The *You Owe Me!* Mentality:
A Student Entitlement Perception Paradox

Thomas Schaefer
Program Director, Marketing and Economics
School of Business
American Public University
Charles Town, WestVirginia

Marguerite Barta
Graduate Teaching Faculty
Nursing Division
University of Mary
Bismark, North Dakota

William Whitley
Program Director, Accounting and Finance
School of Business
American Public University
Charles Town, West Virginia

Margie Stogsdill
Kaplan University
School of Business
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

ABSTRACT

College and University faculty members routinely share stories and anecdotes about students who appear to have an unrealistic expectation of entitlement when it comes to following the requirements and dictates of classroom and collegiate rigor (Gill, 2009; Lippman, Bulanda, Wagenaar, 2009; Roosevelt, 2009). Faculty stories and discussions include narratives about students who skip class (Glater, 2006); invest minimal effort into their studies (Greenberger, Lessard, Chuansheng, & Farrugia, 2008); believe they should be treated as customers rather than as students (Ansburg, 2001; Benton, 2006; Lippman et al.; Snare, 1997); or believe that a quid pro quo relationship exists whereby tuition is a guaranteed purchase of good grades (Ansburg, 2001; Benton, 2006). The continuous regularity with which faculty members report events of student entitlement expectations coupled with the researchers own brushes with student entitlement issues and unreasonable student expectations begs the question as to whether such issues are anomalies or pervasive, ergo, the research quest to determine if students have unrealistic entitlement expectations began. The research question and premise of this research paper is: "Do students have unrealistic academic entitlement expectations?"

INTRODUCTION

College and University faculty members routinely share stories and anecdotes about students who appear to have an unrealistic expectation of entitlement when it comes to following the requirements and dictates of classroom and collegiate rigor (Gill, 2009; Lippman, Bulanda, Wagenaar, 2009; Roosevelt, 2009). Faculty stories and discussions include narratives about students who skip class (Glater, 2006); invest minimal effort into their studies (Greenberger, Lessard, Chuansheng, & Farrugia, 2008); believe they should be treated as customers rather than as students (Ansburg, 2001; Benton, 2006; Lippman et al.; Snare, 1997); or believe that a quid pro quo re-

lationship exists whereby tuition is a guaranteed purchase of good grades (Ansburg, 2001; Benton, 2006). The continuous regularity with which faculty members report events of student entitlement expectations coupled with the researchers own brushes with student entitlement issues and unreasonable student expectations begs the question as to whether such issues are anomalies or pervasive, ergo, the research quest to determine if students have unrealistic entitlement expectations began. The research question and premise of this research paper is: "Do students have unrealistic academic entitlement expectations?"

From a psychological perspective, entitlement has been viewed by researchers as a component of narcissism (Campbell, Bonacci, Sheldon, Exline & Bushman, 2004). Entitlement includes the observation that the individual "deserves" something or that the world or society owes the individual something (Glater, 2006), even if the individual fails to fulfill societal or professional compacts. Individuals who exhibit an attitude of self-entitlement tend to adopt pervasive "I'm special," self-centered, and me-centric attitudes. As such, they believe that when they have a "want," it should be filled immediately (Lippman, et al. 2009) or if they believe they deserve something (such as the bending or dismissal of rules or objectives) they have an automatic unrestricted right to receive their deserved entitlement.

Historically self-entitlement issues are discussed in regard to customer-business or citizen-government relationships and the self-entitlement paradigm is infrequently perceived as a condition in student-college/student-university relationships. However, recent anecdotal evidence suggests that academic institutions are not sheltered from the impact of the psychological self-entitlement paradigm. This paper examines if the societal self-entitlement belief system has entered into the world of post-secondary education in the form of a student academic entitlement paradigm. Finally, if this student belief system is present does it directly foster a student mindset whereby such entitlements, if apparent, are applied and present within the higher education academic environment (Campbell, et al. 2004; Greenberger, et al. 2008).

