UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

GRADE EXPECTATIONS: PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF

ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

ASHLEY THURMAN STAFFORD
Norman, Oklahoma
2013

GRADE EXPECTATIONS: PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF
ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Terry Pace, Chair

_____
Dr. Cal Stoltenberg

_____
Dr. Rockey Robbins

_____
Dr. Mike Crowson

_____
Dr. Nicole Campbell

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the God Who Sees Me. Every day of this process has been proof-positive of His unfailing love and boundless grace in all things.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The past years in graduate school have been some of the most challenging and rewarding of my life. Throughout it all, the faculty, staff, and students of the University of Oklahoma have been a constant source of support and encouragement. I am most grateful for all the people I worked with during my time at OU, particularly the staff of University College, who helped me conceptualize student issues in an entirely new light.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee for their wit and wisdom in all things psychological. I have benefitted greatly from your intelligence and insight. To Dr. Terry Pace, thank you for serving as my committee chair. Your patience, availability, and uncanny ability to check-in when I needed it most were much appreciated!

To my husband David, thank you for you tireless support and indefatigable sense of humor during what was certainly a long haul for you as well. We may have never settled our debate on the supremacy of SPSS versus Excel, but you are an example of perseverance to me and I love you very much.

To my mom Holly, thank you for your encouragement and Starbucks gift cards. I am so lucky to have a mother who can brighten up my week with even the shortest phone call. Thank you for always pointing me back to prayer.

To my brother Matt, thank you for teaching me to be an 'idea person.' Your friendship and intelligence have been a valuable constant in my life. Thank you for always giving me something to shoot for.

To my sister Nicole, thank you for your common sense and hilarious insight. Your openness and curiosity are a great example to me. I am so lucky to count you part of the family.

To my best friend Kelly, I am so grateful for your humor and general awesomeness. You always gave me something to look forward to and were so quick to listen and comfort whenever things got tough. Your maturity and bravery was an endless source of inspiration to me and taught me more about staying sensitive to the struggles of others than any book or class.

And last, a big thanks to my dad, Dr. Chris Thurman. You are a great psychologist and an even better father. Thank you for raising me to love the Lord and giving me a passion for understanding and helping others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Predictive factors of academic entitlement were explored in this study. Using Object Relations Theory for guidance as well as current literature on entitlement in students, perfectionism, locus of control, self-esteem, perceived parenting style, and social desirability were chosen as five possible predictive factors of academic entitlement. Undergraduate students were given a survey providing scores on each factor. The data was analyzed and the findings discussed. The results suggest that high scores on measures of perfectionism, authoritarian parenting, and permissive parenting predict high scores on a measure of academic entitlement. Recommendations for staff and faculty who deal with students face-to-face are made.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

For those who go about the business of education, there can be no enigma like the

modern-day student. Much time and energy is expended in an effort to understand each

generation as it changes, specifically, the unique challenges each student must face as a

member of the current generation. Some attribute challenges faced by new generations as

a sign that these members are inferior to the previous one, others see these challenges as a

generational personality expressing itself, problems and all. While the problems facing

students today may claim debatable originality, they still exist and must be understood in

order to be solved. Such is the case with the perceived increases in academic entitlement

of the current generation anecdotally observed by educators in nearly all academic

spheres.

Entitlement on the Rise

An element of some debate, the apparent increase in entitlement, or more broadly,

narcissism, among college students adds a newfound shade of importance to the issue.

One landmark meta-analytic review found that self-esteem was on the rise in college

students, showing a national decrease in students from 1965 to1979 and an increase in

students from 1980 to 1993 (Twenge & Campbell, 2001). Twenge (2006) went on to

draw the conclusion that this rise in self-esteem led to a rise in entitlement among the

same age group based on data ranging from attitudes towards career, divorce, child-

rearing, and a host of other issues.

As a counter to the belief that narcissism was on the rise and the self-esteem

movement was to blame, Trzesnieski, Donnellan, and Robbins (2008) conducted a study

surveying college students in a California university's various campuses. The author

noted that because California was seen as the birthplace of the self-esteem movement, the

students ought to show the effects Twenge described. The study found that no significant

increase in narcissism existed. A second article by the same authors went on to find

problems with Twenge's meta-analysis techniques and attempted to debunk the findings

based on these problems (Trzesnieski, Donnellan, & Robbins, 2008).

In response, Twenge et al. (2008) reproduced the California findings, noting that

these were at odds with the national findings. The authors argued that the California

university used in both studies has a higher Asian population, adding that Asian students

tend to score lower on measures of narcissism. Twenge et al. (2008) also provided

counters to Trzesnieski, Donnellan, and Robbins (2008) claims of convenience sampling

and other issues.

While it would seem that whether or not narcissism is on the rise among college

students is still a subject of some debate, one might cautiously conclude that general

anecdotal and research consensus finds that it has increased over time. Even Trzesnieski,

Donnellan, and Robbins (2008) noted that while they found no increase in NPI

(Narcissistic Personality Scale) ratings in college students from 1980 to 2000, scales of

entitlement, exploitiveness, and self-efficacy showed an increase when comparing 1979-

1985 students with 1996-2007 students. Since the primary purpose of this paper centers

around entitlement, this may again show that it is safe to cautiously accept that

entitlement is on the rise.

Implications

Academic Entitlement might easily be dismissed as an element of university life that must be overcome by students and tolerated by professors, but the implications of it run much deeper. As will be explored later, academic entitlement is associated with a host of negative psychological outcomes for students that range from mild test-anxiety to full-blown depression. In popular media, college scenes typically involve groups of well-adjusted, optimistic students partying all week and magically passing all their classes, but the real story seems to involve much more pressure and anxiety. The financial and social pressures of college life exacerbate academically demanding years and what starts out as a four-year foray into adulthood can quickly become a burdensome plod to the finish line.

For faculty, student entitlement and incivility can come to represent far more than a passing annoyance. Critical, demanding students and helicopter parents can represent a serious obstacle to job satisfaction, one that is either better protected against or screened out entirely in most other work environments. While it is probable that most professors have developed mechanisms to deal with such behavior from students, it is also probable that these may be little more than palliative given how deep the issue of entitlement can run on an individual level. A better understanding of academic entitlement and the factors that predict it would much better serve that already-busy faculty members who genuinely seek to help their students adjust to adulthood.

The Current Study

The following study seeks to examine what academic entitlement is, how it might be distinguished from the broader category of psychological entitlement, and its relationship to ego threat. In a similar fashion, the definition of ego threat and its bearing

on academic entitlement will be discussed. The relationship of both will be examined; an exploratory study of the predictive factors of academic entitlement will be outlined and the findings discussed. The pivotal question this study sought to answer is whether factors related to perfectionism, perceived parenting style, locus of control, self-esteem, and social desirability predicted levels of academic entitlement. It was hypothesized that a high score on a measure of perfectionism, low scores on measures of self-esteem and social desirability, authoritarian parenting styles, and internal locus of control would all predict high scores on a measure of academic entitlement.

The possible predictive factors of entitlement were chosen based on recurring themes in the literature regarding narcissism, entitlement, and academic entitlement. Additionally, the theoretical model provided by Ego Psychology was consulted and compared against studies to formulate additional factors that might, according to that model, predict academic entitlement. Again, the usefulness in such a study lies at the level of intervention. College retention and college adjustment are areas of concern for any university and certainly justify the thousands of dollars spent in programming aimed at students. Armed with knowledge of what factors may predict academic entitlement in students, those working with them directly can better tailor their interventions and programming to meet student needs.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

The construct of Academic Entitlement is a relatively new one, gaining traction over the past twenty years, but owes its origin to concepts introduced to the psychological community long before that. To fully appreciate the implications of academic entitlement, it becomes necessary to go back to the original idea of narcissism and follow the progression to modern day incarnations of specific symptoms of ego threat. The following seeks to start at the beginning and gradually build the case for academic entitlement as an entity worth exploration. Additionally, possible predictive factors will be enumerated and described. Current research will be used to support the hypotheses mentioned later.

Narcissism

No discussion of entitlement and ego threat would be complete without an understanding of the context in which both interact. Narcissism might be conceptualized as the awning under which both psychological constructs interact. Popular subject of psychology folklore, Sigmund Freud, spent years developing the concept of narcissism and its ties to the formation of the self (Blanck & Blanck, 1986). Freud uses "narcism" to describe the tendency in individuals to allow their own ego to take the place of objects pursued to gratify libidinal urges (1920). The name itself comes from an oft-referenced Greek myth wherein the main character, Narcissus, abandons a love-struck wood nymph in favor of his own reflection, wasting away to the point of death as he gazed at himself lovingly (Brown, 1997; D'Aulaire & D'Aulaire, 1962). For the purposes of this study,

narcissism might be broadly defined as a label for a group of psychological traits existing to regulate the self-esteem.

Key to the understanding of pathological narcissism is a description of the presentation of those exhibiting narcissistic traits. Narcissists can be characterized by their "excessive attentional focus on the self" and tendency to endorse "external attributions of failure" (Tracy & Robins, 2004, p. 117). This is particularly relevant to the current study as it illustrates that narcissistic tendencies leave an individual with a difficult time accepting responsibility for others, and really, even caring about others in the first place. Brown points out that "narcissism can constitute a pathological disorder that interferes with individual's abilities to function adequately or to form meaningful relationships with others" (1997, p. 648). Furthermore, narcissists are often described as possessing inflated senses of their own abilities in order to cover for crippling doubts about their own self-efficacy, though there is some debate about whether deflated self-esteem is really the culprit (Campbell, Foster, & Brunnell, 2004). What seems to be generally accepted is the narcissist's strong desire for the love and admiration of others and at least a projected belief that he or she deserves it (Brown, 1997).

Of particular note is the narcissistic vulnerability to ego threat. Horvath and Morf describe the narcissist as being "hypervigilant for ego-threats", vacillating between a strong predilection for feelings of worthlessness and an equally strong reaction to dampen said feelings (2010, p. 1). This leads to frequently inaccurate perceptions of the self and distorted self-ratings (John & Robins, 1994). The process by which the narcissist moves from perceived threat to a partially-defended self-concept might be understood best in

terms of ego defenses, or defense mechanisms (Blanck & Blanck, 1986; Brown, 1997).

These defenses present on the surface as irritating or off-putting personality foibles, but

may actually represent a desperate attempt on the part of the ego to protect itself. The

defense mechanism of particular interest to this study is that of entitlement.

