

Gender Differences in Ambition

Lukas Maria Brus

614306

Supervisor: dr. Yvette Stráznický van Osch

Second reader: dr. Olga Stavrova

Department of Social Psychology, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Tilburg University

March 2020

## Abstract

The current research investigated a sample of Dutch workers ( $N = 369$ ) whether there is a difference between male- and female workers in ambition. Former research found conflicting results: men are more ambitious than women or men and women are equally ambitious. However, for these measurements only unidimensional scales were used, meaning only one type of ambition was measured. The majority of the items of these scales is categorized by us as vertical ambition (e.g. focused on power, promotion, money). An increasing amount of literature suggests this definition should be extended with a second dimension (i.e. horizontal ambition) which would be more focused on striving for self-development, and mastery of the task in order to benefit communal goals. A recent developed scale (i.e. Horizontal- and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire; HVA-Q) enabled us to investigate gender differences in vertical- and horizontal ambition. The results of the current research show us men score higher on vertical ambition than women. Additionally, on horizontal ambition no gender differences were found. Furthermore the current research compared various unidimensional scales of ambition with the two-dimensional HVA-Q. Results confirmed the unidimensional scales measure merely vertical ambition, and hereby leave horizontal ambition out of the picture.

*Keywords:* Ambition, gender, horizontal ambition, vertical ambition, unidimensional, two-dimensional

### Gender Differences In Ambition.

Women are perceived as being equally competent as men nowadays, however not perceived as ambitious. This was established by a meta-analysis that reviewed stereotypes on gender, by analyzing polls between 1946 and 2018 in the U.S. (Eagly, Nater, Miller, Kaufmann & Sczesny, 2019). The question arises what actually defines an ambitious worker. Sheridan, (2004) argued our image of ambition is too much being defined by masculine traits (e.g. power, promotion, high salary), and hereby men automatically are the 'more ambitious' worker. Various sources suggest that this definition should be extended with a second dimension focussing on communal goals (by Benschop, van den Brink, Doorewaard & Leenders, 2013; Larimer, Hannagan & Smith, 2007; Sools, van Engen & Baerveldt, 2007). The current research strives to investigate whether distinguishing between two types of ambition will shine new light on the idea of men being the more ambitious gender.

### **Perceptions on ambition related to gender**

The perception of men being the more ambitious gender was not only found in polls (Eagly et al., 2019), but is also supported by empirical evidence. To illustrate, in the experiment by Larimer, et al., (2007) where people had to vote on candidates who would divide resources on their behalf, men received more votes because they were perceived as more ambitious. In addition to this, other research also states that the majority of people assume men are generally more ambitious (Kickmeyer, 1998; 2002; 2006).

**Societal consequences of men being perceived as the more ambition gender.** This stereotype of men being more ambitious, has societal consequences in terms of allocated gender roles. Van Dijk and Van Engen (2019) argued this is because gender role expectations reinforce themselves in groups. According to this research gender role expectations determine three mechanisms: firstly, who gets which responsibility allocated, secondly, how do perceivers in the environment react to a certain gender having certain responsibilities and

lastly, to which extent does a person itself show (unconsciously or consciously) gender role-confirming behaviour. The consequences of these three mechanisms tend to confirm the initial gender role expectations. A similar reinforcing mechanism can be applied on ambition. To illustrate, Eagly et al., (2019) argued that the perception of men being more ambitious compared to women, might suppress women from working in the top of hierarchies.

Leadership roles are associated with higher ambition (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell & Ristikari, 2011), and since men are perceived more ambitious, more men are hired for these positions.

Concluding, the stereotype of men being more ambitious (Eagly et al., 2019; Kichmeyer, 1992; 2002; 2006; Larimer et al., 2007), disadvantages women in their career success in terms of moving to top positions in organizations. Taking these disadvantages into account, it is important to investigate whether this perception of men being more ambitious is correct.

### **Actual ambition**

So far, research shows us that men are perceived as more ambitious than women, however little scientific research has investigated whether men and women differ in actual ambition (i.e. ambition measured within a person using a self-report scale). In addition to this lack of evidence, the findings seem to be conflicting as well. On the one hand, three studies suggest women to be less ambitious compared to men. To start off, a study by Vianen and Keizer (1996) suggested female employees are less ambitious, due to a circular process. In this process managers expect female employees to be less ambitious and subsequently managers are less supportive to female workers in fulfilling their ambitions. Eventually, these female employees start to conform to these expected roles. Similarly, two studies on ambition where gender was added as a control variable, also found women to be less ambitious (Blyweert, 2014; Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). On the other hand, two studies suggest there are no gender differences in ambition. Firstly a study by De Pater et al., (2010), on

career success at managerial positions, found no measurable gender differences. Secondly, a study by Coffeng (2016), where gender was added as a control variable found there is no difference between men and women in ambition.

Regarding the findings on previous research, there is evidence that women are less ambitious compared to men. However there is also evidence that there is no difference between women and men in ambition. Nevertheless the evidence for both findings is scarce, which makes these current known findings inconclusive. These studies all used unidimensional scales to measure ambition, which were for the most focused on the masculine traits (e.g. power, promotion, high salary). In the current paper we will approach ambition as a two-dimensional construct. This enables the current research to investigate how different types of ambition relate to gender.

### **Different types of ambition**

The current research differentiates between two types of ambition: horizontal- and vertical ambition. This distinction is based on three studies which also suggested that ambition can be divided into two types. Firstly, Larimer et al., (2007) differentiated in a quantitative research between two types: one type of ambition is focused on communal goals and the other type of ambition is focused on individualistic goals such as need for power. Secondly, Sools, van Engen and Baerveldt (2007) also classified two types of ambition in a discourse-analytical study. One type is associated with individualistic goals (e.g. extrinsic rewards, promotion) and the other more with communal goals (e.g. self-realization). Finally, Benschop, et al., (2013) differentiated between two types of ambition in a qualitative research: vertical- and horizontal ambition. Vertical ambition entails striving for goals such as extrinsic rewards, power, money and promotion. Horizontal ambition entails striving for self-development, and mastery of the task in order to benefit communal goals. Overall these studies suggest ambition can be addressed as a construct with multiple types. Regarding these

previous differentiations, Kortekaas-Mertens (2018) defined Horizontal Ambition as: “A drive to successfully complete work-related goals in order to be rewarded in terms of self-development, gaining expertise, and gaining communal goals”. The definition of Vertical Ambition is described as: “A drive to successfully complete work-related goals in order to be rewarded in terms of status, power, promotion, and money”. The current research uses a two-dimensional scale of ambition (Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire by Van Osch and Schaveling) which uses these definitions of vertical- and horizontal ambition.

**Aims current research.** By using a two-dimensional scale of ambition, the current research has two aims. Firstly, we will study gender differences in vertical- and horizontal ambition. Secondly, we will compare the two-dimensional Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire (HVA-Q) to unidimensional measurements.

