly, we hypothesize as follows:

*H1: The collectivistic work outcomes of serving society and interpersonal contacts would be more important to Muslims than Jewish managers in Israel.

Tartakovsky and Cohen (2014) suggested that managers had higher organizational power and autonomy than workers, given that they were expected to make their own decisions, initiate new ways of achieving organizational goals, and lead their subordinates. According to other studies, compared to employees, managers had higher intrinsic values such as autonomy, achievement, and

self-fulfillment (e.g., Petty & Hill, 2005; Shapira & Griffith, 1990). These needs were associated with individualistic values since, in an individualistic society, there was a higher need for independence and self-actualization, autonomy, challenge, achievement, and personal success (Hofstede, 1980, 2011; Schwartz, 2013; Triandis, 2018).

Although both Jewish and Muslim managers are expected to espouse these values more than employees, Jewish managers are expected to value them more than their Muslim counterparts. This is because Israeli Jewish society values the mastery and affective autonomy dimensions associated with individualism, while Muslim society adopts the conservatism and hierarchy dimensions associated with collectivism (Schwartz, 2013). Independence, autonomy, attainment, challenges, and self-actualization can be achieved via increased organizational status and prestige. Based on the above findings and the cultural differences between Jews and Muslims in Israel, we hypothesize as follows:

*H2: Jewish managers would attribute a higher value to the work outcome of status and prestige (individualistic outcomes) than would Muslim managers in Israel.

Kuchinke and Cornachione (2010) compared midlevel managers in the US and Brazil regarding the meaning of work and performance-focused work attitudes. First, they indicated that US society was significantly more individualistic, with lower power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and higher masculinity orientation compared to Brazilian society (based on Hofstede's cultural dimensions). They found that US managers had higher intrinsic and extrinsic values than Brazilian managers. Indeed, individualism was related to the extrinsic or economic values of materialism, income, financial independence and rewards, and financial security, as well as to the intrinsic values of self-actualization, challenge, and attainment (Hofstede, 1980; Inglehart, 1997; Schwartz, 2013). Based on the above findings, and especially on cultural differences between managers from the two ethnoreligious groups, we hypothesize that:

*H3a: Jewish managers would attribute greater value to the work outcome of income (extrinsic value) than Muslim managers in Israel.

*H3b: Jewish managers would attribute greater value to the work outcomes of interest and satisfaction (intrinsic values) than Muslim managers in Israel.

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Data Collection

Data for the present study were collected in 2019 via the Meaning of Working Questionnaire (MOW International Research Team, 1987). We located 100 Muslim and 253 Jewish managers in northern Israel since most of the Muslims in Israel lived in this area. They were from varied, mostly private organizations. The respondents were approached via a combination of online (38%) and printed questionnaires (62%). The Muslims completed questionnaires in Arabic, and the Jews in Hebrew. We did not require formal ethical approval to conduct the study since it did not involve any physical or psychological assessment, and the managers participated voluntarily.

The demographic distribution and descriptive statistical differences between Jews and Arabs are presented in Table 1. While there were no differences between Jews and Muslims regarding mean age or gender, there were significant differences in the other demographic variables. Muslim managers were more educated, worked longer hours, and earned less than Jewish managers. A higher percentage of Muslims lived in Arab villages, and they were more religious than their Jewish counterparts (reflecting the collectivistic and traditional culture of Muslim managers compared to their Jewish counterparts).

Instrument

WOPs were measured based on the Meaning of Work questionnaire (MOW International Research Team, 1987), translated and back translated into Hebrew and Arabic to maintain adequate validity and reliability. Respondents were asked to assign up to a total of 100 points to the following six outcomes that work provided:

*Work gives me status and prestige.

*Work provides me income.

*Work keeps me busy/ time filling.

*Thanks to the work, interesting interpersonal relationships are created.

*Through work, I bring benefit to society/ serve society.

*Work itself is interesting and gives me personal satisfaction.