Entitlement Explored

Capable of being studied as a stand-alone phenomenon, entitlement is a trait that

falls under the umbrella of narcissism (Campbell et al., 2004; Raskin & Terry, 1988).

While a diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder comes with a list of common

behaviors, it is entitlement in particular that this study seeks to explore. Campbell et al.

(2004, p. 31) describe psychological entitlement as "a stable and pervasive sense that one

deserves more and is entitled to more than others." Interestingly, the same authors

differentiate this from the notion of one deserving a reward as a result of hard work.

They point out that entitlement is the result of a perceived social contract and is not a

thing to be expected as a result of effort. This is particularly interesting in light of the

fact that academic success at a university is often contingent on the presence of a strong

work ethic. Raskin and Terry (1988), noted that entitlement also includes "the

expectation of special privileges over others and special exemptions from normal social

demands" (p. 890). It is not difficult to see how this sense of uniqueness or expectation

of being excused from normal requirements could become problematic in a college

environment. Despite the negative definitions used above, not all entitlement should be

seen as detrimental. Certainly a sense of being owed when one is in fact owed something

should not be labeled a problem.

7

Meyer (1991) differentiates a healthy sense of entitlement from an unhealthy one by pointing out that healthy individuals expect rights in line with their age. He points out that entitlement within an individual is shaped by the child's interaction with their environment. It begins as capabilities that grow with physical development and expands to include the child's negotiation with parents for additional privileges. As children physically and cognitively mature and their competence broadens, they view themselves as able to bargain for more room to explore. This continues on into young adulthood; entitlement rises as ability to be responsible increases. For example, a college student living in a dorm room may expect to be allowed to stay up past their high school curfew because they are 18 now and living away from home. The increase in their age and number of responsibilities makes their expectation of choosing when to sleep a reasonable one, so long as it does not infringe on their roommate's right to do the same.

In contrast, excessive entitlement is an exaggeration of actual and perceived rights often accompanied by a lower ability to tolerate frustration (Meyer, 1991). Using the same example, a college student may feel entitled to return to their dorm at whatever hour they wish, making as much noise as they wish, while their roommate tries to sleep. Healthy entitlement does not exist independent of the rights of others, the student's declaration of having the right to choose when to sleep would certainly be an exaggeration of a right given that it tramples on the rights of others. Meyer (1991) goes on to point out that this excessive entitlement is often a cover for feelings of inadequacy and hopelessness. As mentioned previously, it can act as a defense against unpleasant realizations about the self.

8

Additionally, Alfred Adler's work regarding childhood inferiority adds layers of meaning here. Interestingly, Adler cited that a child's feelings of inferiority are "pathologically heightened" in the presence of, among other things, parents who spoil the child and therefore fail to foster the development of courage (1988). He goes on to describe how the same tug-of-war between feelings of inferiority and expressions of superiority might better explain deviant behavior (1976). It is safe to surmise that the idea of entitled acting out as a smokescreen for feelings of inferiority is not a new one.

Brown (1997) points out that entitlement is frequently characterized by a particularly ruthless tendency towards exploitation of others. In his work in company settings, he noted that traits of psychological entitlement are advantageous at times when related to leadership roles. He also maintains that entitlement can become a company trait collectively and becomes as much a part of an individual's social identity as the social sphere's identity as a whole. It might be argued that college campuses have several features that might easily be compared to a company atmosphere: a president in place of a CEO, professors instead of executives, and undergraduates instead of entry-level workers. It follows that if entitlement may become a collective phenomenon in the work world, it may have already become so in the academic world.

When carried further into an academic sphere, healthy entitlement certainly serves an important function. A student remaining aware of their rights as a student and making sure they are upheld would have a positive effect on their adjustment. Similarly, relational entitlement, which will be discussed in greater detail below, can protect individuals from tolerating unacceptable behaviors from their partner. As mentioned

above, the key to healthy entitlement is a reasonable expectation of rights and consideration for the rights of others. While the positive elements of healthy entitlement are worth considering, it is the negative aspects that are the focus of this review. Specifically, negative entitlement in academic and social spheres unique to the college environment is a special point of consideration.

Academic Entitlement

Academic entitlement in the college environment presents as an expectation of higher grades independent of the work that went into earning them, student incivility towards teachers when these grades are not received, and the perception that negotiating grades is appropriate (Campbell et al., 2004; Chowning & Cambpell, 2009; Ciani, Summers, & Easter 2008). It is interesting to note that this phenomenon is more common in men than women and more prevalent in seniors than freshmen (Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008). The authors of the same study speculated that this may imply that there is an institutional element that encourages this particular type of entitlement, which is certainly in line with the previous assertion that narcissistic traits can become collectivistic in nature and expression.

Greenberger et al. (2008) found that academic entitlement owes its roots to a parenting style characterized by high expectations and that the attitude displayed by students is merely a method of coping with the anxiety caused by these expectations. It is also noteworthy that students with high academic entitlement tend to view grades as

being given to them by instructors, rather than something they earn with hard work and dedication (Chowning & Campbell, 2009). This seems consistent with Greenberger et al.'s (2008) finding that entitlement is a product of anxiety, as the view that grades are a product of elements beyond the student's control would doubtless produce significant anxiety. Here again we see entitlement acting in the role of defender against unpleasant truths. This is also in line with Twenge's (2006) point that students feel an ever-decreasing sense of responsibility for problems, being instead more apt to cast the blame on instructors. In short, the academically entitled student is one who perceives little control over negative outcomes related to their performance while simultaneously believing themselves worthy of high grades. The entitled student may also be more apt to perceive that the institution is to blame for not recognizing "special" students (Harvey & Martinko, 2009). It ought to be pointed out students with learning disabilities, who do require special attention and services, should not to be described in this way. Their entitlement to what might easily be called "special treatment" results from genuine, observable need and legal mandate, rather than perceived need and personal request (Zirkel, 2009). One study found that learning disabled students benefitted from special college transition courses and actually improved more than non-learning disabled students in measures of academic self-efficacy (Reed et al., 2011). This suggests learning disabled students' beliefs about self-efficacy are the target of concern, as opposed to an unhealthy sense entitlement.

Not surprisingly, Menon and Sharland (2011) found a correlation between narcissism and academic entitlement. They point out that a significant mediating factor

in this relationship is an exploitive attitude. Their results indicate that a student can be narcissistic without necessarily demonstrating qualities of academic entitlement if they do not show a tendency towards exploiting others. While academic entitlement is not necessary to the quality of narcissism, it appears interpersonal exploitation is necessary to the quality of being entitled. This would be a fascinating area of future study.

Student Incivility and Consumer Mentality

An element of special note in addition to expectations of higher grades is the occurrence of student incivility. Chowning and Campbell (2009) describe a list of behaviors ranging from answering cell phones in class to disrespectful emails. The same study developed a measure that predicts the likelihood of engaging in these behaviors based on the level of academic entitlement. Additionally, Nordstrom, Bartels, and Bucy (2009) cite talking during class, leaving early, using cell phones during class, texting, reading the newspaper, and leaving once an exam is returned. Twenge (2006) credited the increase in entitlement among college-age individuals as responsible for a decrease in general civility, citing evidence that knowledge of more formal social behaviors was on the decline. Indeed, when taken together, recent research on student incivility seems to agree that most inappropriate behaviors exhibited by students are those which would probably be deemed so in most other settings. Concern regarding this phenomenon is understandable given that these behaviors are hardly acceptable in a work environment.

One interesting suggestion regarding student incivility and complaining is that a consumer mentality pervades the college student's understanding of their role in an academic environment. Finney and Finney (2010) found that students who saw

12

themselves as consumers of university services were more likely to display entitled attitudes and viewed complaining as an acceptable practice. Furthermore, students who viewed themselves as consumers of university services were more likely to engage in other uncivil and disrespectful behaviors (Nordstrom, Bartels, & Bucy, 2009).

Boyd and Helms (2005) drew a link in retail arenas between early consumer experiences and consumer attitudes. They postulate that if a consumer has an early shopping experience where they are treated with great attention and care, they will most likely go on to develop expectation of such treatment later. This conjures up images of early childhood education where teachers and parents are stereotypically highly solicitous for and encouraging of children's forays into education. If the assertions of Boyd and Helms hold true for an academic environment, then the "consumer" of education may expect the same solicitousness in early adulthood that they received in grade school. Other research indicates that this process is dynamic and changes with every encounter (Boulding et al., 1993). This adds another layer of interest, possibly suggesting that students' expectations in the academic environment could raise as well as lower with positive or negative previous experiences.

Providing an alternate line of reasoning, Stork and Hartley (2009) point out that *professor* incivility can be distressing for students and lead to frustration in the classroom. Students may view themselves as consumers within the classroom, but the interaction with a professor's clashing viewpoint may be lessened as understanding on both sides increases (2009). It is possible that dismissive comments or public

13

punishments, perhaps reflective of professor entitlement, may lead students to justify their own entitled behavior rather than correct it.

Expectations Surrounding Performance and Grades

The college environment poses a unique set of problems for the academically entitled individual. As mentioned above, college adjustment can be contingent on academic success. An academically entitled student is one who does not attribute academic success to their own efforts and therefore ensures difficulty adjusting to college expectations. If study skills and motivation predict adjustment, these students may find themselves in trouble quickly (Crede & Kuncel, 2008; Proctor et al., 2006). Similarly, the ability to take responsibility for one's academic outcomes predicts successful adjustment (Mooney, Sherman, & Lo Presto, 1991). This may prove to the great detriment of the academically entitled student.

From a different angle, entitled students can also be students battling feelings of being an imposter. Gibson-Beverly and Schwartz (2008) found that entitled students struggled with imposter syndrome and had difficulty taking credit for success internally. The same study found this diminished internal locus of control was accompanied by an increase in self-centered attitudes. All that to say, the entitled student may project a demanding attitude, but internally feels incapable of giving themselves credit for the accomplishments they have.

In a article on the relationships between grade inflation and faculty evaluations, Germain and Scandura assert that faculty evaluations contribute to a consumer mentality among students (2005). As mentioned previously, consumer attitudes contribute to

14

student incivility, so a line of progression begins to emerge. Germain and Scandura credit faculty evaluations with the resulting grade-inflation because faculty members must cater to the students in an effort to keep their jobs. Some credit the rise in student consumer mentality with the marketing strategies of many universities (Molesworth, Nixon & Scullion, 2009). They postulate that the academic environment has assumed many of the marketing strategies of businesses in order to attract students and keep afloat. They emphasize a degree as a product and students as buyers. It stands to reason that this line of thinking might in turn encourage students to see themselves as customers instead of individuals in pursuit of learning. This is consistent with previous discussions of university students expecting good grades independent of the effort they put forth. Landrum found that even students who evaluated their own work as average still expected to receive a 'B' in the class overall (1999). This illustrates how grade inflation is expected, yet also betrays a type of mental gap between effort put forth and outcome received. Twenge and Campbell support this by asserting that students are, in fact, receiving higher grades for doing the same amount and quality of work (2008). Faculty and administrators may be tempted to slap their foreheads in exasperation, but the entitled attitude is apparently being reinforced, and therefore, allowed to continue.