### **Different types of ambition in relation to gender according to literature**

Taking into account that ambition can be approached as a construct with two types that be differentiated from each other (i.e. horizontal and vertical), some research suggests men and women have different levels of these ambition types. On the one hand, women are expected to have higher levels of horizontal ambition than men. Evidence for this was found in two studies. To start off Turner (1964) suggested women to seek more intrinsic satisfactions from their profession and education than men, which would be at the base of their ambition. Similarly a qualitative study by Dyke and Murphy (2006) on career success suggested that women focus in their career more on balance in a more personal, multidimensional definition and relationships. Considering the suggestions of these two studies overlap with the definition of horizontal ambition in terms of being rewarded in self-development, it is expected women score higher on horizontal ambition than men. On the other hand, men are expected to have higher levels of vertical ambition than women. This is being supported by two studies. Firstly, Dyke and Murphy (2006) suggested that men focus

more on material success. Secondly, Horsten (2018) found men score higher on extrinsic career success (i.e. focused on promotion and money) than women. This is argued by the author to be caused partially by men being more vertically ambitious, since this is associated with promotion and money. Taken together the findings of these two studies, it is suggested that men score higher on vertical ambition. However, so far little research has differentiated between vertical- and horizontal ambition to empirically investigate whether there are gender differences.

Research on basic values might also speak to gender differences in ambition. Schwartz (1992) defined basic values as: “*broad, transsituational goals that vary in importance as guiding principles in life.*” In comparison, ambition is specifically work-related and basic values are more broad, but there is overlap in terms of guiding behaviour. On the one hand, Schwartz & Rubel-Lifschitz, (2009) suggested that basic values of women consisted of benevolence (i.e. kindness) and universalism. This supports women to be horizontal ambitious. On the other hand men value power, achievement and stimulation more, which supports men to be vertical ambition.

Overall, there is research suggesting women and men differ in their levels on vertical- and horizontal ambition. By measuring gender with multiple ambition-scales, this thesis researches whether having more vertical- or horizontal items included relates to certain gender differences. In respect to literature suggesting men are more vertically ambitious and women are more horizontally ambitious, (Dyke & Murphy, 2006; Horsten, 2018; Tuner, 1964), gender differences might be determined by the majority vertical- or horizontal items in a scale (e.g. including more vertical items results in men being more ambitious). However to draw further conclusions on this, more research is necessary.

#### **Unidimensional scales vs. two-dimensional scale (HVA-Q)**

There are various known unidimensional scales for ambition. Most of the items of these scales associate ambition with status, power, promotion and money. Therefore, according to our judgement these items focus on vertical ambition and leave horizontal ambition out of the picture. However there are also unidimensional scales (e.g. Career Ambition Scale [CAS] by Dikkers et al., 2010) of which we would categorize some items as vertical and other items as horizontal. The Kortekaas-Mertens (2018), argued that scales such as the CAS could be measuring two different constructs of ambition which cancel each other out (and thus possible relations with gender) in terms of null-results. To illustrate, if a worker has a high score on horizontal ambition and a low score on vertical ambition this person might end up with a medium level of ambition.

Taken together, there is an increasing amount of literature suggesting horizontal ambition cannot be left out as an additional dimension to vertical ambition (Benschop et al., 2013; Larimer et al., 2007; Sools et al., 2007). To further investigate this, the current study will use both, unidimensional measures, and the HVA-Q (i.e. two-dimensional measure). In this way we can look at how these unidimensional scales relate to vertical- or horizontal ambition of the HVA-Q.

**Convergent validity.** Convergent validity means that two scales measure similar constructs (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). In the current study we investigate the convergent validity (via Pearson correlations) of each of the unidimensional measures (Table 1), and respectively the horizontal- and vertical ambition constructs of the HVA-Q. This enables us to investigate whether unidimensional scales measure only vertical- or also horizontal ambition.

**Included unidimensional measures.** The current study found eight unidimensional measures on ambition in our literature research. Five of them were included based on the following criteria: (1) acceptable internal consistency (i.e. Cronbach's alpha's), and (2) their



applicability to the Dutch working population (several scales only applied to managerial functions [Vianen, 1999], female students [O'Brien, 1996] or teenagers [Ashby & Schoon, 2010]). The included measures can be seen in Table 1, as well as why they were included (i.e. internal consistency) and what our expectations are regarding gender differences. The items of these five included measures can be found in Appendix A.

Furthermore, we will categorize the items of the unidimensional measures into horizontal- and vertical ambition. Hereby we will use the definitions of the HVA-Q (Van Osch & Schaveling, in progress). This enables us to investigate whether women score higher on horizontal items and men score higher on vertical items, or whether there are no gender differences. Justification for these particular categorizations of the items can be found in the method section.

### **Research question**

Taken together, the current thesis investigates two things. Firstly, we will investigate whether male- and female workers differ in their levels on vertical- and horizontal ambition. Secondly, we will research the relationships between unidimensional measures of ambition and a two-dimensional measure of ambition (HVA-Q).

**Table 1.** Overview of unidimensional measures including characteristics and predictions.

Name scale	n items	Response format	Example item	Cronbach's alpha's	Reference	Expectations
Desire for Success Scale (DSF)	1	1 (totally disagree) – 7 (totally agree)	GQ: I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.	Not applicable	Hansson, Hogan, Johnson & Schroeder, 1983	F = M
Career Ambition Scale (CAS)	9	1 (I do not agree at all) – 7 (I very much agree)	HA: A career is important for my self-actualization and self-development VA: In my work, I want to attain the top	0.88	Dikkers, van Engen & Vinkenburg, 2010	F = M
Career Advancement Ambition Scale (CAAS)	4	1 (totally disagree) – 5 (totally agree)	VA: How important is it that you move up in your present firm?	0.90	Desrochers & Dahir, 2000	F < M
Career Levels Advancement Scale (CLAS)	1	1 (0 levels), 2 (1 level), 3 (2 levels), 4 (3 levels), 5 (more levels)	VA: How many levels do you want to move up from your current position?	Not applicable	Judge & Locke, 1992	F < M
Ambitious Career Model (ACM)	5	1 (completely disagree) – 5 (completely agree)	VA: I want a job in which I can get promotion	0.83	Elchardus & Smits 2008	F < M

*Note.* HA = horizontal ambition, VA = vertical ambition, GQ = general question, F = female worker, M = male worker. The reported Cronbach's alpha's are from former research. The expectations entail an approximation based on the items being vertical and horizontal.

## Hypotheses

**Hypotheses concerning gender differences.** Scientific research found men focus more on material success, and women more on balance in a more personal, multidimensional definition and relationships (Dyke & Murphy, 2006). The former comprehends more with vertical ambition (i.e. status, power, promotion and money) and the latter with horizontal ambition (i.e. self-development, gaining expertise and attaining communal goals).

Considering this we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: Male workers score higher than female workers on items measuring vertical ambition. This counts for the following items: the vertical-subscale of the HVA-Q, 1,2,5 and 7 of the Career Ambition scale, 2 and 4 of the Career Advancement Ambition Scale, 1 of the Career Levels Advancement Scale and 4 of the Ambitious Career Model.

Hypothesis 2: Female workers score higher than male workers on items measuring horizontal ambition. This counts for the following items: the horizontal-subscale of the HVA-Q and 3 and 6 of the Career Ambition scale.