Table 1: Demographics of Muslim and Jewish Managers

	Jews	Muslims	Differences a
Age (means)	41.0	42.4	-.97
Gender (%)			
Men	55.7	60.0	.53
Women	44.3	40.0	
Educational level (%)			
Postsecondary education and less	39.6	16.0	
Bachelor's degree	20.9	40.0	22.30***
Higher than bachelor's degree	39.5	44.0	
Net income (NIS, %) b			
<5000	5.9	8.0	
5001-6300	8.3	15.0	
6301-7600	15.4	23.0	11.94*
7601-8900	15.4	13.0	
>8900	54.9	40.0	
Working weekly hours (means)	37.5	46.2	-5.75***
Religiosity Degree (%)			
Secular	62.5	20.0	
Traditionalist	29.2	64.0	51.81***
Religious	8.3	16.0	
Residence area (%)			
Rural area (< 2,000)	29.2	42.9	
Town (2,000-20,000)	7.5	14.3	12.51**
City (> 20,000)	63.2	42.9	

Note. a. t-test or Chi-square tests of demographic differences between Jews and Muslims

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Data Analysis

To gain an overview of the relationships between the WOPs and demographic variables among Muslim and Jewish managers, we performed separate correlation analyses for each group. Next, we compared WOPs' means of Muslims and Jews by t-test, which enabled us to examine our hypotheses. Since several demographic factors could affect WOPs (e.g., age, gender, education level), we performed separate hierarchical regression analyses for Jews and Muslims to understand in depth the impact of each demographic factor in order to extract practical implications for each ethno-religious group.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix of Demographic Variables and WOPs among Jews and Muslims

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1)	Age	-	-.14	-.05	.24*	-.08	.14	-.16	-.02	.07	-.05	-.09	.11	-.13
2)	Gender b	-.11	-	.10	-	-	.09	-.02	.11	-.10	.07	-.04	.06	-.12
					.54**	.28**								
3)	Educational level	.14*	.13*	-	.01	-	.13	.09	-.01	.01	.08	-.08	-.04	-.05
						.27**								

4)	Income	.41**	-	.32**	-.15	.16	.02	-.03	.10	-.08	.02	-.15	.12
			.25**										
5)	Working hours	.13*	-	.03	.38**	-.12	.12	-.06	.26**	-.04	-.09	-.19	.11
			.31**										
6)	Religiosity	.05	-.12	-.10	-.14*	-.07	-	-.07	.11	.10	.01	-.15	-.10
degree c													-.05
7)	Residential area	.05	.17**	.28**	.15*	-.01	-	-	.09	.06	-.09	-.04	-.10
size						.19**							.04
8)	Status	and .05	-.14*	.03	.14*	.12	.03	-.07	-	-	-.07	-.12	-
prestige										.27**		.30**	-.13
9)	Income	.05	-.12	-.13*	-.01	-.02	.12	-.08	-	-	-.23*	-	-
								.23**				.34**	.36**
10)	Time filling	.07	-.09	-.16*	-.07	-.06	.13*	-.16*	-.02	-.16*	-	.08	-
												.32**	-.02
11)	Interpersonal-		.14*	-.01	-	-	-.10	.15*	-	-	-.08	-	-.09
contacts		.21**			.22**	.18**		.22**	.28**				.24*
12)	Serving society	-.03	.06	.05	-.02	.07	.05	.00	-	-	-.12	.06	-
								.18**	.46**				-.09
13)	Interest	and -.02	.24**	.25**	.07	-.04	-	.22**	-	-	-	-.02	.16**
satisfaction						.21**		.26**	.42**	.24**			-

Note. The correlations above the diagonal are for Muslims; b. 1-Men, 2-Women; c. 1-Secular, 2-Traditionalist, 3-Religious.

*p < .05; **p < .0

RESULTS

The correlation matrix in Table 2 includes all demographic variables and WOPs, demonstrating that among Jews and Muslims there is a negative correlation between income and all the other work outcomes, and between serving society and status and prestige. Only among Muslims were interpersonal relations negatively correlated with time filling, while interpersonal relations were positively correlated with interest and satisfaction. Furthermore, only among Jews were interest and satisfaction negatively correlated with time filling. Looking at the demographic variables, only among Jews was there a positive association between education level and income, meaning that higher education level led to increased income. Furthermore, only among Muslims was educational level negatively correlated with working hours, meaning that higher education level led to reduced working hours.