Interestingly, Germain and Scandura point out that grade inflation may very well lead to increased concern with regard to grades as students come to expect higher grades and experience anxiety at the prospect of not getting them (2005). This sentiment is echoed by Baer and Cheryomukin who point out that demanding attitudes and incivility towards professors may simply be a method of entitled coping (2011). They go on to

explain that students may respond with entitled and uncivil behaviors out of significant distress regarding their grades and fatalistic thinking around bad grades (i.e., less than an "A"). These findings provide further support for the assertion that entitlement is a way of coping with unpleasant realities. The irony, however, is that this coping mechanism seems to act in opposition of bettering the situation by causing further stress in students. It is reminiscent of chaotic family systems where children act in the place of adults and are therefore prone to anxiety caused by role confusion.

Another layer of consideration in student's entitled expectations to higher grades is the differing definitions that often exist for what constitutes "hard work." Kopp et al. point out that while three hours may seem like an inordinate amount of time to spend on a paper to some students, it may constitute embarrassingly little time to their professors (2011). Here the professor and student are merely two ships passing in the night with what may perhaps involve unclear communication regarding expectations. As will be discussed in greater detail later, it is possible that this is a mirror image of what the entitled student faced at home with parental relationships.

Social and Relational Entitlement

While academics are a dominant element of university life, social and relational elements also play a huge role in the college student lifestyle. Many students live on campus and enjoy a newfound sense of freedom in their social life and find themselves allowed to pursue social activities with relish. Whether a student's relationships are romantic or platonic, their level of entitlement will play a role. Campbell et al. (2005) found that narcissist (i.e. those displaying a stable tendency towards entitlement) were

16

more apt to make decisions that benefitted themselves in the short run at great cost to others around them and even society as a whole. This was thought to come as a result of their competitive, rather than collaborative bent. It seems from the outset students with high levels of entitlement run the risk of sabotaging relationships with an over-emphasis on self-preservation and need to feel the victor. This is also consistent with research mentioned previously that documented the entitled student's tendency towards exploitive behavior.

Similarly, Moeller, Crocker, and Bushman (2009) found that self-image goals, that is, preservation of a positive self-image, took precedence in the relationships of high entitlement individuals. The authors noted that this tendency led to a near-constant level of relational hostility and conflict. This echoes the assertion by John and Robins (1994) that narcissistic individuals have an inaccurate self-perception. These behaviors frequent the narcissistic horizon due to covert beliefs of worthlessness (Horvath & Morf, 2009). This supports conclusions drawn earlier about entitlement stemming from inadequacy (Meyer, 1991).

Campbell et al. (2004) found that individuals high in entitlement tended to be less accommodating to those they were in a relationship with. The same study also found these individuals show a greater difficulty taking the perspective of their partner in addition to displaying decreased levels of loyalty. Interestingly, Campbell et al. (2004) noted these individuals tend to be more relationally selfish and less loving. Gibson-Beverly and Schwartz (2008) found that entitled individuals in a relationship tend to have a demanding attitude and are more self-centered than their normal counterparts. The

17

entitled student runs the risk of carrying these expectations of special treatment into friendships and romantic relationships. One can only imagine the friction that would be created should both partners suffer from high entitlement.

Interesting also was the added element of the need to maintain a positive self-image at the cost of a healthy relationship. This echoes the sentiments of academic entitlement: that relational entitlement may serve as a coping mechanism for feelings of inadequacy (Gibson-Beverly & Schwartz, 2008; Meyer, 1991). Because the social environment and the formation of a social identity plays such a large role in college adjustment, as mentioned above, the relationally entitled student may find this a problematic area. If one has the tendency to sabotage relationships with unrealistic expectations, one will not find the discovery of a social niche easy. Romantically, highly entitled students face a whole new set of problems. As mentioned above, the difficulty they may experience performing activities crucial to the healthy development of intimate relationships (empathy, sacrifice, etc.) will doubtless sabotage their abilities to form meaningful romantic relationships.

While academic entitlement is the primary occupation of the proposed study, an exploration of relational entitlement is believed justifiable because it adds valuable dimension to a more holistic understanding of entitled students. Entitlement is a construct acted out on other people and cannot always be neatly separated into neat academic and non-academic categories. Many of the questions evaluating level of academic entitlement involve face-to-face interactions with professors and fellow students, suggesting the value of an understanding of relational entitlement.

Parental Contribution and Attachment Style

Baumrind and Black's oft-cited work on the socialization methods used with toddlers laid the groundwork for what is broadly accepted as the optimal parenting style (1967). They found that tension-producing experiences led to the development of competence in young children and that high expectations encouraged independence. Baumrind termed the demanding yet warm parental style as "authoritative", the warm yet non-demanding style as "permissive", and the controlling yet detached style as "authoritarian" (1967; 1971). Her work further revealed that a permissive parenting style was associated with the least self-reliant and self-controlled children while the authoritarian style was associated with discontented, untrusting children. This carries some weight in a discussion of parental contributions to student entitlement because here we see that parental expectations and support can determine how self-reliant the student becomes. It might be argued, through research outlined below, that entitled students have received the high expectations of the authoritarian parent, but the low control of the permissive parent.

As mentioned previously, Greenberger et al. (2008) found that high parental expectations led to entitled behavior in students as a means of coping with the anxiety these expectations produced. It stands to reason that a student in doubt of their abilities might resort to a feeling of being owed to quell their own fears of inadequacy. Parents may expect more for and from their children simply because they believe their child to be superior, perhaps hinting at parental entitlement.

Twenge (2006) offers much on the subject of parenting's contribution. She points to the recent tendency in parents to treat their young children as small adults, asking them what they prefer in everything and deferring to the child's decisions. Twenge argues that parents today treat their children's feelings and opinions as if they are of paramount importance. She goes on to say that this gives the child an inflated sense of importance and prolongs the egocentrism that typically accompanies youth.

Another issue addressed by Twenge (2006) is the possibility that politeness is on the decline because these same children are taught to care more about what they think than what others think, another belief that may be ingrained in them by parents and teachers. This seems to fall in line with Chowning and Campbell's (2009) discussion of student incivility. It stands to reason that a student who has been raised to believe their opinions and feelings are of the utmost importance would not hesitate to be dismissive of a professor's preferences. After all, professors are merely another authority figure in a student's life, serving functions similar to that of parenting. If students are treated as equals by their parents, why should they expect less from instructors? Relationally, this type of upbringing would also lead to obvious difficulties. If a child grows up believing they are the center of the family, they might naturally expect their friends and romantic partners to treat them the same way. If all a student has ever known is a careful inclusion of their wishes, one could argue their ability to weather the compromise and perseverance relationships require would be seriously compromised.

It has been suggested that this shift in parenting is due in part to a recent movement towards protecting and bolstering child self-esteem (Twenge, 2006; Twenge et

20

al. 2008).   Twenge et al. (2008) note that self-esteem interventions frequently employed by parents and teachers serve to worsen, rather than improve this issue. These interventions range from school projects specifically designed to explore the child's personality to songs praising the child's individuality (Twenge, 2006). Twenge et al. (2008) note that so few students are in need of this treatment that they liken it to giving Ritalin to a classroom of students when only a couple show any need for it. Twenge (2006) argues that it is this type of parenting and schooling approach that bears the blame for the entitlement found in today's college students.

While aforementioned research suggests that entitled children receive treatment and privileges that might be associated with a permissive style of parenting, it is the child's perception of the parenting style that may influence their degree of entitlement. One recent study found that mistrust and alienation towards caregivers was associated with higher levels of narcissistic entitlement (Rothman & Steil, 2012). This seems more in line with an authoritarian approach. The same study also found that attachment was a better predictor of entitlement than wealth, suggesting material possessions or indulgences alone are not enough to foster entitlement.

Locus of Control and Attributional Style

A more covert element of narcissism, attributional style can factor heavily in a student's ability to meet the demands of university life. Specifically, this means their tendency to attribute success or failure to their own efforts, also known as internal vs. external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). Twenge, Zhang, and Im (2004) found that when compared to their counterparts of previous decades, students today show a greater

tendency towards an external locus of control. The authors credited this with an overall increase in cynicism and a tendency for students to believe their individual actions have little effect on life outcomes. One can imagine the effect this has on a student's adjustment to college. It would be difficult to successfully make the transition to university life while feeling that success would be dependent on the actions of others. While students who academically succeed tend to credit their success to their own effort and ability, they credit the teacher's performance as bearing the most responsibility for their success (Griffin et al., 1983). This may suggest that even successful students feel the generational push to hold others responsible for their performance, or it may simply be the recognition of a teaching job well done.

Providing further shades of distinction, another study found that internal locus of control paired with high self-esteem predicted successful college adjustment (Mooney, Sherman, & Lo Presto, 1991). The same study found that internal locus of control and high self-esteem acting in isolation did not have the same effect on adjustment as the two in tandem. It could be said that students who see success as contingent on their own effort and themselves as capable of making that effort are more likely to adjust to college successfully. Gibson-Beverly and Schwartz (2008) echo this sentiment by stating that entitled students may have demanding attitudes and a self-centered approach, but it often hides feelings in line with imposter syndrome. They linked entitled student's beliefs that they are deserving of preferential treatment with the students' possible accompanying difficulty taking credit for success. The authors noted that a difficulty internalizing accomplishments led to imposter syndrome, which was reflective of a poor self-image.

Ego Threat and Self-Esteem

Borrowing from Freud, Blanck and Blanck define the function of the ego as "bring(ing) all the individual programs into coherence and harmony with each other and with reality" (1986, p. 44). Blanck and Blanck go on to explain that Freud, and later his daughter Anna, conceptualized the ego as a wall of defense against threats to identity, pushing unmanageable truths to the realms of the unconscious. It could be said that though the task of the ego is to cause parts of the self to resonate with reality, its defensive function frequently causes the opposite. Ego defenses rush to our aide, allowing us to handily distort reality so that our fragile selves can exist in it without the constant frustration of realized dissonance.