**Hypotheses concerning correlations between constructs measuring ambition.** The other hypotheses are built on theory arguing ambition should be distinguished into two types: horizontal and vertical ambition (Benschop et al., 2013; Larimer et al., 2007; Van Osch & Schaveling, in progress; Sools et al., 2007). We can discuss the convergent validity by looking at the correlations between unidimensional scales and the two subscales of the HVA-Q. Thereby we want to investigate whether unidimensional scales only measure vertical-ambition or horizontal ambition as well.

According to our judgement all of the items of the Career Advancement Ambition Scale (Desrochers & Dahir, 2000), the Career Levels Advancement Scale (Judge & Locke,

1992) and the Ambition Career Model (Elchardus & Smits, 2008) are vertical. Therefore, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

Hypothesis 3: The Career Advancement Ambition Scale, the Career Levels Advancement Scale and the Ambition Career Model will be correlated positively with vertical ambition of the HVA-Q.

Because, according to our judgement, the Career Ambition Scale (Dikkers et al., 2010) has items on both, horizontal- and vertical ambition, and the Desire for success measure (Hansson et al., 1983) is a single-item measure which asks a general question open for interpretation, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

Hypothesis 4: The Career Ambition Scale and the Desire for Success measure will be correlated positively with both, vertical and horizontal ambition of the HVA-Q.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

Considering the current study conducted two types of analyses (i.e. one-way ANOVA, Pearson correlation), the needed amount of participants was based on power computations which needed the biggest sample size. This was the case for the one-way ANOVA, comparing two independent groups. The current research strived for at least 139 participants for both groups (i.e. female and male) to be able to detect small-medium effect size (Cohen's  $d$ ) of  $d = 0.3$ , with the power of .80 % and an alpha level of 0.05. A few exclusion criteria were set up in advance, in order to clean the data. Considering the HVA-Q measures ambition among working people, the criteria take into account occupational matters. Exclusion criteria were (1) participants should be currently employed (part-time/full-time), (2) participants should be Dutch speaking in order to limit measuring variance arising from cultural differences, and (3) participants should identify as male or female. The initial dataset existed out of 681. Firstly participants with missing values were excluded ( $n = 279$ ).

Secondly people who indicated to have a side-job ( $n = 31$ ). Lastly people who indicated 'other' as their gender ( $n = 2$ ). The final sample consisted out of Dutch employees ( $N = 369$ ; 167 male, 202 female). The average hours a participant worked per week was  $M_{hours} = 33$ ,  $SD = 9.46$ . This latter was needed for the control variable, which will be explained later on in the method section.

### **Procedure**

The participants were approached to fill in an online questionnaire via Facebook, LinkedIn, various companies and relatives. The full questionnaire in Dutch can be found in Appendix C. Firstly participants were briefed about the requirements to participate and had to accept an informed consent. Subsequently the scales (i.e. the five unidimensional measures and the HVA-Q; Appendix A & B respectively) were presented in a randomized order. The questionnaire asked for their gender, whether occupying a full-time, part-time job or side-job and how many hours they work per week according to their contract. At the end of the questionnaire participants were debriefed about the purpose of the study, and given the opportunity for questions or remarks.

### **Measures**

All the measures were tested on their reliability via Cronbach's alpha, therefore we used the guideline of an acceptable alpha between .70 and .95. (DeVellis, 2016; Bland & Altman, 1997; Nunnally, 1994). Furthermore factor analyses were conducted. Hereby we used the guideline of a minimal factor loading of .40 (Wille, 1996, pp.25-26).

**Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire (HVA-Q).** The HVA-Q (Van Osch & Schaveling, in progress) measures horizontal – and vertical ambition. The questionnaire entailed 14 items for horizontal ambition (e.g. "My goal is to contribute to the development of others.") and 16 for vertical ambition (e.g. "I spend a great deal of energy on securing a promotion."), which made use of a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7

= completely agree; see Appendix B for all items). The current thesis found a sufficient reliability, for both, vertical- and horizontal ambition. The reliability alpha's were:  $\alpha = .95$  and  $\alpha = .89$ , respectively. A factor analysis was conducted with all the 30 items for ambition of the HVA-Q. Four factors were indicated with an Eigenvalue over 1. The first factor explained 32% of the variance, the second 19%, the third 5% and the fourth 4%. The scree plot indicated a cut-off after 2 factors. A pattern matrix suggested that all vertical items loaded on factor 1, with a factor loading of at least .40. (between .625 and .756). Twelve items of the horizontal scale loaded on factor 2 with at least a factor loading of .40 (between .466 and .710). Lastly one item of the horizontal scale loaded on factor 1 (.513) which was unexpected, and factor 2 (.389). Therefore this item ("*I am mostly focused on developing myself.*") was excluded from the data analyses. Overall the factor analysis proved that the scale is two-dimensional.

**Unidimensional measures.** The Career Ambition Scale by Dikkers et al., (2010) has nine items measuring work-related ambition. To our judgement, it has items which can be associated with vertical (e.g. "In my work, I want to attain the top") and items which can be associated with horizontal ambition (e.g. "A career is important for my self-actualization and self-development"). Participants answer items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree; 5 = totally agree). However the version used by (Coffeng, 2016) to analyse a sample of 212 Dutch working parents has adjusted this to a 7-point Likert scale. <sup>1</sup>This scale will be used in the current study (1 = totally disagree; 5 = totally agree). The reliability found by the current thesis was  $\alpha = .89$ . A factor analysis was conducted with 8 items for ambition on the CAS. Two factors were indicated with an Eigenvalue over 1. The first factor explained 57% of the variance and the second 13%. The scree plot indicated a cut-off after 1 factor. The pattern

---

<sup>1</sup>Due to a human error, item 9 of the Career Ambition Scale got excluded from the questionnaire that was distributed.

matrix suggested that 7 items of the ambition scale loaded on the first factor (this was between .577 and .863). This proved that the scale is unidimensional.

The Career Advancement Ambition Scale by Desrochers and Dahir (2000) has four items. The measure asks general questions such as “How important is it that you succeed in your present firm?”, and also more vertical questions (e.g. “How important is it that you move up in your present firm?”). Ambition is approached as a motivational factor to achieve in one’s profession. The current research will follow former research from Zoonen and Treem (2019) by using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). They had a sample of 430 Dutch employees. The current research found a sufficient reliability of  $\alpha = .69$ . A factor analysis was conducted with 4 items for ambition on the CAAS. Two factors were indicated with an Eigenvalue over 1. The first factor explained 52% of the variance and the second 28%. The scree plot indicated a cut-off after two factors. The pattern matrix suggested that 2 items of the ambition scale loaded on the first factor (these scores were .771 and .785) and 2 items had a loading on both factors. This proves this scale is two-dimensional.

The Desire for Success Scale by Hansson, Hogan, Johnson and Schroeder (1983) is a single-item measure (i.e. “I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.”). This measurement approaches ambition as a personality trait (i.e. Type A behaviour). The score on this measure depends on the participant’s association with ambition, so this might be both vertical- or horizontal ambition. The item response format is a seven-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree, 7 = totally agree).

The Career Levels Advancement Scale by Judge and Locke (1992) is also a single-item measure (i.e. “How many levels do you want to move up from your current position?”). Considering this item asks for the amount of promotions wanted, we categorized it as vertical ambition. The current research will use the same response format as the original scale (1 = 1 levels, 2 = 1 level, 3 = 2 levels, 4 = 3 levels, 5 = more levels).