For the purpose of this paper and in order to reduce the danger of miscommunication, clear articulation and recognition of the concepts (1) psychological entitlement and (2) academic en-

titlement are paramount. Therefore, the term psychological entitlement is defined as "a pervasive sense that one deserves more and is entitled to more than others" (Campbell, et al. 2004, p. 30). This research paper will adopt the concept of academic entitlement which is the state of entitlement applied within an academic environment (Campbell et al. 2004; Greenberger, et al. 2008).

Previously published discussions of academic entitlement have focused predominantly on multiple types of student activities and behaviors, the consequential implications of these behaviors in the classroom setting and the direct causal repercussions of academic entitlement on the administration of colleges and universities. As such, Ansburg (2011) identified that there is an inherent belief among students and higher education administration that students are "customers" or "consumers" and, as such, are entitled to considerations and concessions that would be expected within the traditional retail business model. Any analogy that students are customers implies the use of the general customer/business model, which posits that the customer is "always right." It is likely that an "always right" mindset can lead to or foster a student's belief that grades are product of education to be attained by purchase. The price or result of said sale thus expressly creates a quid pro quo transaction, namely, tuition in exchange for a degree rather than tuition in exchange for the introduction to knowledge and the opportunity to learn, understand, and practice said knowledge (Snare, 1997). The customer-business perception supports the implication that the student is a customer (because money/tuition has been paid) therefore, education is guaranteed (Ansburg, 2001; Benton, 2006; Correa, 2006) and good grades will be awarded through the business-customer relationship/process. It is highly likely that any student belief in the customer-business model replacing the student-academic institution model serves as the foundation for a belief in academic entitlement.

The academic entitlement belief system (student as a customer) has created a paradigm, which shapes the students' mindset, the student's attitude, and consequently the students perceptions (Lippman, et al. 2009). The paradigm occurs when the student believes they are a customer paying for the delivery of a given service or product (which in this particular case is an A or a 4.0 GPA) (Ansburg, 2001). The student academic

entitlement belief systems contradicts the education student-academic model and in fact, is diametrically opposed to the proven and successful education student academic model. Instead, the academic entitlement belief system implies that the product or service is (in this case, a degree), is not earned by academic application, but instead has been purchased in a consumer transaction. The "student as a customer" attitude can significantly impact the academic landscape by changing the existing academic model into one in which colleges and universities are not institutions of higher learning, but businesses providing a given commodity which may be purchased rather than earned (Correa, 2006).

It is reasonable to expect the "student as a customer" concept to be accepted, in limited fashion for transactional issues involving students and academic administration. Within these transactions, the student is indeed a customer who has a reasonable expectation of quality service and courtesy. Some of these administrative transactions are items such as tuition billing, student employment, billeting, and meal services. However, when this belief moves (student as a customer) into the academic arena, students may carry the belief of self-entitlement/academic entitlement into the classroom, where it can easily become the status quo, via which the service (i.e., education/knowledge) is something easily attained by purchase rather than by academic pursuit and where professors are merely facilitators delivering a product (i.e., education/knowledge). Under the customer-business model, professors cease to be educators and become service delivery employees who may run the risk of being disciplined (or fired) for displeasing the customer (Benson, 2006). This belief coupled with college/university administrations' expectations and increased focus on student retention increasingly germinates and perpetuates a negative student/professor dynamic. The traditional student/dynamic is replaced with a negative student/professor dynamic, which, diminishes the quality of education and compromises the integrity of student learning.

Student self-entitlement/academic entitlement is likely further fostered in the eyes of faculty by the customer's (i.e., the student's) ability to utilize end-of-course evaluations as a weapon to punish or hurt faculty who, students believe, have not fulfilled the student's expectations or answered their demands. Traditionally the end of course

evaluation has three areas of focus, the first area of focus being evaluation of the curriculum and course itself, the second being assessment of the environment in which the course was held, and third the evaluation and assessment of the faculty member. While the faculty evaluation/assessment portion of the end of course evaluation is but one third of the document, the common perception is that this is the most important part of the end of course survey and the remainder of the survey is superfluous.