Leary et al. assert that definitions of ego threat are as varied as the methods used to evaluate them (2009). They point out that much of the previous research involving ego threat provides disparate and often confusing definitions of the construct as well as contaminated methods of measurement. Specifically, they maintain that the majority of studies define ego threat in terms of self-esteem and therefore set out to use measures related to raising or lowering participants' self-esteem.

Leary et al. state that varied definitions of ego threat and methods of its measurement are not inherently negative, but call for great care on the part of the researcher when developing methodology (2009). They also note that ego threat can include threats to public image and threats to perceived control. The purpose of this study is primarily to evaluate ego threat as it relates to self-esteem.

23

As mentioned previously, self-esteem is a key factor in the development of entitlement Interestingly, one study found that low self-esteem was associated with both excessive and restricted levels of relational entitlement (Tolmacz & Mikulincer, 2011). Vater et al. (2013) similarly found that individuals with narcissistic personality disorder displayed vulnerability in the form of low self-esteem. In addition to further supporting the claims made by research mentioned above, this supports the supposition that low self-esteem may predict high academic entitlement.

Narcissistic Responses to Ego Threat

As mentioned previously, narcissism can easily be conceptualized as a response to ego threat (Brown, 1997). Kohut's work on narcissism clearly delineates that there is a difference between mature anger and the "narcissistic rage" that accompanies frustration experienced by a narcissist (1972). He describes this as stemming from the narcissists grandiosity and insistence on perfection. Interestingly, Kohut also notes that mature anger differs from narcissistic rage in that it allows for clearer boundaries of separation between the self and other objects. Here, a framework is established by which student entitlement and incivility can be better understood.

Weak identity development coupled with the perceived attacks often afforded by the university atmosphere may lead narcissistically entitled students to have a much stronger response than their more secure counterparts. This also echoes the previous sentiment of grade inflation leading to increased worry and emphasis on grades. It stands to reason that while a student's fixation on earning an 'A' may seem excessive to

24

professors, it may very well be the characteristic rage response of a narcissistic individual. This, of course, calls for a finer understanding of rage and does not necessitate the physically violent image typically conjured by the word.

It is noteworthy that in individuals with narcissistic traits, threats to public image are more likely to lead to aggressive defense of the positive aspects of the self. Specifically, narcissism was predictive of aggression when threats to self-image were negative and public (Ferriday, Vartanian, & Mendel, 2011). Stucke and Sporer echo these findings and go on to add that the aggression experienced by narcissistic individuals is often directed at the source of the ego-damaging feedback (2002). Herein lies another layer to the understanding of narcissistic rage and its expression when faced with ego threat.

Another narcissistic response to ego threat is to downplay the qualifications of the one handing down the negative feedback. Specifically, when an evaluator was deemed to have high status, narcissists were more likely to engage in self-protection behaviors related to denigrating the instrument used to determine their low performance (Horton & Sedikides, 2009). While there are several self-protecting behaviors in the repertoire of most individuals, grandiosity and social desirability are the two of particular interest to this study.

Social Desirability and Grandiosity

Marlow and Crowne define social desirability as "a need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that this can be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors" (1961, p. 1). As mentioned previously, narcissists greatly value

the way in which they come across to others and strive for approval and admiration. They also tend to over-inflate their positive qualities (John & Robbins, 1994). Given previous findings, it is important to note that narcissists are more prone to grandiose self-enhancement than to social desirability. It has been found that narcissists appear to use grandiosity as the defense mechanism of choice over inflated social-desirability (Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991). In further support of this, Horvath and Morf found that narcissists engage in bolder attempts at self-enhancement by giving themselves higher scores on self-ratings of positive traits (2010). This led to higher scores on grandiosity ratings for narcissists while their high self-esteem counterparts eschewed such endorsements and showed more concern for social connectedness.

Not surprisingly, Watson and Morris found that high scores in measures of entitlement predicted lower scores on measures of social desirability (1991). Watson et al. also identified a negative correlation between entitlement and social desirability (1984). They credit the entitled tendency to exploit as the reason behind a disregard for societal norms. This suggests, that in the absence of ego threat, entitled individuals do not show a tendency to put themselves in a socially favorable light.

In sum, the above research may support the hypothesis that entitled individuals will receive low scores on measures of social desirability, but high scores on measures related to self-aggrandizement. This study proposes a measure to ascertain if low social desirability predicts high academic entitlement.

Perfectionism

In an earlier work that set the tone for future research, Hamacheck (1978) posited that perfectionism is related to setting high standards for one's performance. He went on to specify two distinct types, which he termed "normal" and "neurotic," and to point out that those suffering from neurotic perfectionism struggled to feel satisfaction towards their work. Hamachek described their standards as unattainable and their inability to relax these standards. Interestingly, Hamachek tied neurotic perfectionism to poor parental communication regarding standards and high levels of conditional parental approval. This harkens back to the earlier discussion of authoritarian parenting and its relationship to the creation of anxiety in children.

Today, the concept of perfectionism has come to be referred to more frequently in terms of adaptive and maladaptive. Stoltz and Ashby (2007) found indeed there were significant lifestyle differences between adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, and non-perfectionists. They further noted that maladaptive perfectionists are differentiated by their poor coping strategies. Maladaptive perfectionism is associated with a host of poor outcomes, not the least of which are higher levels of anxiety and depression (Gnilka, Ashby & Noble, 2012; Ashby, Noble & Gnilka, 2012). The above research supports the hypothesis that high maladaptive perfectionism may predict higher academic entitlement.

Conclusions

In sum, the factors selected for this study were based on a thorough exploration of the literature as well as guidance from Object Relations Theory. While there are many other factors that might have been included and may also predict levels of academic

entitlement, it is believed that these five factors are a good beginning direction for this study. Future research may go on to include a broader range of characteristics, but the literature review for this study supports the selection of the five factors.

Hypotheses

The complex relationship between academic entitlement and perceived parenting style, locus of control, social desirability, self-esteem, and perfectionism warrants further exploration. The following study was conducted to explore the impact these factors have on scores related to academic entitlement in an effort to ascertain whether these factors predict scores received on a measure of academic entitlement. It was hypothesized that, as a set, perceived parenting style, locus of control, social desirability, self-esteem, and perfectionism will predict scores on a measure of academic entitlement. More specifically, it was also hypothesized that authoritarian parenting style, external locus of control, low social desirability, low self-esteem, and high perfectionism would individually predict scores on academic entitlement. It is further hypothesized that authoritarian parenting style, external locus of control, self-esteem, and perfectionism would all be positively correlated with scores on academic entitlement. Conversely, it is hypothesized that social desirability will be negatively correlated with academic entitlement. It was further hypothesized that men would, as a group, receive higher scores in academic entitlement than women and that seniors would, as a group, receive higher scores than freshman.

The value of such a study is in providing a better understanding and way of examining academic entitlement. Universities spend much time and resources attempting

to understand why students leave school. In an effort to provide better services to its students, the university offers a host of events, counseling services, study seminars, writing centers, and many other interventions aimed at keeping students enrolled and on track to finish their degree. Understanding the new generation's struggles with entitlement and accompanying issues related to self-esteem may help universities to better tailor their services to meet these challenges. The information provided by such a study would also allow university professors and other personnel to feel better prepared to understand and help their students.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants for this study were a convenience sample of undergraduate

students drawn from The University of Oklahoma. The participants were both male and

female full-time students between the ages of 18 and 24. The students were recruited via

an email listserv of students currently or previously enrolled in the University of

Oklahoma's introductory psychology course. Students participating in the study had the

opportunity to be entered for a gift card drawing upon completion of the survey.

Of the students who completed the survey 28% were male and 71% were female.

Freshman made up 76% of respondents, 18% were Sophomores, 3% were Juniors, and

2% were Seniors. The number surveyed totaled 1,444 with a response rate of 15%. A

sample size calculator and consultation with faculty members were used to determine that

an appropriate sample size was between 150 and 200 participants. The actual sample size

was 218 (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Participant Characteristics

	N	Percentage of Total N
Total	218	100%
Male	61	28%
Female	155	71%
Undisclosed	2	1%
Freshman	166	76%
Sophomore	39	18%
Junior	7	3%
Senior	4	2%
Undisclosed	2	1%

Instruments

AEQ

The survey administered to participants was offered online and was composed of six instruments. The first was the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (AEQ) (Kopp et al, 2009). This measure was selected because it incorporated many elements and questions of previous academic entitlement questionnaires, but included the element of consumer mentality more overtly. Additionally, this instrument was selected because it established academic entitlement as a distinct construct when compared to psychological entitlement. This instrument is composed of eight items and allows participants the opportunity to respond using a Likert scale.

The AEQ was chosen over the Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES) (Campbell et al., 2004) because it showed a modest correlation with the measure while showing a stronger correlation with academic factors (Kopp et al., 2009). This indicates the AEQ is more appropriate for academic entitlement than the more general PES. In an additional study performed by the developer, the AEQ was shown to produce higher scores in non-compliant students. The same study provided more evidence of validity and empirically linked student incivility to academic entitlement (Kopp & Finney, in press).

BIDR

The second instrument used was the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) (Paulhus 1984; 1991). Paulhus separated self-enhancement and impression management into two distinct categories and developed a measure to evaluate them both. This seems highly relevant to the current study as it captures a desire to come across well

to others and to heighten one's internal sense of positive attributes.   This assessment

contains 40 items and also utilizes a Likert-scale. In additional research, concurrent

validity data revealed both categories of the BIDR to be satisfactory measures of their

separate constructs in addition to social desirability as a whole (Lanyon & Carle, 2007).

One study found that overall, the BIDR scores were reliable for use in research, but that

mean reliability estimates for the individual scales were not as strong in the impression

management category (Li & Bagger, 2007). Taken together, this suggests the BIDR is

useful for the current purposes of this study, but that the scores ought to be taken as a

whole.

PI

The third instrument used was the Perfectionism Inventory (PI) (Hill et al., 2004).

This inventory is composed of 59 items and uses a five-point Likert scale This measure

was selected because it is believed to be an efficient method of measuring different facets

of perfectionism while maintaining the predictive power of other instruments (Hill et al.,

2004). One study evaluated the Perfectionism Inventory and found support for its

authors' assertions, though they warned it might be more diagnostically useful when

broken down into subscales (Cruce et al., 2012). The purpose of this study requires a

broad measure of perfectionism, but the PI provided a good option for subscale

examination as well.