The Ambitious Career Model by Elchardus and Smits (2008) has five items. Some of these items focus on promotion (e.g. I want a job in which I can get promotion) and some more are more general (e.g. I have lots of plans for my professional future). Hereby it includes items which tap into more vertical ambition, and items with leave room for interpretation whether vertical or horizontal. Participants answer items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 5 = completely agree). Elchardus and Smits reported they used the scale earlier on 4666 Belgian employees. The current research found a reliability of  $\alpha = .85$ . A factor analysis was conducted with 5 items for ambition on the ACM. One factor was indicated with an Eigenvalue over 1. This factor explained 63% of the variance. The scree plot indicated a cut-off after 1 factor. The pattern matrix suggested that 5 items of the ambition scale loaded on the first factor (these scores were between .740 and .840). This proves this scale is unidimensional.

Bearing in mind the target audience consists out of Dutch employees, all the questionnaires of the current thesis had to be in Dutch. With exception for the Career Ambition Scale (Dijkers et al., 2010) and the HVA-Q which already had a Dutch version, the rest had to be back-translated. This process entails English questions to be translated in Dutch and back again into English, in order to check whether the Dutch translation avoids errors. This was done by 5 authors who all wrote a separate thesis on the HVA-Q. Inconsistencies were resolved in the discussion.

**Control variable.** According to Benschop, et al., (2013) women who work part-time are seen as less ambitious compared to women who work full-time. Furthermore, former research suggested part-time workers are less ambitious than full-time workers (Dick & Hyde, 2006; Mescher, 2011). Taking this into account we added the amount of hours per week someone has to work as a control variable. The questionnaire asked whether people worked part-time, full-time or had a side-job, and additionally the amount of working hours



per week according to their contract. People who indicated to have a side-job were excluded and subsequently the amount of hours per week was added a continuous variable. This is the control variable.

### **Analysis plan**

To test the hypotheses multiple statistical analyses were conducted via SPSS. Firstly, in order to test H1, we ran one-way ANOVA's with gender as a predictor and all vertical items as dependents. Similarly to test H2, we ran one-way ANOVA's with gender as a predictor and all horizontal items as dependents.

Secondly, to examine whether unidimensional measures were related to the HVA-Q we computed Pearson correlations (H3 & H4). Every unidimensional measure has been tested on correlations with both the horizontal- and vertical ambition component of the HVA-Q. This enabled us to investigate the convergent validity. In other words, whether the different measures measured the same type of ambition. Correlations in general can be divided over a small-, medium-, large-, and very large effect, respectively  $r = .10; .20; .30; .40$  (Funder & Ozer, 2019). Considering no other known scientific research to us has investigated the convergent validity of two ambition measures by looking at correlations, we based our correlation cut-off on research about a similar topic. London and Noe (1997) reported in their study on career motivation, correlations between two measures of .46 and .44 as a sign of high convergent validity. Based on this, we set a correlation of .40 as our cut-off point for high convergent validity.

### **Results**

Prior to the statistical analyses we excluded participants as described in the method section. Furthermore one item (i.e. item 5) of the Career Ambition Scale (Dikkers et al., 2010) was recoded for being asked reversed. Finally, to compare scales with a different amount of items the mean score for each scale was calculated. These mean scores were used

in the correlation analyses. For all the analyses conducted, SPSS was used and an alpha level of 0.05 was applied, unless otherwise stated. Prior to analysing the data, the statistical assumption of normality has been investigated by looking at the Q-Q plots for normality. All the items were checked separately (Garson, 2012), and no violations were found. Table 2 shows an overview of the results on the one-way ANOVA's, and also gives the effect size in eta squared. We will interpret the effect sizes with the standards of Cohen (1988, p. 280-287), which goes from small, medium to large, .01, .06, and .14, respectively. Furthermore, Table 3 shows the correlation matrix.

### **Statistical analysis**

#### **Difference in ambition between male- and female workers.**

*Vertical ambition.* We ran multiple one-way ANOVA's with gender as predictor and vertical ambition as dependent variable. As can be seen in Table 2, most tests revealed that men score higher on vertical ambition than women. Male workers scored significantly higher on the vertical ambition subscale of the HVA-Q, and items 1,2 & 7 of the CAS, and item 4 of the ACM, confirming H1. The effects sizes of these items were small to medium, with the exception of item 7 of the CAS which had a medium to large effect size. For the remaining items no significant differences were found: 5 of the CAS, 2 and 4 of the CAAS and 1 of the CLAS. Overall H1 is partially confirmed. <sup>2</sup>Controlling for the number of working hours per week did not affect the results.

*Horizontal ambition.* We ran multiple one-way ANOVA's with gender as predictor and horizontal ambition as dependent variable. As can be seen in Table 2, the horizontal subscale of the HVA-Q revealed no gender differences. We did observe a significant effect of gender on items 3 and 6 of the CAS, however opposite to our hypothesis, men scored higher on these items. The effects sizes of these findings were small to medium. Taken together, the

---

<sup>2</sup> The control variable 'working hours per week' did not affect any of the analyses of the ambition scales with gender as a predictor.

data does not support H2. Controlling for the number of working hours per week did not affect the results.

**Correlations between various constructs measuring ambition.** To test whether the different scales measured the same type of ambition (i.e. convergent validity) various Pearson correlation analyses were conducted. What we see is that all scales are correlated to each other to a certain extent. However, as suggested by former research (London & Noe, 1997) a cut-off point of .40 was a priori applied as a minimum correlation. A correlation matrix with the results can be found in Table 3.

**Vertical ambition.** The correlation analyses revealed that the vertical component of ambition of the HVA-Q was positively related to the CAAS, CLAS and ACM, confirming H3. However, worth mentioning is that the ACM was also positively correlated with the horizontal component.

**Vertical- and horizontal ambition.** The correlation analysis revealed that both, the vertical- and horizontal component of the HVA-Q correlated positively with the CAS. However, the DFS was only sufficiently correlated with vertical ambition. Taken together these findings partially confirm H4.

**Table 2.** ANOVA

	Men <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Women <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>F</i> ( <i>df</i> )	$\eta^2$
<b>Vertical items</b>				
HVA-Q vertical ambition	3.69 (1.18)	3.11 (1.17)	$F(1,365) = 21.67^{**}$	.056
CAS_1	4.50 (1.87)	3.93 (1.81)	$F(1,367) = 8.69^*$	.023
CAS_2	4.87 (1.73)	4.44 (1.93)	$F(1,367) = 5.06^*$	.014
CAS_5	5.34 (1.94)	4.05 (1.83)	$F(1,367) = 2.11$	.006
CAS_7	4.26 (1.85)	3.23 (1.86)	$F(1,367) = 28.28^{**}$	.072
CAAS_2	2.83 (1.26)	2.52 (1.14)	$F(1,367) = 6.04$	.016
CAAS_4	3.17 (1.21)	2.95 (1.29)	$F(1,367) = 2.88$	.001
CLAS_1	2.52 (1.32)	2.33 (1.13)	$F(1,367) = 2.33$	.006
ACM_4	3.25 (1.25)	2.76 (1.30)	$F(1,367) = 13.73^{**}$	.036
<b>Horizontal items</b>				
HVA-Q horizontal ambition	5.1 (.74)	5.14 (.68)	$F(1,367) = .37$	.001
CAS_3	5.89 (.86)	5.64 (1.14)	$F(1,367) = 5.40^*$	.014
CAS_6	5.36 (1.30)	4.87 (1.68)	$F(1,367) = 9.57^*$	.025
<b>Average score on scale</b>				
CAS	4.84 (.94)	4.38 (1.06)	$F(1,367) = 19.07^*$	.049
CAAS	3.45 (.81)	3.31 (.77)	$F(1,367) = 2.98$	.008
ACM	3.75 (.84)	3.47 (.89)	$F(1,367) = 9.42^*$	.025
Horizontal + Vertical ambition	4.57 (.059)	4.30 (.054)	$F(1,367) = 11.54^*$	.031
HVA-Q				