Table 3 presents ANOVA tests executed with Tukey post-hoc. The findings uncovered significant differences between Jewish and Muslim managers regarding all WOPs. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported: as expected, compared to Jewish managers, Muslim managers attributed higher importance to the work outcome of serving society (16.59 vs. 11.36), but lower importance to interpersonal contacts (10.91 vs. 12.96). The second hypothesis was rejected since status and prestige were more important to Muslim than to Jewish managers (18.70 vs. 12.42).

Table 3: Means and Ranking Differences of WOPs among Jewish and Muslim Managers

Work outcomes	Jews (n = 253)		Muslims (n = 100)		t-test
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Status and prestige	(4) 12.42	12.01	(2) 18.70	12.46	-4.38***
Income	(1) 33.65b	18.50	(1) 27.89b	17.85	2.66**
Time absorption	(6) 9.07	9.14	(5) 11.27	8.92	-2.05*
Interpersonal contacts	(3) 12.96	9.14	(6) 10.91	8.05	1.96*
Serving society	(5) 11.36b	9.73	(3) 16.59	15.07	-3.86***

Interest and satisfaction	(2) 19.49b	12.80	(4) 15.22b	9.87	3.00**
---------------------------	------------	-------	------------	------	--------

Note. the rankings of the WOPs are in parentheses; b. The differences between the means of one work outcome and the next in the rank order are significant.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were confirmed: Jewish managers attributed higher importance to the work outcomes of income (33.65 vs. 27.89), and interest and satisfaction (19.49 vs. 15.22) than their Muslim counterparts. Furthermore, time filling was more important among Muslim than Jewish managers (11.27 vs. 9.07). Overall, the findings mostly confirmed that Muslim managers valued collectivistic while their Jewish counterparts valued individualistic values.

According to the literature review and our sample characteristics, there were demographic differences between Muslim and Jewish managers (Table 1). Therefore, linear regression analysis was conducted for each group to examine the influence of the demographic variables on WOPs (see Table 4). Overall, the demographic variables were found to have low explanatory power with regard to the WOPs within the two groups, particularly among Muslims. Among both Muslim and Jewish managers, working longer hours was negatively correlated with the importance of interpersonal relations ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$ and $\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$, respectively), meaning that working longer hours was related to a reduction in the importance of interpersonal relations.

Table 4: Regression Analysis (Standardized Beta) of WOPs according to Demographic Variables among Jewish and Muslim Managers

Work outcomes	Status and prestige	Income	Time filling	Interpersona l relations	Serve society	Interest and satisfaction
Jews						
Age	-.01	.06	.10	-.13*	-.04	-.04
Gender a	-.09	-.09	-.07	.01	.09	.19***
Educational level	.03	-.12+	-.11+	.00	.06	.17**
Income	.11	.02	-.04	-.15*	-.03	.05
Working hours	.05	-.05	-.07	-.13*	.12+	-.01
Religiosity degree b	.03	.09	.08	-.09	.07	-.14*
Residential area size	.07	.02	.10	-.15**	.01	-.10+
R2 (adjusted)	.04	.04	.07	.11	.02	.15
F	1.48	1.56	10.93***	4.47***	.80	5.93***
Muslims						
Age	-.02	.08	-.03	-.16	.12	-.16+
Gender (men=0)	.11	-.04	.02	-.00	-.04	-.03
Educational level	-.08	.09	.06	-.05	-.06	-.02
Income	.01	.03	-.07	.14	-.16+	.14
Working hours	-.08	.26**	.01	-.19*	-.18*	.04
Religiosity degree	.11	.07	-.00	-.12	-.06	-.06
Residential area size	.12	.04	-.10	-.05	-.06	.00
R2 (adjusted)	.04	.10	.04	.08	.09	.05
F	.55	1.36	2.19*	1.11	1.23	.67

Note. a. 1-Men, 2-Women; b. 1-Secular, 2-Traditionalist, 3-Religious.

+ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Furthermore, only among Muslim managers were working hours found to be negatively correlated with serving society ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .01$) and positively correlated with the importance of income ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$), meaning that working longer hours was related to the need for higher income and less to the need to serve society. Only among Jewish managers was higher education level related to a higher need for interest and satisfaction ($\beta = .17$, $p < .01$). Interest and satisfaction were more important to women than to men ($\beta = .19$, $p < .001$). Finally, the more religious managers

were, the lower their need for interest and satisfaction, and the need for interpersonal relations was negatively correlated with aging and bigger residential area ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$, and $\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$, respectively), meaning that the older the managers and the larger their living area, the less importance they ascribed to interpersonal relations.

DISCUSSION

The current study compares the work values of Muslim and Jewish managers in Israel. This issue is of great contemporary relevance given the growing integration of Muslim workers and executives into labor markets in numerous economies and given that they come from a culture that is significantly different from the dominant cultures in Western countries, where they are marginalized minorities (Shanneik et al., 2017). Since Jewish society is closer to an individualistic pole of the spectrum while Muslim society is closer to the collectivistic one (Kaufman et al., 2012; Ralston et al., 2012; Schwartz, 2013; Sharabi et al., 2019), we analyze the differences in terms of cultural values in order to understand the work values of managers from these two ethno-religious groups, within the same labor market. The findings uncover significant differences between Muslim and Jewish managers across all work outcome preferences (WOPs), most of which may be explained by cultural differences.

As expected, the individualistic values of income, interest, and satisfaction gain higher importance among Jewish managers, while the collectivistic value of serving society gains higher importance among Muslim managers. It seems that Muslims' prioritization of serving society (the second most prominent work value) stems from their being members of a society in which family, 'Hamula' (extended family/clan), as well as the local community, are all-important (Sharabi et al., 2021).

Contrary to our expectations, status and prestige, which are considered individualistic values (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 2013), gain much higher importance among Muslim managers compared to their Jewish counterparts. This phenomenon can be a manifestation of the unique situation of Muslim managers as members of a marginalized minority in Israel and can be explained by the "scarcity hypothesis." This assumes that individual preferences reflect their socioeconomic surroundings, such that individuals attribute greater subjective value to issues that have relatively little to offer them and do not meet their real needs (Inglehart, 1997; Sharabi & Harpaz, 2010). The greater importance Muslims attribute to status and prestige- ranked second compared to fourth among Jews- illustrates the dissatisfaction many Muslim managers experience as a result of working in positions that do not match their education, experience, and expertise (Miaari & Khattab, 2013; Sharabi, 2009). It may also reflect the difficulties they have due to employment discrimination, as well as their difficulty climbing the hierarchy ladder in private and public Israeli organizations (ICBS, 2020; Pilot, 2017).

The collectivistic values of sociability and interpersonal relations (Schwartz, 2013; Triandis, 2018) are more important for Jewish than for Muslim managers. It seems that this contradictory finding is related to the participants' managerial status. Although Guiso et al. (2003) argued that Muslim executives may value brotherhood at the expense of competition and organizational performance; this is not the case in our study. Generally, Muslim and Jewish managers have higher workloads and pressure regarding their team performance and organizational objectives. They must motivate their subordinates to work harder and supervise their performance outcomes while facing stress from their subordinates and often meet their managerial goals at the expense of interpersonal relationships with their workers (Broadbridge & Simpson, 2011; Kim, 2017). Muslim collectivistic culture is related to higher power distance, where hierarchy, social power, and wealth are highly valued (Schwartz, 2013). Therefore, the managerial status gains high respect among Muslims and requires the managers to keep a greater distance and to be less sociable with their subordinates. Jewish society, characterized by individualism and lower power distance, attaches less importance to hierarchy. Furthermore, only Jews living in smaller localities have a high need for interpersonal relations (see regression analysis in Table 4).

Note that Muslim managers work significantly longer hours than their Jewish counterparts (46.2 vs. 37.5 a week, respectively; $p < .001$) and that only among them is there a negative relationship between working hours and interpersonal relationships (Table 4). The longer working hours of Muslim managers can also explain the higher importance they attach to work as a time filler compared to their Jewish counterparts.

In conclusion, for managers of both groups, income is the most important value, while others differed considerably. Whereas Muslim managers rank status and prestige second and serve society third, their Jewish counterparts rank interest and satisfaction second and interpersonal relations third. These rankings partially reflect the cultural differences and the above findings.