RSES

The fourth instrument used was the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES)

(Rosenberg, 1989). This scale has ten items and uses a four-option Likert scale. This

instrument was selected for its strong reliability and validity, wide acceptance amongst researchers, and usefulness with college populations (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001; Gray-Little, Williams, & Hancock, 1997). It has been found that this instrument works best as a measurement of self-esteem as a unitary construct, rather than broken down into subscales (Gray-Little, Williams, & Hancock 1997).

I-E

The fifth instrument used was the Internality-Externality Scale (I-E) (Rotter, 1966). This is a 29-item forced choice scale commonly used to assess orientation towards internal or external locus of control. One study evaluated the I-E and a second commonly used locus of control scale and found both measures had high internal consistency, but lacking in strong reliability and validity evidence (Beretvas et al., 2008). The same study noted that revised versions of the I-E, as well as versions where the forced-choice had been altered to a Likert scale, did not appear to have any research support and suggested using the scale as-is. Levenson's locus of control measure was considered, but some research indicated there was little difference in reliability between the two measures when used with undergraduates (Blau, 1984).

PAQ

Finally, the sixth instrument used was the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) (Buri, 1991). This is a thirty-item measure on a five-point scale designed to evaluate whether a participant perceives if they received an authoritative, authoritarian, or permissive parenting style. It should be noted that a revised version developed by different authors exists, but is not being used due to potential subscale concerns (Reitman

33

et al., 2002). The original Parental Authority Questionnaire was developed from Baumrind's (1967) types and chosen because of its more frequent usage amongst researchers. Additionally, the authors found it had good reliability, validity, and criterion validity (Buri, 1991; Buri et al., 1988). Interestingly, one study used the PAQ to establish a relationship between authoritarian parenting and perfectionism (Flett, Hewitt & Singer, 1995).

Procedures

Participants were recruited via email using a listserv provided by a faculty member at The University of Oklahoma. Students were offered the chance to be entered into a drawing for a gift card upon completion of the survey. The survey was available online via Qualtrics, a commonly used online survey distributor and data manager. It was offered online in an effort to diminish possible contamination of responses due to student fears surrounding researcher perception (Leary et al., 2009). The survey was composed of the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (Kopp et al., 2009), the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1984; 1991; Robison, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991), the Perfectionism Inventory (Hill et al., 2004), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989), the Internality-Externality Scale (Rotter, 1966), and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (1991). Respondents also indicated their age, gender, and grade level. This was done so that gender and academic classification comparisons could be made. Age information was collected so that data for students who did not fall between the ages of 18 and 24 could be excluded from analysis. Once the data was collected, it was analyzed using SPSS.

It is also important to note that scale randomization was used in order to combat any order effects that might occur with the three instruments used. This was done in order to ensure that, as has been discovered in previous studies, the order of the instruments supplied to participants did result in artificially greater or lesser symptom report (Erdodi, Lajiness-O'Neill, & Saules, 2010; Moore, 2002). If each participant were to be given the Balanced Inventory of Socially Desirable Responding first immediately followed by the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire, it might create artificially low entitlement scores the researcher would be unaware of. Randomization through a feature on Qualtrics reduced this possibility by alternating the order in which participants receive the instruments. It is hoped by doing this that any effects that are present from instrument order will counteract each other.

Data Analysis

Once the data was collected, an independent samples *t* test was conducted to evaluate the claims of previous research that men tend to report higher entitlement than women. As sufficient numbers were not collected, a *t* test to see if seniors score significantly higher on a measure of academic entitlement than freshman was unfortunately impossible. It was hypothesized that men would score significantly higher on the AEQ than woman, corroborating previous research.

A Pearson's Correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between the criterion variable and predictor variables. It was predicted that AE will show a strong positive relationship with perfectionism, authoritarian parenting, external locus of

35

control, and social desirability. It was further predicted AE will show a strong negative

relationship with self-esteem and internal locus of control.

Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if scores on measures

of perfectionism, locus of control, self-esteem, perceived parenting style, and social

desirability predicted scores on a measure of academic entitlement.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Results of the study were analyzed using SPSS according to the proposed data analysis. Descriptive statistics indicated a mean score of 24.7 for the AEQ, 160.6 for the BIDR, 200.3 for the PI, 20.1 for the RSES, 11.2 for the I-E, 24.7 for the PAQ (Permissive), 32.4 for the PAQ (Authoritarian), and 35.5 for the PAQ(Authoritative). Standard deviations were also calculated (See Table 2).

It should be noted that the mean for the AEQ was slightly, though not meaningfully, higher than that found by the developer of the instrument in college freshman (Kopp et al., 2011). Scores were not divided on the BIDR, making a direct comparison to original sample means counterintuitive. Similarly, the PI was not separated into indices for the purpose of this study, so direct comparison of scores was difficult, but the means for specific questions also appeared slightly higher in this study than the population used in the original (Hill et al., 2004). Scores for the RSES fell predominantly in the normal range (Rosenberg, 1989). Compared to the original sample population, the students in this study scored a few points higher on the authoritarian portion of the PAQ, but the permissive and authoritarian scores were comparable (Buri, 1991). The students in this study had a higher mean score than the original sample used to norm the I-E, indicating a greater tendency towards external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). More recent studies place the theoretical mean much closer to the one found in this study (11.5), reflecting the expected generational shift (Kirkpatrick et al., 2008).

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
AEQ	24.7	8.6	218
BIDR	160.6	22.3	218
PI	200.3	30.1	218
RSES	20.1	5.6	218
I-E	11.2	3.8	218
PAQ(Permissive)	24.7	6.3	218
PAQ(Authoritarian)	32.4	6.9	218
PAQ(Authoritative)	35.5	6.4	218

An independent samples t test was conducted to test the hypothesis that men would score significantly higher on a measure of academic entitlement than women. Surprisingly, results were not significant, indicating there was no significant difference between men and women on the measure of academic entitlement. This is not consistent with previous research that found men tend to score significantly higher on measures of entitlement than women. It is possible that this was due, in part, to the relatively low number of males who agreed to participate in this survey.

A Pearson Correlation was conducted to see if a linear relationship existed between the variables. Correlation coefficients were obtained for the six measures used (See Table 3). The correlation between the AE and BIDR was significant and negative, $r(210) = -.169$, $p = .006$, indicating that those who receive higher scores in academic entitlement tend to receive lower scores in social desirability. The correlation between the AE and PI was also significant, $r(210) = .233$, $p = .000$. This suggests that those who receive high scores for academic entitlement receive high scores in perfectionism as well.

Similarly, the correlation between the AE and RSES was also statistically significant and positive, $r(210) = .115$, $p = .045$, indicating those who receive high scores on Academic Entitlement also receive high scores on the RSES. The correlation between the AE and I-E was also significant and positive, $r(210) = .138$, $p = .021$, indicating those who receive high scores on the AE tend to endorse items related to an external locus of control. Finally, the correlation between AE and PAQ(Permissive) was also statistically significant and positive, $r(210) = .292$, $p = .000$, indicating those with high AE tend to perceive their parents as more permissive. Correlations between AE and the other two perceived parenting styles were not significant.

TABLE 3

Correlation Matrices for the Six Measures

		AEQ	BIDR	PI	RSES	I-E	Perm	Auth	Tat
AEQ	Pearson Correlation	1	-.169	.233	.115	.138	.292	.073	-.038
	Sig (1-tailed)	-	.006	.000	.045	.021	.000	.141	.289
BIDR	Pearson Correlation	-.169	1	-.101	-.345	-.323	-.048	-.003	.070
	Sig (1-tailed)	.006	-	.069	.000	.000	.242	.480	.152
PI	Pearson Correlation	.233	-.101	1	.139	.053	.001	.272	.236
	Sig (1-tailed)	.000	.069	-	.020	.216	.495	.000	.000
RSES	Pearson Correlation	.115	-.345	.139	1	.231	.048	-.006	-.175
	Sig (1-tailed)	.045	.000	.020	-	.000	.240	.465	.005
I-E	Pearson Correlation	.138	-.323	.053	.231	1	.031	-.051	-.017
	Sig (1-tailed)	.021	.000	.216	.000	-	.322	.228	.399
Perm	Pearson Correlation	.292	-.048	.001	.048	.031	1	-.427	.093
	Sig (1-tailed)	.000	.242	.495	.240	.322	-	.000	.086
Auth	Pearson Correlation	.073	-.003	.272	-.006	-.051	-.427	1	-.011
	Sig (1-tailed)	.141	.480	.000	.465	.228	.000	-	.434
Tat	Pearson Corrleation	-.038	.070	.236	-.175	-.017	.093	-.011	1
	Sig(1-tailed)	.289	.152	.000	.005	.399	.086	.434	-

A multiple regression analysis was conducted with alpha levels set at $p < .05$ to see the degree to which the set of predictors predicted scores on a measure of academic entitlement. The predictors were scores on the BIDR, PI, RSES, I-E, PAQ(Permissive), PAQ(Authoritarian), and PAQ(Authoritative) while the criterion variable was scores on a measure of academic entitlement. The PAQ was split into three indices to maximize the information it provided. The linear combination of these measures was significantly related to the measure of academic entitlement $F(7,210) = 7.49$, $p < .01$. The results indicated that approximately 20% of the variance of scores on a measure of academic entitlement in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of the predictive measures with $r^2 = .20$. This is consistent with the hypothesis that as a set, the predictor measures would predict scores on a measure of academic entitlement.

Next, the indices were examined to discover the relative strength of individual predictors (see Table 4). Of all the bivariate correlations between the predictor measures and AE, only three presented as statistically significant with alpha set at $p < .05$. The partial correlation between perfectionism, permissive parenting style, and authoritarian parenting style emerged as positive and statistically significant. It should be noted that the correlations found between AE and the three parenting styles may suggest possible suppressor effects. This means that while Authoritarian and Authoritative parenting styles appear to contribute to the overall predictive power of the model, they both show near-zero correlation with the dependent variable (Horst, 1941). Suppressor variables are believed to improve the overall predictive power of a model by reducing irrelevant

variance. They typically have low correlations with the dependent variable, as finding a correlation of zero is rare (Lancaster, 1999).