*Note.* HVA-Q = Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire; CAS = Career Ambition Scale; CAAS = Career Advancement Ambition Scale; CLAS = Career Levels Advancement Scale; ACM = Ambitious Career Model; DFS = Desire for Success scale

\*  $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

**Table 3.** Correlation matrix

	<i>M(sd)</i>	HVA-Q Vertical ambition	HVA-Q Horizontal ambition	CLAS	DFS	CAS	CAAS	ACM	Hours worked per week
<b>HVA-Q Vertical ambition</b>	3.38 (3.38)	1							
<b>HVA-Q Horizontal ambition</b>	5.12 (.71)	.185*	1						
<b>CLAS</b>	2.41 (1.22)	.490*	.222**	1					
<b>DFS</b>	4.59 (1.56)	.589*	.380**	.375**	1				
<b>CAS</b>	4.56 (1.03)	.637*	.462**	.546**	.637**	1			
<b>CAAS</b>	3.37 (.79)	.505*	.283**	.470**	.448**	.606**	1		
<b>ACM</b>	3.60 (.88)	.582*	.447**	.599**	.599**	.814**	.602**	1	
<b>Hours worked per week</b>	33 (9.46)	.119*	.085*	.032	.115*	.230**	.271**	.212**	1

*Note.* \*\*. Correlation is significant at an alpha of .01 (2-tailed)

\*. Correlation is significant at alpha of .05 (2-tailed)

HVA-Q = Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire; CAS = Career Ambition Scale; CAAS = Career Advancement Ambition Scale; CLAS = Career Levels Advancement Scale; ACM = Ambitious Career Model; DFS = Desire for Success scale;

## Discussion

We set out to study gender differences in ambition as a construct with two dimensions. Hereby we used the dimensions vertical- (i.e. focused on status, power, promotion and money) and horizontal (i.e. focused on self-development, gaining expertise and gaining communal goals) ambition, as suggested by former research (Van Osch & Schaveling, in progress). By measuring with both, unidimensional scales and a two-dimensional scale (Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire) we attempted to investigate two things. Firstly, whether men and women differ in their levels of vertical- and horizontal ambition (H1 & H2). Secondly, whether these scales measure the same construct (i.e. ambition) (H3 & H4).

### Findings on gender differences

The results indicate that men score significantly higher on the vertical ambition component of the HVA-Q and the majority of the vertical items of the unidimensional scales than women. This is in line with H1. This confirms findings of former research (Dyke and Murphy, 2006; Horsten, 2008) where men score higher on extrinsic career success (i.e. focused on promotion and money), which could be caused by men being more vertically ambitious.

Our data did not confirm H2. In fact, results were mixed. The horizontal ambition component of the HVA-Q (which consists of 14 items in total) indicated that there were no significant differences regarding gender. Surprisingly, two individual horizontal items of unidimensional scales indicated an opposite effect (i.e. men score higher than women on these items) to what we expected. At the moment we don't have a clear explanation for this latter result.

### Findings on convergent validity

The data revealed that the majority of the unidimensional scales merely measure vertical ambition. The results show us that various scales (i.e. CAAS, CLAS, ACM) correlate strongly with the vertical ambition component of the HVA-Q, which was in line with H3. However, notable is that the ACM is also strongly correlated with the horizontal component of the HVA-Q. Nevertheless, as earlier described in the method section, the factor analysis proved the scale is unidimensional, which means this scale also measures only vertical ambition.

Furthermore, in the factor analysis for the CAAS was found that two constructs were measured. However, This scale only correlates with vertical- and not with horizontal ambition. Therefore we assume the CAAS measures another construct in addition to vertical ambition which has not been taken into account in the current thesis.

Additionally, the data revealed that the CAS correlated strongly with both, the horizontal- and the vertical component of the HVA-Q. This was in line with our expectation on H4. This implies that this measure is strongly related (i.e. high convergent validity) with both components of the HVA-Q. However, a factor analysis proved that the CAS is a unidimensional scale. Therefore, the strong correlation with both types of ambition cannot be interpreted as a sign of a two-dimensional scale.

Lastly, opposite to our expectations in H4, is that the DFS (i.e. “I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.”) only correlated strongly with the vertical component of the HVA-Q. A priori, we categorized this question as open for interpretation whether measuring vertical- or horizontal ambition. This is because it depends on how a participant defines success. However, with hindsight this question might be focused too much on power, in order to correlate strongly with the horizontal component as well.

### **Implications**

Overall there are two main findings on gender differences: (1) Men are more vertically ambitious than women, and (2) men and women are equally horizontally ambitious. In the case of unidimensional scales this means gender differences might be determined by whether the majority of the items measure vertical- or horizontal ambition. To illustrate, in Table 2 we see that on the CAS and ACM men score on average significantly higher than women. However if we look at the items of these scales separately, not all of the items indicate a significant gender difference. Similarly, if we look at the combined scores of the horizontal- and vertical ambition subscales of the HVA-Q (i.e. referred to as: Horizontal + Vertical ambition HVA-Q) in Table 2, men have a higher score than women. However, when looking at the two components separately, men only have a higher score on vertical ambition and for horizontal ambition there is no gender difference. Concluding, in order to make the ambition levels of both, men and women correctly visible, ambition needs to be measured in a two-dimensional way. This would do more justice to people scoring high on horizontal ambition. Subsequently this helps female employees to not be overshadowed by unidimensional scales which measure merely vertical ambition (and thereby giving male employees an advantage to score higher on ambition).

This distinction between two types of ambition is important to take into account when research looks further into gender differences in ambition. Replicating former research which found men are more ambitious than women (Blyweert, 2014; Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012; Vianen & Keizer, 1996), might lead to different results by measuring in a two-dimensional way. Considering science affects the public opinion, creating awareness on such topics, might help people to replace the stereotype of men being the ambitious gender (Eagly et al., 2019; Kichmeyer, 1992; 2002; 2006; Larimer et al., 2007) with new insights on how men and women differ in how their ambition is being expressed.