There appears to be a common belief, although not fully substantiated through research, that when students receive higher grades, higher faculty evaluations follow (Brodie, 1998; Needham, 1978). Professors share a common belief that there is a direct correlation between giving good grades and receiving good end-of-course evaluations (Krautman & Sander, 1999) regardless of, if a students' academic learning and subsequent assessments (assignments, quizzes, or work) are not deserving of a good grade. Conversely, students have expressed the belief that they have the right to potentially coerce professors into giving good grades through the implied withholding of good end of course faculty evaluations (Boysen, 2008; Ellis, Burke, Lomire, & McCormack, 2003; Greenwald & Gilmore, 1997; Heckert, Latier, Ringwald-Burton & Drazen, 2006; Lippman et al, 2009; & Snare, 1997). As the practice of academic institutions soliciting student feedback about the quality of course material, the effectiveness of the course, and finally of instructor performance through the use of end-of-course surveys/evaluations has increased, the belief among students and faculty has become more prevalent and common place that end of course surveys/evaluations may be used as a weapon against their professors, especially if the student perceives that they have been treated poorly by their professor. Furthermore, a pervasive belief has been fostered that the end of course faculty evaluation may be used by higher education administration as the sole means of professor performance evaluation, as a justification for decisions to grant or deny tenure or to stall promotions or as a crutch for justification in salary decisions. The power of the end of course evaluation are believed to be so powerful and so highly regarded by higher education administrators that the information gathered from the end of course surveys may be used by the university administrators to determine which professors are recognized as successful in

their work or the information drawn from the end of course surveys may be used as a primary culling device to determine which professors stay employed within the academic institution (Aleamoni, 1999, Benton, 2006; Ellis, Burke, Lomire, & McCormack, 2003: Neath, 1996; & Wachtel, 1998).

The impact of the student as customer attitude (which is perpetuated by the use of end of course surveys) has apparently created a prevailing mindset and expectation among students that they are entitled to satisfaction, regardless of the work invested; "if I work hard, I deserve a grade" (Gill, 2009, Roosevelt, 2009; Trout, Platt, & Crumbley, 1997). This may lead students to have inflated preconception about the grade they should earn for a class or course (possibly an A?), and in turn, preconceived expectation that they will receive an A regardless of their effort, or quality of academic product. Consequently, such beliefs creates the academic entitlement expectation, in which credit is awarded for doing "something" (Ciania et al, 2008; Lippman et al. 2009; Svuanum & Bigatti, 2006) even when that "something" does not fulfill academic requirements.

While only limited research has been conducted on student entitlement expectations, one major study conducted by Greenberger, et al. in 2008 reported that one third of surveyed students believed that they should receive a final grade of "B" for attending lectures and classes regularly. This same study reported 40% of surveyed students thought they should receive a final grade of "B" if they only finished their reading (Greenberger, et al. 2008). In separate research, (Gill, 2009) it was reported that students expressed the belief that they should earn a grade of "B" by only attending lectures and doing the assigned readings. Further studies have discovered that students also have expressed the belief that if they attend class and turn in homework (on time), these actions alone and not the quality of the assignment outcome assessments, should guarantee that they will not fail a course (Hansen, 1991). Surprisingly, students have further reported that the quality of outcome assessments (i.e., assignments, quizzes, and exams) is trivial in grade determination. Roosevelt (2009) cited one student as commenting that "I think putting in a lot of effort should merit a high grade. What else is there really than the effort you put in?"