Table 4

The Bivariate Partial Correlations of the Predictors with the AE

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and the AE	Correlation between each predictor and the AE controlling for all other predictors
BIDR	-.17	-.09
PI	.23	.19
SE	.12	-.00
I-E	.14	.10
PAQ(Permissive)	.29	.35
PAQ(Authoritarian)	.07	.17
PAQ(Authoritative)	-.04	-.11

Additionally, inspection of standardized and unstandardized coefficients show that Perfectionism, Permissive Parenting, and Authoritarian parenting reveal the greatest predicted change in probability of outcome given a standard deviation change in predictor (Thompson, 2009). The absolute value of standardized coefficients for Perfectionism, Permissive Parenting and Authoritarian Parenting were .19, .37, and .18 respectively. Unstandardized coefficients went as high as .50 for Permissive Parenting style. This supports the conclusion that these three predictors had the greatest impact of all predictors that made up the model.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Summary

In sum, several hypotheses were supported while others were rejected. It was found that high scores on a measure of Academic Entitlement are indeed correlated with low scores on socially desirable responding. This is consistent with previous research and supports the conclusion that entitled individuals do not feel the need to appear socially desirable. It was discovered that high scores on the AE and high scores on the PI were correlated. As hypothesized, this indicates that those with high degrees of academic entitlement also endorse items related to high degrees of perfectionism. These findings support the assertion that entitled individuals struggle with perfectionism.

It was discovered that locus of control was positively correlated with academic entitlement. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported and those who receive high scores on academic entitlement tend to endorse measure related to external locus of control. As discussed previously, the data supports that entitled students tend to hold others responsible for their performance.

Similarly in line with expectations, it was discovered that self-esteem correlated positively with academic entitlement, indicating high scores on academic entitlement went with lower self-esteem scores. This was expected and may indicate that students with high AE do indeed struggle with self-esteem. At the very least, it seems to support the notion that self-esteem is a potentially effective avenue of approach when treating entitlement.

Finally, it was found that a perceived permissive parenting style, as opposed to authoritarian or authoritative, was positively correlated with academic entitlement. This is not entirely surprising. While it was predicted that authoritarian parenting style would correlate positively with AE, some of the literature appeared to suggest that permissive parenting styles might be connected as well.

Additionally, the findings supported the prediction that the set of predictors would predict scores on the criterion variables. As a whole, scores on measure of social desirability, perfectionism, self-esteem, locus of control, and perceived parenting style all combined to predict scores on academic entitlement. Interestingly, Perfectionism, Permissive Parenting style, and Authoritarian Parenting style emerged as statistically significant predictors when partialling out the effects of the other predictors. It is tempting to attribute the entirety of percentage of variance accounted for to these three predictors, but it is difficult to make judgments regarding relative importance when other measures are correlated.

The hypothesis that higher scores on measures of perfectionism and authoritarian parenting style would predict high scores on a measure of academic entitlement was supported. It was not predicted that high scores on a measure of permissive parenting style would predict academic entitlement scores, but the finding is consistent with some previous research. This harkens back to the previous assertion that entitled children manage the high expectations of the authoritarian parent with the indulgence of the permissive parent. The combination of both in the literature combined with the predictive findings of both in this study support the notion that both are present in the

upbringing of the academically entitled student. Additionally, the assertions of Object

Relations theory hold in that both parenting styles foster anxiety within the child, leading

to a weak ego and the need for ego defenses like entitlement (Blanck & Blanck, 1986).

The hypotheses that high scores on the other predictor measures would predict scores on

the criterion variable were not supported as findings were not significant.

Conclusions

In conclusion, while many of the hypotheses put forth were ultimately rejected,

many were supported by the findings of this study. If anything may be concluded, it is

that academic entitlement is a complex issue that will take far more research to

understand. It is safe to cautiously surmise that family of origin issues, perfectionism,

and issues related to locus of control are all promising areas of treatment that may

provide insight into entitlement while giving an avenue to address it.

What is particularly striking is the connection between AE and perfectionism. As

mentioned in previous discussions of the literature, entitlement as a shield from the

uncomfortable ego truth of inevitable failure appears to explain the high incidence of

perfectionism. If one has a strong desire to be perfect and not much by way of allowance

for anything less than that, entitlement and the blaming of others that goes along with it

would seem a satisfactory substitute for a less-than-ideal performance.

This also seems closely intertwined with the element of perceived parenting style.

It stands to reason that overly demanding (authoritarian) parents would foster the

development of a strong desire for perfection in their children. It is possible that this

desire to please the high standards of parents leads to the development of an inner voice

45

that also demands perfection. Entitlement emerging as a defense against this critical and demanding side seems a plausible explanation for the incidence of both together.

While the connection may be more subtle, the ties between entitlement and permissive parenting styles also seem consistent with some of the ego psychology literature (Blanck & Blanck, 1986). If overly permissive parenting styles lead to insufficient identify formation, and therefore weak ego, it may be safe to surmise that the anxiety caused by lack of structure is best thwarted by entitlement. Permissive parenting is often viewed as the antithesis of authoritarian parenting, and yet they appear to lead to a similar outcome. Entitlement as a defense against overly rigid structure leading to perfectionism and overly lax structure leading to anxiety is a fascinating area of future study.

These findings raise some interesting questions about the nature of education. Consistent with the view of banking vs. transformational styles of education, entitlement is the tool of those in power used to keep the oppressed from recognizing their real needs (Friere, 1993). As our current educational climate appears to favor the banking method, this study shows that the prevalence in entitlement may be keeping the modern student focused on things of little real-world value, like letter grades on exams, instead of their greater challenges, like finding a rewarding career or learning marketable skills. The social implication is the creation of a generation so fixated on earning the elusive "A" that issues of social justice, real-world problem-solving, and personal empowerment are too easily cast aside. It is tempting to relegate entitlement to an irritating issue professors must deal with, but it may represent the divergence of a generation's social contribution.

By reducing the status of "student" to that of "consumer", we rob students of life's challenges and replace with a meaningless token economy. Adopting this perspective shifts blame for problematic behavior away from the students and parents and towards society's standards and expectations.

Limitations

While the design of this study tried to limit the interference of outside factors, the study still had its limitations. The first is the population sampled. All of the students surveyed were currently or had previously enrolled in the University of Oklahoma's introductory psychology course. While introductory psychology is a popular option for a required social science credit extending to all students enrolled at the University of Oklahoma, sampling exclusively from this population may have created a selection bias that would make it difficult to generalize findings to college students as a whole. Furthermore, the use of a convenience sample in which random selection and assignment was impossible might have further limited generalizability as well.

A second limitation emerges from the researcher's decision to not include cultural and socioeconomic factors as an element of exploration. Students were not asked for any information regarding their ethnicity or socioeconomic status, further limiting the extent to which findings might be argued to represent college students across the country. While this provides a fascinating area of further research, it was outside the scope of the current study and was therefore not included.

Additionally, the five factors selected for their possible predictive relationship to academic entitlement were far from exhaustive and may demonstrate another selection

bias on the part of the researcher. Obtaining theoretical guidance from Object Relations

Theory may have led to the exclusion of equally defensible factors and therefore led to

more limited findings. For example, Object Relation's emphasis on narcissism as

emanating from poor regulation of the self-esteem led to the inclusion of self-esteem,

perfectionism, social desirability, and locus of control as predictive factors. Additionally,

parenting style was used because of the importance given to early object representations

and the formation of the self in response to them during childhood. Grandiosity and

aggression were themes found in all predictive factors and in entitlement itself, showing

once more that Object Relations heavily influenced the direction of this study (Kernberg,

1988). A direction of further research, as mentioned below, would be to explore

additional factors that may yield even greater insight into the problem of academic

entitlement.

Recommendations

The findings of this study provide direction for future student interventions.

While the entitled student may behave disrespectfully, this study suggests that such

behavior comes from insecurity that lies far below a haughty exterior. It may benefit

professors and university personnel to attend a seminar or workshop designed to make

student insecurities known. Information linking uncivil behavior to imposter syndrome,

anxiety, and depression might foster greater communication between professors and

students. Spreading such information would empower professors to handle the entitled

student in more productive way that speaks to the root of the problem, as opposed to the

often offensive behavior the problem creates.

Similarly, university counseling centers can benefit from the findings in this study. Armed with the connection between perfectionism and perceived parenting style, they can better screen their clients for possible entitlement issues. Providers would be better equipped to discuss the anxiety issues that appear to lie at the root of student entitlement. Groups targeted to students wanting help adjusting to the college atmosphere might include material related to uncivil behavior, but in a way that empowers the student to address their own worries about performance.

As mentioned previously, one of the limitations of the study circled around the five predictive factors explored. It is quite possible that exploring the predictive value of other factors associated with academic entitlement might also yield potentially valuable results. Specifically, delving further into anxiety and its relationship with academic entitlement seems a promising direction. Anxiety and academic entitlement are frequently mentioned in tandem and may offer university faculty and staff another means by which to combat student struggles. Another promising set of factors may emerge with the exploration of specific cultural factors. Measuring academic entitlement and evaluating predictive factors across culturally different groups would be a fascinating area of future study.

Additionally, exploring entitlement in regard to cultural and socioeconomic factors may provide a greater depth of insight into the problem of academic entitlement. Successful interventions rely on an understanding of diversity and are frequently adapted to suit the individual in question. Studies directed at specific interventions for different

49

peoples would allow university staff and faculty even more tools to meet student issues more effectively.

<center>**References**</center>

Adler, A. (1988). The child's inner life and a sense of community. *Individual Psychology: Journal Of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, *44*(4), 417-423.

Adler, A. (1976). Individual psychology and crime. *Journal Of Individual Psychology*, *32*(2), 131-144.

Ashby, J. S., Noble, C. L., & Gnilka, P. B. (2012). Multidimensional perfectionism, depression, and satisfaction with life: Differences among perfectionists and tests of a stress-mediation model. *Journal Of College Counseling*, *15*(2), 130-143. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2012.00011.x

Baer, J. C., & Cheryomukhin, A. (2011). Students' distress over grades: Entitlement or a coping response?. *Journal Of Social Work Education*, *47*(3), 565-577. doi:10.5175/JSWE.2011.200900127

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child Care Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, *75*(1), 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*(1, Pt.2), 1-103. doi:10.1037/h0030372

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization Practices Associated With Dimensions of Competence in Preschool Boys and Girls. *Child Development*, *38*(2), 291-327. doi:10.2307/1127295

Beretvas, S., Suizzo, M., Durham, J. A., & Yarnell, L. M. (2008). A reliability generalization study of scores on Rotter's and Nowicki-Strickland's locus of control scales. *Educational And Psychological Measurement*, *68*(1), 97-119. doi:10.1177/0013164407301529

Blanck, R., & Blanck, G. (1986). *Beyond ego psychology: Developmental object relations theory*. New York, NY US: Columbia University Press.