Furthermore, looking at the results there are two important findings regarding the convergent validity. Firstly, the majority of the unidimensional scales are related to vertical ambition of the HVA-Q (H3). This confirmed our expectation of unidimensional scales measuring mostly vertical ambition. Secondly, we found some of the unidimensional scales are strongly related to both vertical- and horizontal ambition (H4), however the factor analyses show none of the unidimensional scales of ambition had a second dimension. Therefore, these unidimensional scales measure only vertical ambition and not horizontal ambition. Taking this into account, the most adequate scale should be selected with care before measuring someone's ambition. With regards to our findings on gender differences, measuring ambition with the two-dimensional HVA-Q, does more justice to female employees than measuring with the investigated unidimensional scales.

### **Evaluation of the study**

**Strengths.** One strength of the study was the large sample in which both working men and women were represented equally. This was necessary to investigate gender differences. There were a sufficient amount of participants to achieve a power of .80. Furthermore, the study reduced noise in the dataset via several ways. Firstly, by excluding people with a side-job and only including people who indicated to have a part-time or full-time job. This is because in general people with a side-job do not have the ambition to grow further in that particular organization. Secondly, by only including Dutch speaking workers, it reduced possible noise coming from cultural differences. Lastly, the questionnaires which were for the most in English have been translated carefully into Dutch via a back-translated process.

**Limitations and future directions.** The current research suggests differences between men and women in ambition do exist to a certain extent (i.e. men are more vertically ambitious). However, the reader should bear in mind that the study is limited to data which only reflects a particular point in time. Scientific research indicates the roles of men and

women are becoming more equal (Burkhauser & Holden, 2013). Taking this into account, ambition might be a dynamic process which changes over time. Verstraeten (2017) argued that the responsibility to earn money as well as status for the family is becoming increasingly equal distributed over men and women. This is due to two gender role changes. Firstly, there is an increase in women who are working full-time, and secondly, there is an increase in stay-at-home-dads. Therefore, vertical ambition might increase for women, since they seem to be increasingly working full-time. In addition to this, vertical ambition for men might decrease, since there is also a decrease in their responsibility (e.g. money, status). Lastly, men have more time to explore their horizontal ambition as stay-at-home-dads.

Further research on this, might explore how gender differences between horizontal- and vertical ambition in society develop over time. Investigating this over a long time span, in a longitudinally study could give us more insight in whether gender differences among ambition is something that is inborn or determined by society. This might help us understand why research finds men are more vertically ambitious, and whether this is shifting along with the gender roles becoming more equal.

Another limitation of the current research is that measuring actual gender differences in ambition might be affected by the stereotype of men being the more ambitious gender (Eagly et al., 2019, Kirchmeyer, 1998; 2002; 2006, Larimer et al., 2007). We do not know whether this image is based on vertical-, horizontal, or both types of ambition. A suggestion is given by Eagly et al., (2019). In their study the stereotype of ambition is associated to one's own mastery and own goal attainment. Considering this individualistic focus, it would be more in line with vertical- than horizontal ambition. Therefore, our suggestion is that this stereotype is being associated with a more vertical- than a horizontal- version of ambition.

Future research on perceptions that makes a similar distinction between vertical- and horizontal ambition as in the HVA-Q, might help us to understand what the foundation is of

men being perceived as the more ambitious gender. This helps our society to overcome women being disadvantaged (e.g. suppressed from working in the top of organizations, Eagly et al., 2019) due to this stereotype.

Furthermore the current research has two practical limitations. Firstly a small group of participants indicated in the remarks of the questionnaire that not all the items were applicable on their occupation. Various scales focusing on vertical ambition, seem to ask for promotion. CEO's, teachers and entrepreneurs indicated to struggle with these kind of questions, because of not having the promotion opportunities. This might explain partly why there was a relatively big drop-out in our data-set due to incomplete questionnaires.

Secondly, the unidimensional scales have been categorized into horizontal- or vertical ambition by one author only. Involving more independent raters to categorize the items might have helped to set up stronger hypotheses on specific items.

### **Conclusion**

The aim of the present research was to examine whether female- and male workers differ in ambition. For this we used various scales, of which one (i.e. HVA-Q) made a distinction between vertical- (i.e. focused on status, power, promotion and money) and horizontal (i.e. focused on self-development, gaining expertise and gaining communal goals) ambition. Findings of this scale suggest that men are more vertically ambitious, and men and women are equally horizontally ambitious.

The current research also suggests that unidimensional scales of ambition are only related to vertical ambition and thereby leave horizontal ambition out of the picture. Considering this, measuring ambition with the two dimensions of the HVA-Q does more justice to the female employee.

## References

- Ashby, J. S., & Schoon, I. (2010). Career success: The role of teenage career aspirations, ambition value and gender in predicting adult social status and earnings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 350-360. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.006
- Bender, K. A., Donohue, S. M., & Heywood, J. S. (2005). Job satisfaction and gender segregation. *Oxford economic papers*, 57(3), 479-496. doi:10.1093/oep/gpi015
- Benschop, Y., van den Brink, M., Doorewaard, H., & Leenders, J. (2013). Discourses of ambition, gender and part-time work. *human relations*, 66(5), 699-723. doi:10.1177/0018726712466574
- Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1997). Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *British Medical Journal*, 314(7080), 572. doi:10.1136/bmj.314.7080.572
- Blyweert, V. (2014) Ambitie: Vloek of zegen? Onderzoek naar de relatie tussen ambitie en werk-privé balans. (*Master's thesis*)
- Burkhauser, R. V., & Holden, K. C. (Eds.). (2013). *A challenge to Social Security: The changing roles of women and men in American society*. Elsevier. doi:10.2307/3323341
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2), 81. doi:10.1037/h0046016
- Coffeng, T. (2016). Bevlogen in Balans: Ondersteunend leiderschapsgedrag in relatie tot prestatie, ambitie en carrièretevredenheid (*Master's thesis*).
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768783

- Desrochers, S., & Dahir, V. (2000). Ambition as a motivational basis of organizational and professional commitment: Preliminary analysis of a proposed career advancement ambition scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 91*(2), 563-570.  
doi:10.2466/pms.2000.91.2.563
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.
- Dick, P., & Hyde, R. (2006). Consent as resistance, resistance as consent: Re-reading part-time professionals' acceptance of their marginal positions. *Gender, Work & Organization, 13*(6), 543-564. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2006.00322.x
- Van Dijk, H., & van Engen, M. L. (2019). The flywheel effect of gender role expectations in diverse work groups. *Frontiers in psychology, 10*, 976.  
doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00976
- Dijkers, J., van Engen, M., & Vinkenburgh, C. (2010). Flexible work: ambitious parents' recipe for career success in The Netherlands. *Career Development International, 15*(6), 562-582. doi:10.1108/13620431011084411
- Dyke, L. S., & Murphy, S. A. (2006). How we define success: A qualitative study of what matters most to women and men. *Sex Roles, 55*(5-6), 357-371.  
doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9091-2
- Eagly, A. H., Nater, C., Miller, D. I., Kaufmann, M., & Sczesny, S. (2019). Gender stereotypes have changed: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of US public opinion polls from 1946 to 2018. *American Psychologist*. doi:10.1037/amp0000494
- Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 2*(2), 156-168. doi:10.1177/2515245919847202