Prior research indicates that students expect equal-level familiarity with professors rather than accept that professors and instructors are not the students' peers. As a consequence, when familiarity expectations are not met, students no longer see a need to respect the faculty-student relationship. In fact, respect diminishes when students expect professors to go to exceptional lengths to accommodate all their needs, wants, desires, and preferences (Gill, 2009; Glater, 2006; Lippman et al. 2009). Subsequently, the student's view is one whereby they demand certain accommodations, which leads to an environment where student respect for faculty is severely diminished (Benton, 2006, Ciani et al. 2008; Hansen, 1991, Landrum 1999, Lippman et al. 2009). As familiarity, expectations, and student academic entitlement expectations increase, the likelihood of a negative confrontation between student and faculty, in addition to student backlash via negative faculty evaluations, will become more commonplace. From the existing research it can be extrapolated that student academic entitlement attitudes appear to give students the idea that they have permission to challenge professors on any and all issues, regardless of intent, content, or supporting validation. The research clearly indicates that as the level of student academic entitlement increases, the potential for students to become argumentative and aggressive increases exponentially (Lippman, et al. 2009).

This study is not intended to imply that students are not entitled to respect, courtesy, and the opportunity for a high quality educational experience (as stipulated by an educational contract with the university). Students can rightly expect their educational experience to be delivered via quality textbooks; informative lectures, excellent professorial interaction, an extensive research database along with an academic rich library, and finally, clean and safe facilities. It cannot be underemphasized that it is the responsibility of the institution of higher learning to provide an environment that facilitates a strong and robust learning experience. The research will reveal a snapshot in time whereby student perceptions are recorded and analyzed to explore the paradigm of student academic entitlement.

METHOD

Sample

A survey was administered across a target population of 21,177 students which included individuals in the graduate program (500 and 600 level classes), the baccalaureate program (300 and 400 level classes), and the associate program (100 and 200 level classes) for the school of business of a large for-profit online academic institution. The survey was strictly voluntary and elicited responses from 970 undergraduate students and 296 graduate students. Of the 970 undergraduate students 57% were in the associate program, and 43% were in the baccalaureate program. The survey was made available for 30 days during an active semester in the late spring and early summer of 2010.

Results

Results of this survey cannot be examined in detail without first describing general response data to the survey questions on academic entitlement shown in Table 1. Among the more highly-endorsed items was the item "Students should expect to take all exams on or before exam deadlines" (94.3%), "The amount of effort a student puts into a course should be recognized and rewarded" (93.1%), and "Teachers award me the grades I deserve" (90.1%). Among the lowest endorsed items was the item "I should be able to turn in an assignment late, without penalty, if the assignment due date interfered with my personal plans" (7.7%), and "When exam grades are lower than I expected the fault lies primarily with the professor" (6.8%).

Table 2 identifies results from an exploratory factor analysis. Two main components can be culled from the results, particularly when reviewing the survey items that were loaded most heavily (>.5) on each component identified. Component 1, accounts for 21.449% of the variance of the extraction of sums squared loadings and provides insight into the "participation" elements of student entitlement. Conversely, component 3, accounts for 7.858% of the variance of the extraction of sums squared loadings, provides insight into the "effort" elements of student entitlement. Components 1 and 3 are identified as Partgrp and Efftgrp respectively from this point forward as they become the primary constructs for further analysis and testing. A test for Cronbach's Alpha presented a result of .81 and revealed a high level of consistency between responses on the constructs.

A summed score of all items for each construct were utilized to create a split half population based on the mean within the construct for further analysis. The effort construct was separated into effort groups (hereafter referred to as EfftGrp1 and EffrGrp2). EfftGrp1 contains responses that were below the mean and EfftGrp2 contained responses above the mean. The participation construct was separated into participation groups (hereafter referred to as PartGrp) and labeled PartGrp1 and PartGrp2. PartGrp1 contained responses below the mean and PartGrp2 contained responses above the mean. Additionally, a series of t-tests were conducted using the groups established within each construct measured against the remaining variables in the dataset. The purpose was to determine whether or not there are differences in student characteristics that might contribute to the expectations represented.