Blau, G. J. (1984). Brief note comparing the Rotter and Levenson measures of locus of control. *Perceptual And Motor Skills*, *58*(1), 173-174. doi:10.2466/PMS.58.1.173-174

Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1993). A Dynamic Process Model of Service Quality: From Expectations to Behavioral Intentions. *Journal Of Marketing Research (JMR)*, *30*(1), 7-27.

Boyd, H., & Helms, J. E. (2005). Consumer Entitlement Theory and Measurement. *Psychology & Marketing*, *22*(3), 271-286. doi:10.1002/mar.20058

Brown, A. D. (1997). Narcissism, identity, and legitimacy. *The Academy Of Management Review*, *22*(3), 643-686. doi:10.2307/259409

<center>51</center>

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *57*(1), 110-119. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13

Buri, J. R., Louiselle, P. A., Misukanis, T. M., & Mueller, R. A. (1988). Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritativeness of self-esteem. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *14*(2), 271-282. doi:10.1177/0146167288142006

Campbell, W., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *83*(1), 29-45. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Campbell, W., Bush, C., Brunell, A. B., & Shelton, J. (2005). Understanding the Social

Costs of Narcissism: The Case of the Tragedy of the Commons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1358-1368. doi:10.1177/0146167205274855

Campbell, W., Foster, J. D., & Brunell, A. B. (2004). Running from shame or reveling in pride? Narcissism and the regulation of self-conscious emotions. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*(2), 150-153.

Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 982-997. doi:10.1037/a0016351

Ciani, K. D., Summers, J. J., & Easter, M. A. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 169(4), 332-344. doi:10.3200/GNTP.169.4.332-344

Credé, M., & Kuncel, N. R. (2008). Study habits, skills, and attitudes: The third pillar supporting collegiate academic performance. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(6), 425-453. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00089.x

Cruce, S. E., Pashak, T. J., Handal, P. J., Munz, D. C., & Gfeller, J. D. (2012). Conscientious Perfectionism, Self-Evaluative Perfectionism, and the Five-Factor Model of personality traits. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *53*(3), 268-273. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.013

D'Aulaires, Ingri & D'Aulaires, Edgar Parin (1962). *D'Aulaires' Book of Greek Myths*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Erdodi, L. A., Lajiness-O'Neill, R., & Saules, K. K. (2010). Order of Conners' CPT-II administration within a cognitive test battery influences ADHD indices. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 14(1), 43-51.

Ferriday, C., Vartanian, O., & Mandel, D. R. (2011). Public but not private ego threat triggers aggression in narcissists. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, *41*(5), 564-568. doi:10.1002/ejsp.801

Finney, T., & Finney, R. (2010). Are students their universities' customers? An exploratory study. *Education & Training*, *52*(4), 276-291. doi:10.1108/00400911011050954

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Singer, A. (1995). Perfectionism and parental authority styles. *Individual Psychology: Journal Of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, *51*(1), 50-60.

Freud, S. (1920). The libido theory and narcism. In , *A general introduction to psychoanalysis* (pp. 356-371). New York, NY US: Horace Liveright. doi:10.1037/10667-025

Freire, Paulo. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New rev. 20th-Anniversary ed. New York: Continuum.

Germain, M., & Scandura, T. A. (2005). Grade Inflation And Student Individual Differences as Systematic Bias in Faculty Evaluations. *Journal Of Instructional Psychology*, *32*(1), 58-67.

Gibson-Beverly, G., & Schwartz, J. P. (2008). Attachment, entitlement, and the impostor phenomenon in female graduate students. *Journal of College Counseling*, 11(2), 119-132. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Gnilka, P. B., Ashby, J. S., & Noble, C. M. (2012). Multidimensional perfectionism and anxiety: Differences among individuals with perfectionism and tests of a coping-mediation model. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, *90*(4), 427-436. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2012.00054.x

Gray-Little, B., Williams, V. L., & Hancock, T. D. (1997). An item response theory analysis of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*(5), 443-451. doi:10.1177/0146167297235001

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. P. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(10), 1193-1204. doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9284-9

Griffin, B. Q., Combs, A. L., Land, M. L., & Combs, N. N. (1983). Attribution of success and failure in college performance. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 114(2), 259-266. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology: A Journal Of Human Behavior*, *15*(1), 27-33.

Harvey, P., & Martinko, M. J. (2009). An empirical examination of the role of attributions in psychological entitlement and its outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 459-476. doi:10.1002/job.549

Hill, R. W., Huelsman, T. J., Furr, R., Kibler, J., Vicente, B. B., & Kennedy, C. (2004). A new measure of perfectionism: The Perfectionism Inventory. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *82*(1), 80-91. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8201_13

Horton, R. S., & Sedikides, C. (2009). Narcissistic responding to ego threat: When the status of the evaluator matters. *Journal Of Personality*, *77*(5), 1493-1525. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00590.x

Horvath, S., & Morf, C. C. (2009). Narcissistic defensiveness: Hypervigilance and avoidance of worthlessness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(6), 1252-1258. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.07.011

Horvath, S., & Morf, C. C. (2010). To be grandiose or not to be worthless: Different routes to self-enhancement for narcissism and self-esteem. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, *44*(5), 585-592.

Horst, P. P. (1941). The prediction of personal adjustment. *Social Science Research Council Bulletin*, *48*1-156.

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 206-219. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206

Kernberg, O. F. (2001). Object Relations, Affects, and Drives: Toward a New Synthesis. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *21*(5), 604.

Kirkpatrick, M. A., Stant, K., Downes, S., & Gaither, L. (2008). Perceived locus of control and academic performance: Broadening the construct's applicability. *Journal Of College Student Development*, *49*(5), 486-496. doi:10.1353/csd.0.0032

Kohut, H. (1972). Thoughts on narcissism and narcissistic rage. *The Psychoanalytic Study Of The Child*, *27*360-400.

Kopp, J. P., Zinn, T. E., Finney, S. J., & Jurich, D. P. (2011). The development and evaluation of the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire. *Measurement And Evaluation In Counseling And Development*, *44*(2), 105-129. doi:10.1177/0748175611400292

Kopp, J.P. & Finney, S.J. (in press). Linking Academic Entitlement and Student Incivility Using Latent Means Modeling. *Journal of Experimental Education*.

Lancaster, Brian P. (1999) Defining and Interpreting Suppressor Effects: Advantages and Limitations. Lancaster, Brian P. (1999). *Defining and Interpreting Suppressor*

Effects Advantages and Limitations. [Washington D.C.] : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

Landrum, R. (1999). Student expectations of grade inflation. *Journal Of Research & Development In Education*, *32*(2), 124-128.

Lanyon, R. I., & Carle, A. C. (2007). Internal and external validity of scores on the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding and the Paulhus Deception Scales. *Educational And Psychological Measurement*, *67*(5), 859-876. doi:10.1177/0013164406299104

Leary, M. R., Terry, M. L., Allen, A., & Tate, E. B. (2009). The concept of ego threat in social and personality psychology: Is ego threat a viable scientific construct?. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, *13*(3), 151-164. doi:10.1177/1088868309342595

Li, A., & Bagger, J. (2007). The balanced inventory of desirable responding (BIDR): A reliability generalization study. *Educational And Psychological Measurement*, *67*(3), 525-544. doi:10.1177/0013164406292087

Marlow, D., & Crowne, D. P. (1961). Social desirability and response to perceived situational demands. *Journal Of Consulting Psychology*, *25*(2), 109-115. doi:10.1037/h0041627

Menon, M., & Sharland, A. (2011). Narcissism, exploitative attitudes, and academic dishonesty: An exploratory investigation of reality versus myth. *Journal Of Education For Business*, *86*(1), 50-55. doi:10.1080/08832321003774772

Meyer, W. S. (1991). A case of restricted entitlement. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 19(3), 223-235. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Moeller, S. J., Crocker, J., & Bushman, B. J. (2009). Creating hostility and conflict: Effects of entitlement and self-image goals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(2), 448-452. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.11.005

Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: The marketisation of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching In Higher Education*, *14*(3), 277-287. doi:10.1080/13562510902898841

Mooney, S. P., Sherman, M. F., & lo Presto, C. T. (1991). Academic locus of control, self-esteem, and perceived distance from home as predictors of college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69(5), 445-448. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Moore, D. W. (2002). Measuring new types of question-order effects: Additive and subtractive. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(1), 80-91. doi:10.1086/338631

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal*, *43*(1), 74-85.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 598-609. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.598

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Version 6- Form 40A.

Paulhus, D. L., & Reid, D. B. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *60*(2), 307-317. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.2.307

Proctor, B. E., Hurst, A., Prevatt, F., Petscher, Y., & Adams, K. (2006). Study Skills Profiles of Normal-Achieving and Academically-Struggling College Students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 37-51. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissism, self-esteem, and defensive self-enhancement. *Journal Of Personality*, *59*(1), 19-38.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 890-902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890

Reed, M. J., Kennett, D. J., Lewis, T., & Lund-Lucas, E. (2011). The relative benefits found for students with and without learning disabilities taking a first-year university preparation course. *Active Learning In Higher Education*, *12*(2), 133-142. doi:10.1177/1469787411402483

Reitman, D., Rhode, P. C., Hupp, S. A., & Altobello, C. (2002). Development and validation of the Parental Authority Questionnaire - Revised. *Journal Of Psychopathology And Behavioral Assessment*, *24*(2), 119-127. doi:10.1023/A:1015344909518

Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(2), 151-161. doi:10.1177/0146167201272002

Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1989. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Revised edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Rothman, A. M., & Steil, J. M. (2012). Adolescent attachment and entitlement in a world of wealth. *Journal Of Infant, Child & Adolescent Psychotherapy*, *11*(1), 53-65. doi:10.1080/15289168.2012.650002

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General & Applied*, 80(1), 1-28. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Stoltz, K., & Ashby, J. S. (2007). Perfectionism and lifestyle: Personality differences among adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, and nonperfectionists. *The Journal Of Individual Psychology*, *63*(4), 414-423.

Stork, E., & Hartley, N. (2009). Classroom incivilities: Students' perceptions about professors' behaviors. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research*, *2*(4), 13-24.