- Garson, G. D. (2012). *Testing statistical assumptions*. Statistical Publishing Associates, Asheboro, NC
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st century: Preference theory*. OUp Oxford.
- Hansson, R. O., Hogan, R., Johnson, J. A., & Schroeder, D. (1983). Disentangling Type A behavior: The roles of ambition, insensitivity, and anxiety. *Journal of Research in Personality, 17*(2), 186-197. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(83)90030-2
- Horsten, B. E. M. (2018). The gender diverse roads to career success; The influence of ambition and personal expectations on men and women's career success. (Unpublished master's thesis). *Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands*.
- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). On the value of aiming high: The causes and consequences of ambition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(4), 758. doi:0.1037/a0028084
- Judge, T. A., & Locke, E. A. (1993). Effect of dysfunctional thought processes on subjective well-being and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(3), 475. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.475
- London, M., & Noe, R. A. (1997). London's career motivation theory: An update on measurement and research. *Journal of Career Assessment, 5*(1), 61-80. doi:10.1177/106907279700500105
- Nunnally, J. C. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- O'Brien, K. M. (1996). The influence of psychological separation and parental attachment on the career development of adolescent women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*(3), 257-274. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1996.0024

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
- Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel-Lifschitz, T. (2009). Cross-national variation in the size of sex differences in values: Effects of gender equality. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 97*(1), 171. doi:10.1037/a0015546
- Sheridan, A. (2004). Chronic presenteeism: The multiple dimensions to men's absence from part-time work. *Gender, Work & Organization, 11*(2), 207-225. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00229.x
- Sools, A. M., Van Engen, M. L., & Baerveldt, C. (2007). Gendered career-making practices: On doing ambition or how managers discursively position themselves in a multinational corporation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*(3), 413-435. doi:10.1348/096317906X119558
- Turner, R. H. (1964). Some aspects of women's ambition. *American Journal of Sociology, 70*(3), 271-285. doi:10.1086/223839
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1998). Determinants of managerial career success: evidence and explanation of male/female differences. *Journal of Management, 24*, 673-92. doi:10.1177/014920639802400601

- Kirchmeyer, C. (2002). Gender differences in managerial careers: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37, 5-24. doi:10.1023/A:1014721900246
- Kirchmeyer, C. (2006). The different effects of family on objective career success across gender: a test of alternative explanations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 323-46. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.05.002
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 616. doi:10.1037/a0023557
- Kortekaas-Mertens, F. (2018). Measuring Work Ambition: The Development of the Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire (Unpublished master's thesis). *Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands*.
- Larimer, C. W., Hannagan, R. J., & Smith, K. B. (2007). Balancing ambition and gender among decision makers. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 614(1), 56-73. doi:10.1177/0002716207305272
- De Pater, I. E., Van Vianen, A. E., & Bechtoldt, M. N. (2010). Gender differences in job challenge: A matter of task allocation. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(4), 433-453. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00477.x
- Verstraeten, R. C. E. (2017). Ambition as a two sided sword: Two types of ambition in order to get a better picture of gender differences in ambition (Unpublished master thesis). *Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands*.
- Van Vianen, A. E. (1999). Managerial Self-Efficacy, Outcome Expectancies, and Work-Role Salience as Determinants of Ambition for a Managerial Position. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(3), 639-665. doi:j.1559-1816.1999.tb01406.x



- Van Vianen, A. E., & Keizer, W. A. (1996). Gender differences in managerial intention. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 3(2), 103-114. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.1996.tb00051.x
- Wille, G. W. (1996). A stepwise procedure for the empirical assessment of latent variable models (Doctoral dissertation), *University of Port Elizabeth, Port Elizabeth, South Africa*.
- Van Zoonen, W., & Treem, J. W. (2019). The role of organizational identification and the desire to succeed in employees' use of personal twitter accounts for work. *Computers in Human Behavior*. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2019.06.008

## Appendix A

**Career Ambition Scale (Dikkers, van Engen & Vinkenbunrg, 2010)**

(1 = I do not agree at all, 7 = I very much agree)

1. I want to achieve the highest possible level in my work.
2. I have the ambition to reach a higher position.
3. I like to be challenged in my work.
4. I am ambitious.
5. I am not really interested in achieving the highest possible levels at work (reversed).
6. A career is important for my self-actualization and self-development.
7. I would like to fulfill a top position.
8. I have set high goals for my career.
9. A career does not have priority in my life (reversed).

**Career Advancement Ambition Scale (Desrochers & Dahir, 2000)**

(1 = totally disagree; 5 = totally agree)

1. How important is it that you succeed in your present firm?
2. How important is it that you move up in your present firm?
3. How important is it that you succeed in your profession?
4. How important is it that you move up in your profession?

**Desire for Success Scale (Hansson, Hogan, Johnson & Schroeder, 1983)**

(1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree)

1. I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.

**Career Levels Advancement Scale (Judge & Locke, 1993)**

1 (0 levels), 2 (1 level), 3 (2 levels), 4 (3 levels), 5 (more levels)

1. How many levels do you want to move up from your current position?

**Ambitious Career Model (Elchardus & Smits, 2008)**

(1 = completely disagree, 5 = completely agree)

1. I have lots of plans for my professional future
2. I can describe myself as ambitious
3. Professionally I have a number of goals I definitely want to realize
4. I want a job in which I can get promotion
5. I think I will be able to realize a nice professional career.

## Appendix B

**Horizontal and Vertical Ambition Questionnaire** (Van Osch & Schaveling, in progress)

(1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree)

**Vertical ambition.**

1. I spend a great deal of energy on securing a promotion
2. My aim is to increase my income
3. My goal is to outperform my colleagues
4. It is my constant wish to earn more and more money
5. I want to move up in order to be seen
6. When I accept tasks, I give priority to tasks that increase my chances of promotion
7. My goal is to receive higher rewards than my colleagues
8. It is important for me to hold a position that is higher than the positions of others
9. My goal is to achieve the highest possible position
10. My aim is to achieve a higher position
11. My aim is to be in my manager's good books
12. I attach great value to obtaining the highest possible status
13. I find it important that others can see what I have achieved
14. I always make sure that my name is clearly connected to a successful project
15. If I perform better than others, I want this to be publicly known
16. I work hard so that I can ask for higher wages every year

**Horizontal ambition.**

17. I like working with others on achieving goals
18. I like to choose tasks in which I learn something new
19. I strive for inner growth
20. I invest in the further deepening of my knowledge

21. The contribution that I can make to an organization is an important motivator for me
22. When I see an opportunity to learn new skills, I seize it with both hands
23. My goal is to help the organization further develop
24. I strive to develop myself
25. I am mostly focused on developing myself
26. I prefer to focus on tasks in which I gain new knowledge
27. I like to choose challenging projects in which I learn something new
28. I am very happy when a project succeeds, regardless of whether a promotion is attached to it
29. My goal is to contribute to the development of others
30. My goal is to improve myself

## Appendix C

# Ambition Master Thesis Questionnaire

---

## Start of Block: Introduction

Intro Beste deelnemer,

Allereerst willen wij u bedanken voor uw deelname aan ons onderzoek. Voor onze masterscriptie aan Tilburg University doen wij onderzoek naar verschillende aspecten van het werk. Dit onderzoeken wij aan de hand van deze vragenlijst. Het duurt ongeveer 10 à 15 minuten om de vragenlijst in te vullen. Bovendien verloten wij onder alle deelnemers 1 Bol.com giftcard ter waarde van 25 euro.