As stated above, the regression results indicate that demographic variables have low predictive power, but we believe they point to an interesting conclusion: the respondents' main professional identity is that of managers so their demographics do not matter much. In particular, this observation is interesting in gender terms, as the data point to no significant difference between Muslim men and women, despite their overall substantial differences in employment patterns and in Arab culture more generally (Sharabi et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

The labor markets in Western countries are increasingly diverse (races, ethnicities, religions, etc.), and Western organizations employ increasing numbers of Middle Eastern Muslim workers and managers. Accordingly, they have to be sensitive to their sociocultural characteristics. Aside from the diversity in Jewish and Muslim holidays, preferred food, prayer ceremonies, clothing preferences, etc. (especially among religious people), there are differences in their work values. Acknowledging the impact of demographic factors (e.g., religiosity, residential area, and education level) enables better prediction of work values and needs among managers from each group. For example, while the religiosity of Muslim managers does not affect their work values, among Jewish managers, the more religious they are, the lower their need for interest and satisfaction. Furthermore, while education level or gender did not affect the WOPs of Muslims, among more educated Jews, there is a higher need for interest and satisfaction and a lower need for income. Nevertheless, Jewish women managers have a higher need for interest and satisfaction compared to Jewish men.

The willingness of Muslim managers to work significantly longer hours than Jewish managers reflects higher work centrality, organizational involvement, and commitment (Kanungo, 1982; Sharabi, 2020). The occupational discrimination and the longer working hours of Muslims reflect a high untapped potential for Israeli society and organizations. The motivation of Muslim managers to work longer hours mainly stems from their drive for higher income and comes at the expense of the values of interpersonal relations and serving society. Furthermore, younger Muslim managers have a higher need for interest and satisfaction compared to their older counterparts.

This insight suggests a need to assign managers to positions for which they may be more suitable. This would benefit the organizations and employers, as well as all stakeholders, including subordinates, customers, and primarily the managers themselves. More broadly, it can also help plan public policy and material and non-material organizational reward systems and other methods to better compensate managers from different ethnic groups. From a wider perspective, the more individualistic the managers' culture or subculture, the higher their need for intrinsic (interest and satisfaction) and extrinsic (income) work outcomes. Global organizations must invest in understanding and meeting employees' diverse needs and expectations in order to enhance managers' work centrality, engagement, and organizational commitment and, as a result, achieve higher productivity and, eventually, business success (Mone & London, 2018; Sharabi & Harpaz, 2010; Uçanok & Karabati, 2013; Wrench, 2016). Implementing diversity management programs in organizations based on the variance among cultural groups can maximize the potential of human resource (see suggestions by Wrench, 2016). The current study represents a step forward in this direction by taking into account not only measures such as tolerance and inclusion but also work values. Understanding and meeting the diverse needs and expectations of minorities such as

Muslims can improve their integration in the labor market and hence in society as well as enhance their productivity and commitment (Sharabi et al., 2020; Wrench, 2016).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The limitation of the study is that the WOPs measure is based on responses to a single question. Using single-item measures may not be optimal. Yet, this measure has been developed by the Meaning of Working research team and validated in eight countries (MOW, 1987). It has been used in China (Westwood & Lok, 2003), Israel (Sharabi et al., 2019) and several other countries. The findings over time show that this measure is reliable and can reflect the importance of work outcomes in different societies.

To obtain a more comprehensive picture of the subject under study, we suggest the following future directions. Managers of several ranks (senior, middle, or junior) should be studied as their motivations and values may differ. It would also be interesting to examine the identity of managers' subordinates, whether in charge of people from their ethnic background, other minorities, or the majority group. Moreover, in the Israeli context, it seems important to compare not only Jewish and Muslim but also Christian managers, given the fundamental theological differences between these religions.