Stucke, T. S., & Sporer, S. L. (2002). When a grandiose self-image is threatened: Narcissism and self-concept clarity as predictors of negative emotions and aggression following ego-threat. *Journal Of Personality*, *70*(4), 509-532. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.05015

Thompson, Doug. (2009). Ranking Predictors in Logistic Regression. *Assurant Health*. Retrieved Online http://www.mwsug.org/proceedings/2009/stats/MWSUG-2009-D10.pdf

Tolmacz, R., & Mikulincer, M. (2011). The sense of entitlement in romantic relationships—Scale construction, factor structure, construct validity, and its associations with attachment orientations. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *28*(1), 75-94. doi:10.1037/a0021479

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*(2), 103-125. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1502_01

Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M., & Robins, R. W. (2008). Is 'generation me' really more narcissistic than previous generations?. *Journal of Personality*, 76(4), 903-918. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00508.x

Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M., & Robins, R. W. (2008). Do today's young people really think they are so extraordinary? An examination of secular trends in narcissism and self-enhancement. *Psychological Science*, 19(2), 181-188. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02065.x

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. (2001). Age and birth cohort differences in self-esteem: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4), 321-344. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0504_3

Twenge, J. M., Zhang, L., & Im, C. (2004). It's beyond my control: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of increasing externality in locus of control, 1960-2002. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 308-319. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_5

Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation Me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled--and more miserable than ever before*. New York, NY US: Free Press. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Further evidence of an increase in narcissism among college students. *Journal of Personality*, 76(4), 919-928. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00509.x

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. (2008). Increases in positive self-views among high school students: Birth-cohort changes in anticipated performance, self-satisfaction, self-liking, and self-competence. *Psychological Science*, *19*(11),

Vater, A., Ritter, K., Schröder-Abé, M., Schütz, A., Lammers, C., Bosson, J. K., & Roepke, S. (2013). When grandiosity and vulnerability collide: Implicit and explicit self-esteem in patients with narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal Of Behavior Therapy And Experimental Psychiatry*, *44*(1), 37-47. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2012.07.001

Watson, P. J., Grisham, S. O., Trotter, M. V., & Biderman, M. D. (1984). Narcissism and empathy: Validity evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *48*(3), 301-305. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_12

Watson, P. J., & Morris, R. J. (1991). Narcissism, empathy and social desirability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*(6), 575-579. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90253-8

Zirkel, P. A. (2009). Commentary: Legal eligibility of students with learning disabilities: Consider not only RTI but also § 504. *Learning Disability Quarterly,* 32(2), 51-53.

Appendix A

AEQ

The following items are asking about your personal attitudes about the college experience. Not all students feel the same way or are expected to feel the same way. Remember, **there are no right or wrong answers.**

Just answer <u>honestly</u>.

Please respond by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the response options

1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree

****

1. If I don't do well on a test, the professor should make tests easier or curve grades.

2. Professors should only lecture on material covered in the textbook and assigned readings.
3. Because I pay tuition, I deserve passing grades.

4. If I am struggling in a class, the professor should approach me and offer to help.

5. If I cannot learn the material for a class from lecture alone, then it is the professor's fault when I fail the test.

6. I should be given the opportunity to make up a test, regardless of the reason for the absence.

7. I am a product of my environment. Therefore, if I do poorly in class, it is not my fault.

8. It is the professor's responsibility to make it easy for me to succeed.

Kopp, J. P., Zinn, T. E., Finney, S. J., & Jurich, D. P. (2011). The development and evaluation of the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 44*, 105-129.

BIDR Version 6 - Form 40A

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.

+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not true			somewhat			very true

____ 1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.

____ 2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.

____ 3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.

____ 4. I have not always been honest with myself.

____ 5. I always know why I like things.

____ 6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.

____ 7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.

____ 8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.

____ 9. I am fully in control of my own fate.

____ 10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.

____ 11. I never regret my decisions.

____ 12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.

____ 13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.

____ 14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.

____ 15. I am a completely rational person.

_____ 16. I rarely appreciate criticism.

_____ 17. I am very confident of my judgments

_____ 18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.

_____ 19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.

_____ 20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.

_____ 21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.

_____ 22. I never cover up my mistakes.

_____ 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.

_____ 24. I never swear.

_____ 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

_____ 26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.

_____ 27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.

_____ 28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.

_____ 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.

_____ 30. I always declare everything at customs.

_____ 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.

_____ 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.

_____ 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.

_____ 34. I never read sexy books or magazines.

_____ 35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.

_____ 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.

_____ 37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.

_____ 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.

_____ 39. I have some pretty awful habits.

_____ 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Version 6- Form 40A.

Perfectionism Inventory

Please use the following options to rate how much you generally agree with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree somewhat	neither agree nor disagree	agree somewhat	strongly agree

1. My work needs to be perfect, in order for me to be satisfied. (se1)
2. I am over-sensitive to the comments of others. (na1)
3. I usually let people know when their work isn't up to my standards. (hso1)
4. I am well-organized. (o1)
5. I think through my options carefully before making a decision. (p1)
6. If I make mistakes, people might think less of me. (cm1)
7. I've always felt pressure from my parent(s) to be the best. (pp1)
8. If I do something less than perfectly, I have a hard time getting over it. (r1)
9. All my energy is put into achieving a flawless result. (se2)
10. I compare my work to others and often feel inadequate. (na2)
11. I get upset when other people don't maintain the same standards I do. 2)
12. I think things should be put away in their place. (o2)
13. I find myself planning many of my decisions. (p2)
14. I am particularly embarrassed by failure. (cm2)
15. My parents hold me to high standards. (pp2)
16. I spend a lot of time worrying about things I've done, or things I need to do. (r2)
17. I can't stand to do something halfway. (se3)
18. I am sensitive to how others respond to my work. (na3)
19. I'm not very patient with people's excuses for poor work. (hso3)
20. I would characterize myself as an orderly person. (o3)
21. Most of my decisions are made after I have had time to think about them. (p3)
22. I over-react to making mistakes. (cm3)
23. My parent(s) are difficult to please. (pp3)
24. If I make a mistake, my whole day is ruined. (r3)
25. I have to be the best in every assignment I do. (se4)
26. I'm concerned with whether or not other people approve of my actions. (na4)
27. I'm often critical of others. (hso4)
28. I like to always be organized and disciplined. (o4)
29. I usually need to think things through before I know what I want. (p4)
30. If someone points out a mistake I've made, I feel like I've lost that person's respect in some way. (cm4)
31. My parent(s) have high expectations for achievement. (pp4)
32. If I say or do something dumb I tend to think about it for the rest of the day. (r4)

33. I drive myself rigorously to achieve high standards. (se5)
34. I often don't say anything, because I'm scared I might say the wrong thing. (na5)
35. I am frequently aggravated by the lazy or sloppy work of others. (hso5)
36. I clean my home often. (o5)
37. I need time to think up a plan before I take action. (p5)
38. If I mess up on one thing, people might start questioning everything I do. (cm5)
39. Growing up, I felt a lot of pressure to do everything right. (pp5)
40. When I make an error, I generally can't stop thinking about it. (r5)
41. I must achieve excellence in everything I do. (se6)
42. I am self-conscious about what others think of me. (na6)
43. I have little tolerance for other people's careless mistakes. (hso6)
44. I make sure to put things away as soon as I'm done using them. (o6)
45. I tend to deliberate before making up my mind. (p6)
46. To me, a mistake equals failure. (cm6)
47. My parent(s) put a lot of pressure on me to succeed. (pp6)
48. I often obsess over some of the things I have done. (r6)
49. I am often concerned that people will take what I say the wrong way. (na7)
50. I often get frustrated over other people's mistakes. (hso7)
51. My closet is neat and organized. (o7)
52. I usually don't make decisions on the spot. (p7)
53. Making mistakes is a sign of stupidity. (cm7)
54. I always felt that my parent(s) wanted me to be perfect. (pp7)
55. After I turn a project in, I can't stop thinking of how it could have been better. (r7)
56. My workspace is generally organized. (o8)
57. If I make a serious mistake, I feel like I'm less of a person. (cm8)
58. My parent(s) have expected nothing but my best. (pp8)
59. I spend a great deal of time worrying about other people's opinion of me.(na8)

Appendix D

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

BELOW IS A LIST OF STATEMENTS DEALING WITH YOUR GENERAL FEELINGS ABOUT YOURSELF. IF YOU **STRONGLY AGREE**, CIRCLE **SA**. IF YOU **AGREE** WITH THE STATEMENT, CIRCLE **A**. IF YOU **DISAGREE**, CIRCLE **D**. IF YOU **STRONGLY DISAGREE**, CIRCLE **SD**.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

6. I take a positive attitude towards myself.

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

9. I certainly feel useless at times.

10. At times I think I am no good at all.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1989. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Revised edition.

Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press

Appendix E

Rotter's Internality-Externality Scale

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying in really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place   first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard 1 study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of

reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General & Applied*, 80(1), 1-28. Retrieved from

EBSCO*host*.

Appendix F

Parental Authority Questionnaire

Instructions: For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your parents. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your parents during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly agree

_____ 1. While I was growing up my parents felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

_____2. Even if their children didn't agree with them, my parents felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what they thought was right.

_____3. Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

_____4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parents discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

_____5. My parents have always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

_____6. My parents has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

_____7. As I was growing up my parents did not allow me to question any decision they had made.

_____8. As I was growing up my parents directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.

_____9. My parents have always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

70

_____10. As I was growing up my parents did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

_____11. As I was growing up I knew what my parents expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parents when I felt that they were unreasonable.

_____12. My parents felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

_____13. As I was growing up, my parents seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.

_____14. Most of the time as I was growing up my parents did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

_____15. As the children in my family were growing up, my parents consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

_____16. As I was growing up my parents would get very upset if I tried to disagree with them.

_____17. My parents feel that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

_____18. As I was growing up my parents let me know what behavior they expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, they punished me.

_____19. As I was growing up my parents allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from them.

_____20. As I was growing up my parents took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions but they would not decide something simply because the children wanted it.

_____21. My parents did not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

_____22. My parents had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but they were willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

_____23. My parents gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow their direction, but they were always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

71

____24. As I was growing up my parents allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and they generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

____25. My parents have always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

____26. As I was growing up my parents often told me exactly what they wanted me to do and how they expected me to do it.

____27. As I was growing up my parents gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but they were also understanding when I disagreed with them.

____28. As I was growing up my parents did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

____29. As I was growing up I knew what my parents expected of me in the family and they insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for their authority.

____30. As I was growing up, if my parents made a decision in the family that hurt me, they were willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if they had made a mistake.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *57*(1), 110-119.

doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5701