In de vragenlijst wordt er gevraagd naar uw mening en/of ervaringen omtrent uw werk. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Wij verzoeken u de vragen eerlijk in te vullen.

Op de volgende pagina volgt meer informatie over deelname aan dit onderzoek.

Nogmaals dank voor uw deelname.

Lukas Brus  
Mon van den Nieuwenhof  
Manouk Slutter  
Silvia Szabo  
Merel van Rijckevorsel

## End of Block: Introduction

---

## Start of Block: Informed consent

Consent ***Onderzoek naar verschillende aspecten van het werk***

Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door de afdeling Sociale Psychologie aan Tilburg University. Het doel van deze studie is om te onderzoeken en kennis te vergaren over hoe mensen verschillende aspecten van het werk ervaren. Om dit te onderzoeken wordt een vragenlijst afgenomen.

### ***Deelname, voordelen en risico's***

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig. U heeft het recht zich op ieder moment terug te trekken van deelname aan het onderzoek. Als u wenst zich terug te trekken aan deelname van het onderzoek, kunt u simpelweg uw internetbrowser sluiten. De risico's van deelname aan het onderzoek zijn minimaal. Het is hoogst onwaarschijnlijk dat het beantwoorden van deze vragen u emotioneel of op andere wijze zal beïnvloeden.



Ik heb de  
wens om  
telkens meer  
te verdienen.  
(4)

Ik wil  
hogerop om  
gezien te  
worden. (5)

In het  
aannemen  
van taken  
geef ik  
prioriteit aan  
taken die de  
kans op  
promotie  
verhogen. (6)

Mijn doel is  
om een  
hogere  
beloning te  
ontvangen  
dan mijn  
collega's. (7)

Ik vind het  
belangrijk om  
een hogere  
positie te  
bekleden dan  
anderen. (8)

Mijn doel is  
om de hoogst  
mogelijke  
positie te  
behalen. (9)

Ik streef naar  
een hogere  
positie. (10)

Ik streef  
ernaar om in  
een goed  
boekje te  
komen staan  
bij mijn baas.  
(11)

Ik hecht veel  
waarde aan  
het verkrijgen









Ik ben ambitieus. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben niet echt geïnteresseerd in het behalen van de hoogst mogelijke functieniveaus in mijn vakgebied. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Een carrière is belangrijk voor mijn zelfontplooiing en zelfontwikkeling. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik zou graag een topfunctie bekleden. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik heb hoge doelen gesteld voor mijn carrière. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## End of Block: Career ambition scale

## Start of Block: Career advancement ambition scale/Career levels advancement scale



CAAS Geef aan in hoeverre de onderstaande uitspraken op u van toepassing zijn.

	1 - Onbelangrijk (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 - Erg belangrijk (5)
Hoe belangrijk is het dat u slaagt in uw huidige bedrijf? (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hoe belangrijk is het dat u hogerop komt in uw	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

huidige bedrijf? (2)					
Hoe belangrijk is het dat u slaagt in uw huidige beroep? (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hoe belangrijk is het dat u hogerop komt in uw huidige beroep? (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CLAS Geef aan hoeveel niveaus u hogerop zou willen komen in uw huidige organisatie.

	0 niveaus (1)	1 niveau (2)	2 niveaus (3)	3 niveaus (4)	Meer niveaus (5)
Hoeveel niveaus zou u hogerop willen komen, vanaf uw huidige positie? (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Career advancement ambition scale/Career levels advancement scale

Start of Block: Ambitious career model



ACM Geef aan in hoeverre de onderstaande uitspraken op u van toepassing zijn.

	1 - Compleet mee oneens (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 - Compleet mee eens (5)
Ik heb veel plannen voor mijn professionele toekomst. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ik kan mezelf als ambitieus omschrijven. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professioneel gezien heb ik een aantal doelen die ik zeker wil realiseren. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wil een baan waarin ik promotie kan krijgen. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik denk dat ik in staat ben om een goede professionele carrière te realiseren. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Ambitious career model

---

Start of Block: Desire for Success

DFS Geef aan in hoeverre de onderstaande uitspraak op u van toepassing is.

	1 - Sterk mee oneens (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 - Sterk mee eens (7)
Ik heb een sterk verlangen om een succes te zijn in de wereld. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Desire for success

---

Start of Block: Demografische gegevens

Gender Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man (1)
- Vrouw (2)
- Anders (3)
- 

Empl Werkt u fulltime, parttime of heeft u een bijbaan?

- Fulltime (1)
- Parttime (2)
- Bijbaan (bijvoorbeeld als student wat extra geld verdienen) (3)
- 



Hours Hoeveel uur werkt u in de week volgens uw contract?

---

End of Block: Demografische gegevens

---

Start of Block: Debriefing

Debriefing

U heeft het einde van de vragenlijst bereikt. Hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking aan dit onderzoek. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om een onderscheid te maken tussen twee vormen van ambitie: verticale ambitie (waar men gedreven wordt door status, promotie en geld) en horizontale ambitie (waar men gedreven wordt door persoonlijke groei, expertise en het helpen van anderen).

In dit onderzoeken willen we daarnaast kijken naar: Of er verschillen tussen mannen en vrouwen zijn op het gebied van ambitie. Of/hoe ambitie van invloed is op conflicten op het werk en of dit komt door de manier waarop men conflicten benadert of door het wel of niet tonen van prosociaal gedrag. Of/hoe ambitie van invloed is op de mate van betrokkenheid bij de organisatie. Of/hoe ambitie van invloed is op de mate van bevoegenheid op het werk, en of dit wordt beïnvloed door steun onder collega's.

Als u het er over wilt hebben hoe u zich voelde tijdens, of na het onderzoek, dan kunt u contact opnemen met de onderzoekers per email via: -----, of met Mind

Korrelatie (<https://mindkorrelatie.nl/>). Of als u nog resterende vragen heeft, voelt u zich dan vrij om contact met ons op te nemen. Mocht u opmerkingen hebben of iets kwijt willen over dit onderzoek, dan kunt u dat ook in het tekstvak hieronder (anoniem) vermelden. Nogmaals bedankt voor uw deelname. Lukas Brus, Mon van den Nieuwenhof, Manouk Slutter, Silvia Szabo en Merel van Rijckevorsel namens Tilburg University

**Klik alstublieft op het blauwe pijltje rechtsonder om de vragenlijst te voltooien en uw antwoorden op te slaan.**

---

---

---

---

---

End of Block: Debriefing

---

Start of Block: Reward

Reward Wij waarderen uw deelname aan ons onderzoek enorm. Daarom willen wij graag iets terugdoen!

Onder de deelnemers zullen wij één Bol.com giftcard ter waarde van 25 euro verloten. Als u kans wilt maken op deze giftcard, kunt u uw e-mailadres achterlaten door op het blauw pijltje rechtsonder in de pagina te klikken. Dit e-mailadres zal niet gelinkt worden aan de antwoorden die u zojuist heeft gegeven. Uw antwoorden blijven volstrekt anoniem.

Als u geen kans wilt maken op de giftcard, kunt u dit scherm sluiten.

Nogmaals dank voor uw deelname!

End of Block: Reward

---