REFERENCES

- Ali, A. J., & Weir, D. (2005). Islamic perspectives on management and organization. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 2(3), 410–415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766080509518602>
- Amara, M. & Schnell, I. (2004). Identity repertoires among Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(1), 175–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183032000170222>
- Arslan, M. (2000). A cross-cultural comparison of British and Turkish managers in terms of Protestant work ethic characteristics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 9(1), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8608.00165>
- Arslan, M. (2001). The work ethic values of protestant British, Catholic, Irish, and Muslim Turkish managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 31(4), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010787528465>
- Bottosh, N. (2020). Pearei Taasuka vesachar bein periferia vemerkaz – netunim veklei mediniut efshariim [Employment and salary data in Arab society with an emphasis on the high-tech industry]. Knesset Information and Research Center. https://fs.knesset.gov.il/globaldocs/MMM/64f30c05-0b0e-eb11-811a-00155d0af32a/2_64f30c05-0b0e-eb11-811a-00155d0af32a_11_16406.pdf
- Broadbridge, A., & Simpson, R. (2011). 25 years on: Reflecting on the past and looking to the future in gender and management research. *British Journal of Management*, 22(3), 470–483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00758.x>
- Cheung, S. Y. (2014). Ethno-religious minorities and labour market integration: Generational advancement or decline? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37, 140–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.808757>
- Gabrielli, G., & Impicciatore, R. (2022). Breaking down the barriers: Educational paths, labour market outcomes and wellbeing of children of immigrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 48(10), 2305–2323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2021.1935655>
- Garcia-Zamor, J. C. (2017). The global wave of refugees and migrants: Complex challenges for European policy makers. *Public Organization Review*, 17(4), 581–594. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-016-0371-1>
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2003). People's opium? Religion and economic attitudes.

- Harpaz, I. (1990). The meaning of work in Israel: Its nature and consequences. Praeger.
- Harpaz, I. (2008). Globalization and its impact on Israel's society, economy, and labor market. VDM.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. SAGE Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(8), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies. Princeton University Press.
- Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. (2020). Labour force survey. Hemmed Press.
- Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. (2022). Statistical abstract of Israel (Vol. 72). Hemmed Press.
- Jerby, I., & Levi, G. (2000). Hashesa hachevrati-calcali belsrael; Niyar mediniut mispar 21 [The socio-economic divide in Israel: Policy Paper No. 21]. The Israel Democracy Institute. <https://www.idi.org.il/media/4475/%D7%94%D7%A9%D7%A1%D7%A2-%D7%94%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%AA%D7%99-%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%99-%D7%91%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%9C.pdf>
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Work alienation: An integrative approach. Praeger.
- Kaplan, H. R., & Tausky, C. (1974). The meaning of work among the hard-core unemployed. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 17(2), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388341>
- Kasir, N. K., & Yashiv, E. (2020). The economic outcomes of an ethnic minority: The role of barriers: IZA Discussion Paper No. 13120. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. <https://docs.iza.org/dp13120.pdf>
- Kaufman, I., Abu Baker, H., & Saar, A. (2012). Hachevra ha'aravit belsrael [The Arab society in Israel]. Open University Publisher.
- Khattab N. & Miaari, S., (eds.) (2013). Palestinians in the Israeli Labor Market: A Multi- disciplinary Approach, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Khattab, N. (2005). Ethnicity, class, and the earning inequality in Israel, 1983-1995. *Sociological Research Online*, 10(3), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.1069>
- Kim, H. (2017). Investigating the effects of work-family spillovers, gender, and formal mentoring on career goal of managers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(8), 1065–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2014-0186>
- Kuchinke, K. P., & Cornachione, E. B. (2010). The meaning of work and performance-focused work attitudes among midlevel managers in the United States and Brazil. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 23(3), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.20090>
- Liverani, M. (2014). Israel's history and the history of Israel. Routledge.
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers. Routledge.
- MOW International Research Team (1987). The meaning of working – An international view. Academic Press.