Statistically significant differences were found within the EfftGrp construct, particularly in the areas of Sex, Age, Ethnic background, and cumulative GPA. Additionally statistically significant differences within the PartGrp construct were found primarily in the areas of Sex, Age, Ethnic background, United States citizenship, Level in program and cumulative GPA. Complete statistical output can be located in Table 4.

DISCUSSION

Potential Economic Impact on Institutions of Higher Learning as AE Perceptions Change

Institutions of higher education are not dissimilar to any other business organization and recognize that the quality of the organization is judged by its ability to meet or exceed consumer/customer expectations. The purpose here is not to debate or argue the merits of the student-consumer analogy, but rather to note how customers who have false expectations may quickly become dissatisfied customers, which may in turn impact the bottom line of the organization (Sheth and Mittal, 1996). Clearly, students' perceptions and

	TABLE 1 **PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS ENDORSING** **ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT ITEMS** **(SLIGHTLY AGREE, AGREE, OR SLIGHTLY AGREE)**	
Code	**Academic Entitlement Question**	**% Endorsers**
Rules	1. Class rules for discussions and assignments are designed to help increase my learning.	88.3
TrHard	2. If I explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think he/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade.	65.8
ApptCncl	3. If the professor cancels an appointment with me on the same day we were supposed to meet, I would rate that experience as (scale utilized was very negative, negative, neutral, somewhat positive, positive)	7.4 positive 44.3 negative 48.3 neutral
ReadGrd	4. If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve at least a grade of _____ in that course. (scale utilized was A, B, C, D, F)	80.1 C or higher 19.9 D or lower
PostFrq	5. As long as I'm learning it should not matter when or how often I post on the discussion board.	31.0
PartGrp	6. If I have participated in 70% or more of the course activities, I deserve at least a grade of _____ in that course (scale utilized was A, B, C, D, F).	8.30 C or higher 17.0 D or lower
GrdDsrvd	7. Teachers award me the grades I deserve.	90.1
VacAllow	8. If I have scheduled a vacation or other trip important to me that occurs at the same time as an exam, I should be able to reschedule the exam after my return at a time and date convenient to me.	43.8
EfftFwd	9. The amount of effort a student puts into a course should be recognized and rewarded.	93.1
ProfAllow	10. If my professional schedule is very busy during the week an exam must be taken, the professor should be flexible and allow me to take the exam when my professional workload decreases even if the exam deadline has passed.	40.3
DBFocus	11. Discussion board grades should focus more on my participation than on the quality of my answers to any questions asked.	28.9
LowGrade	12. When exam grades are lower than I expected, the fault lies primarily with the professor.	6.8
EmailRsp	13. I expect my professor will respond to my email messages within _____. (scale utilized was 4 hours or less, 8 hours, 12 hours, 24 hours, 48 hours, 72 hours)	83.3 =<24hrs 16.7 >24hrs
ExtraCrd	14. On those occasions when my final course grade is lower than I expected, the professor should be willing to allow me to do an additional assignment for a better grade.	54.7
ExamDate	15. Students should expect to take all exams on or before exam deadlines.	94.3
AdptRule	16. If I don't like the class rules or assignment instructions I should be able to adapt them to suit my personal needs.	13.1
OffResp	17. When I leave my professor a phone message/office posting it is reasonable to expect them to respond within _____. (scale utilized was 4 hours or less, 8 hours, 12 hours, 24 hours, 48 hours, 72 hours)	82.7 =<24hrs 17.3 >24hrs
ExtraAsg	18. In the interest of fairness, additional assignments to increase grades should not be allowed.	40.3
MeetTime	19. A professor should be willing to meet with me at a time that works best for me, even if it is inconvenient for the professor.	16.4
LateProf	20. I should be able to turn in an assignment late, without penalty, if the assignment due date interfered with my personal plans.	7.7
LatePers	21. I should be able to turn in an assignment late, without penalty, if the assignment due date interfered with my professional schedule.	31.7
StudCust	22. I feel that the professor should recognize me as a customer and interact with me accordingly.	44.9

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TABLE 2							
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS							
Component							
Rules	.133	-.099	.424	.490	-.345	-.039	-.019
TryHard	.298	.180	-.552	-.180	.205	.028	.022
ApptCncl	-.008	-.334	.379	.096	.299	-.404	.406
ReadGrd	.432	.360	-.311	.197	-.396	-.157	.220
PostFrq	.531	-.178	-.036	.009	-.062	-.198	-.164
PartGrd	.508	.302	-.297	.285	-.301	-.162	.141
GrdDsrvd	.288	-.248	.300	.406	-.225	-.005	.047
VacAllow	.638	-.193	.011	-.119	.095	-.132	.082
EfftRwd	.218	.179	-.360	.173	.316	-.416	.287
ProfAllow	.710	-.189	-.004	-.161	.220	-.099	-.015
DBFocus	.550	.012	-.234	.020	-.198	.124	-.111
LowGrade	.509	-.132	.076	-.197	-.081	-.097	.207
EmailRsp	.302	.743	.485	-.040	.159	.043	-.001
ExtraCrd	.623	-.011	-.106	.309	.353	.186	-.112
ExamDate	.364	-.198	.179	.054	-.138	.132	.146
AdptRule	.526	.101	-.113	-.183	-.260	.244	.018
OffResp	.333	.730	.491	-.047	.176	.014	-.012
ExtraAsg	.406	-.083	-.088	.557	.382	.195	-.296
MeetTime	.445	-.048	.227	-.368	-.105	.025	.157
LateProf	.663	-.187	.122	-.269	-.106	.072	-.118
LatePers	.694	-.244	.146	-.134	.136	.039	-.152
StudCust	.002	-.091	-.057	.112	.153	.633	.658
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis, 7 components extracted							

TABLE 3
TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED

	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.179	21.449	21.449
2	1.836	8.347	29.796
3	1.729	7.858	37.653
4	1.360	6.180	43.833
5	1.231	5.598	49.431
6	1.039	4.725	54.155
7	1.024	4.653	58.809
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis			

expectations must be managed and framed just as they are for "customers" in any other industry.

As opposed to commercial and non-education industries, institutions of higher education (whether profit or non-profit) have a different business challenge because the institution of higher education must answer to many more stakeholders than the traditional business entity. The institution of higher learning has students who are in some areas customers and in other areas of the university students and the institution of higher learning has external stakeholders(who will be the final down-line consumer) to consider. In service to all of the institutions stakeholders, it is imperative that institutions of higher education take into consideration the opinions and perceptions of the final down –line consumers; which are the businesses that hire their graduates and of society at large. The successful post-secondary institution must manage their stakeholder rela-

<table>
<tr><td colspan="1">

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF T-TEST RESULTS

EfftGrp

1. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Sex of the student that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 1.27, s = .446) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.21, s = .405), *t*(732.876) = 2.487, *p* = .013, α = .05.

2. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Age of the student that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 4.33, s = 1.308) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 4.15, s = 1.243), *t*(772.728) = 2.36, *p* = .019, α = .05.

3. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Ethnic of the student that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 4.83, s = 2.101) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 4.54, s = 2.27), *t*(865.162) = 2.179, *p* = .030, α = .05.

4. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of English of the student that the Efft-Grp1 has (M = 1.95, s = .219) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.95, s = .224), *t*(1152) = .193, *p* = .847, α = .05.

5. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of USCit of the student that the Efft-Grp1 has (M = 1.90, s = .304) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.91, s = .284), *t*(1167) = .785, *p* = .433, α = .05.

6. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Mode of the student that the Efft-Grp1 has (M = 2.98, s = .172) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.97, s = .186), *t*(1163) = .658, *p* = .511, α = .05.

7. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of LevelGp of the student that the Efft-Grp1 has (M = 1.79, s = .763) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.76, s = .789), *t*(1172) = .489, *p* = .625, α = .05.

8. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ParEdLev of the student that the Efft-Grp1 has (M = 4.23, s = 1.931) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 4.27, s = 1.914), *t*(1171) = .329, *p* = .742, α = .05.

9. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Rules that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.46, s = 1.661) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.92, s = 1.124), *t*(588.006) = 5.844, *p* = .000, α = .05.

10. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ApptCncl that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.59, s = .842) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.34, s = .846), *t*(1165) = 4.731, *p* = .000, α = .05.

11. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ReadGrd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.96, s = 1.007) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.30, s = .849), *t*(1149) = 5.977, *p* = .000, α = .05.

12. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of PostFrq that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.56, s = 1.575) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.94, s = 1.544), *t*(1164) = 3.966, *p* = .000, α = .05.

13. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of PartGrd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.84, s = .734) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.11, s = .621), *t*(682.643) = 6.264, *p* = .000, α = .05.

14. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of GrdDsrvd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.06, s = 1.273) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.00, s = 1.084), *t*(697.927) = .858, *p* = .391, α = .05.

15. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of VacAllow that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.88, s = 1.496) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.30, s = 1.482), *t*(1166) = 4.578, *p* = .000, α = .05.

16. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of EfftRwd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 4.69, s = 1.169) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 5.08, s = .916), *t*(656.487) = 5.899, *p* = .000, α = .05.

17. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ProfAllow that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.71, s = 1.413) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.29, s = 1.409), *t*(1169) = 6.637, *p* = .000, α = .05.

18. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of DBFocus that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.53, s = 1.309) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.00, s = 1.351), *t*(1161) = 5.722, *p* = .000, α = .05.

19. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of LowGrade that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 1.85, s = .921) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.07, s = .939), *t*(1167) = 3.678, *p* = .000, α = .05.

20. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of EmailRsp that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.15, s = .900) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.20, s = 1.001), *t*(881.145) = .746, *p* = .456, α = .05.

21. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ExtraCrd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.15, s = 1.482) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.74, s = 1.395), *t*(763.484) = 6.661, *p* = .000, α = .05.

22. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ExamDate that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 1.85, s = 1.055) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 1.84, s = .786), *t*(626.293) = .240, *p* = .810, α = .05.

23. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of AdptRule that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 1.91, s = 1.190) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.22, s = 1.260), *t*(834.478) = 4.113, *p* = .000, α = .05.

24. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of OffResp that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.19, s = .930) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.21, s = 1.026), *t*(866.937) = .397, *p* = .692, α = .05.

25. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ExtraAsg that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.50, s = 1.547) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.75, s = 1.460), *t*(766.873) = 2.701, *p* = .007, α = .05.

26. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of MeetTime that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.33, s = 1.060) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.51, s = 1.126), *t*(835.658) = 2.738, *p* = .006, α = .05.

27. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of LateProf that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 1.85, s = .978) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.03, s = 1.006), *t*(1153) = 3.005, *p* = .003, α = .05.

</td></tr>
</table>

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF T-TEST RESULTS

1. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of LatePers that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.51, s = 1.336) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 2.85, s = 1.417), *t*(1161) = 4.113, *p* = .000, α = .05.

2. A *t* test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of StudCust that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.16, s = 1.476) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.25, s = 1.484), *t*(1119) = .987, *p* = .324, α = .05.

3. A *t* test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of CumGPA that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 3.5264, s = .71267) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.3084, s = .96785), *t*(287.485) = 2.246, *p* = .025, α = .05.

PartGrp

1. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Sex of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.20, s = .398) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 1.27, s = .442), t(1002.943) = 2.672, p = .008, α = .05.

2. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Age of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 4.31, s = 1.205) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 4.05, s = 1.311), t(1100) = 3.441, p = .001, α = .05.

3. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Ethnic of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 4.82, s = 2.139) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 4.41, s = 2.301), t(1015.853) = 3.045, p = .002, α = .05.