- Parboteeah, K. P., Hoegl, M., & Cullen, J. (2009). Religious dimensions and work obligation: A country institutional profile model. *Human Relations*, 62(1), 119–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267080995>
- Peleg, O., & Messerschmidt-Grandi, C. (2019). Differentiation of self and trait anxiety: A cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, 54(6), 816–827. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12535>
- Petty, G. C., & Hill, R. B. (2005). Work ethic characteristics: Perceived work ethics of supervisors and workers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42(2), 5–20.
- Pilot, A. (2017, September 6). 18 Misraidei memshala, efes menahalim Aravim [18 government ministries, zero Arab managers]. *Calcalist* <https://www.calcalist.co.il/local/articles/0,7340,L-3720613,00.html>
- Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Riddle, L., Butt, A., Dalgic, T., & Brock, D. M. (2012). Managerial values in the greater Middle East: Similarities and differences across seven countries. *International Business Review*, 21(3), 480–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2011.05.007>
- Roberson, L., Houston, J. M., & Diddams, M. (1989). Identifying valued work outcomes through a content analysis of personal goals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35(1), 30–45. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(89\)90046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(89)90046-8)
- Schnell, I., & Shdema, I. (2016). The role of peripherality and ethnic segregation in Arabs' integration into the Israeli labor market. In H. Stier, N. Khattab & S. Miaari (Eds.), *Inequalities in contemporary Israel* (pp. 207–224). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2013). Culture matters: National value cultures, sources, and consequences. In C. Y. Chiu, Y. Y. Hong, S. Shavitt, & R. S. Wyer Jr. (Eds.), *Understanding culture: Theory, research and application* (pp. 127–150). Psychology Press.
- Shanneik, Y., Heinhold, C., & Ali, Z. (2017). Mapping Shia Muslim communities in Europe: Local and transnational dimensions: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Muslims in Europe*, 6(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22117954-12341345>
- Shapira, Z., & Griffith, T. L. (1990). Comparing the work values of engineers with managers, production, and clerical workers: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(4), 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110404>
- Sharabi, M. (2012). The work and its meaning among Jews and Muslims according to religiosity degree. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 39(11), 824–843. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291211263880>
- Sharabi, M. (2015). Social changes in Israeli society and their impact on the importance of work outcomes. *Social Change*, 45(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085714561842>
- Sharabi, M. (2017). Work ethic among Jews and Muslims: The effect of religiosity degree and demographic factors. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(2), 251–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121416650403>
- Sharabi, M., & Harpaz, I. (2010). Improving employees' work centrality improves organizational performance: work events and work centrality relationships. *Human Resource Development International*, 13(4), 379–392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2010.501960>
- Sharabi, M., Cohen-Ynon, G., & Soskis, M. (2021). Parental involvement in the Arab and Jewish educational systems. *International Education Studies*, 14(2), 69–75. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v14n2p69>
- Sharabi, M., Shdema, I., & Abboud-Armaly, O. (2020). Nonfinancial employment commitment among Muslims and Jews in Israel: Examination of the core-periphery model on majority and

- minority groups. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 43(1), 227–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-12-2019-0486>
- Sharabi, M., Simonovich, J., & Shahor, T. (2019). Gender preferences of work outcomes over the course of time: A cross-sectional study in Israel. *Israel Affairs*, 25(5), 908–925. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2019.1645970>
- Shdema, I. (2020). Shiluv bogrim vebogrot shel batei sefer Arviim movilim besuk ha'avoda be Israel [Integration of graduates of leading Arab schools in Israel's labor market]. The Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research, Tel Aviv University.
- Shdema, I., (2013). Arabs' workforce participation in Israel at a single municipality scale. In N. Khattab & S. Miaari (Eds.), *Palestinians in the Israeli labor market: A multi-disciplinary approach* (pp. 241–262). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137544810_10
- Shdema, I., Abu-Rayya, H., & Schnell, I., (2019). The interconnections between socio-spatial factors and labour market integration among Arabs in Israel. *Papers in Regional Science*, 98(1), 497–514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pirs.12332>
- Shdema, I., Martin, D., & Abu-Asbe, K. (2021). Exposure to the majority social space and residential place identity among minorities: Evidence from Arabs in Israel. *Urban Geography*, 42(4), 507–527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1727118>
- Tartakovsky, E., & Cohen, E. (2014). Values in the bank: Value preferences of bank frontline workers and branch managers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23(5), 769–782. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2013.794933>
- Triandis, H. C. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview.
- Uçanok, B., & Karabatı, S. (2013). The effects of values, work centrality, and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviors: Evidence from Turkish SMEs. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 24(1), 89–129. <http://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21156>
- Westwood, R., & Lok, P. (2003). The meaning of work in Chinese contexts a comparative study. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 3(2), 139–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958030032001>
- Wrench, J. (2016). *Diversity management and discrimination: Immigrants and ethnic minorities in the EU*. Ashgate.