4. A t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of English of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.96, s = .200) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 1.93, s = .252), t(915.995) = 1.867, p = .062, α = .05.

5. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of USCit of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.92, s = .265) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 1.88, s = .321), t(959.077) = 2.267, p = .024, α = .05.

6. A t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Mode of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 2.98, s = .140) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 2.96, s = .227), t(783.753) = 1.705, p = .089, α = .05.

7. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of LevelGP of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.72, s = .761) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 1.85, s = .798), t(1104) = 2.934, p = .003, α = .05.

8. A t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ParEdLev of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 4.35, s = 1.859) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 4.14, s = 1.987), t(1103) = 1.761, p = .079, α = .05.

9. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of Rules that the PartGrp1 has (M = 2.01, s = 1.436) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 2.21, s = 1.239), t(1098) = 2.485, p = .013, α = .05.

10. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of TryHard that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.62, s = 1.442) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 4.20, s = 1.280), t(1087.341) = 7.001, p = .000, α = .05.

11. A t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ApptCncl of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.43, s = .812) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.40, s = .859), t(1099) = .623, p = .533, α = .05.

12. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ReadGrd that the PartGrp1 has (M = 2.98, s = .934) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.42, s = .832), t(1096) = 8.122, p = .000, α = .05.

13. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of GrdDsrvd that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.85, s = 1.114) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 2.24, s = 1.151), t(1098) = 5.694, p = .000, α = .05.

14. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of EfftRwd that the PartGrp1 has (M = 4.83, s = 1.102) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 5.09, s = .920), t(1100.288) = 4.340, p = .000, α = .05.

15. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of EmailRsp that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.07, s = .920) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.32, s = 1.002), t(1017.552) = 4.313, p = .000, α = .05.

16. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ExamDate that the PartGrp1 has (M = 1.62, s = .845) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 2.08, s = .809), t(1069.263) = 9.254, p = .000, α = .05.

17. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of OffResp that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.08, s = .918) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.37, s = 1.050), t(988.786) = 4.754, p = .000, α = .05.

18. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ExtraAsg that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.27, s = 1.482) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 4.13, s = 1.371), t(1078.327) = 9.885, p = .000, α = .05.

19. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of MeetTime that the PartGrp1 has (M = 2.18, s = 1.001) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 2.79, s = 1.135), t(991.602) = 9.206, p = .000, α = .05.

20. A t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean of StudCust of the student that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.25, s = 1.492) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.21, s = 1.459), t(1052) = .395, p = .693, α = .05.

21. A t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean of CumGPA that the PartGrp1 has (M = 3.4954, s = .83176) and that the PartGrp2 has (M = 3.2654, s = .93348), t(220.384) = 2.121, p = .035, α = .05.

tionship with the student, they must manage their stakeholder relationship with the future employers of their students and of society at large and they must manage the relationship between the student and their future employers and society at large.

While it may be posited that the higher learning institutions down-line final consumers are even more significant than those of the institution's active students, given the situation, it is in the best interest of the learning institution and of its students and down the line consumers, that the institution carefully monitors, balances, and maintains the needs, wants, and desires of all consumers, (immediate and down line). Within higher-education, faculty and administrators must recognize that students are not necessarily the best judges of academic quality and that students focus almost exclusively on short-term objectives of academic entitlement. This short term objective may cloud the student's awareness of how important it is to obtain the skills and knowledge that are required of college graduates when it becomes time for the student to become the executive who is responsible for fulfilling the needs, wants, and desires of business, industry and society at large. Regardless of student intent or objective, institutions of higher learning must actively manage the expectations and perceptions of their students to fulfill the societal mandate.

Society's mandate for higher education means introducing new students (in simple and yet detailed terms) to the university and to the universities expectations and requirements and clearly explain and introduce the students to the expectations and requirements of faculty. If the university is meeting it fiduciary responsibilities to all of its stakeholders, then it is paramount that students become well acquainted with the concept of academic rigor, the uncompromising dedication to academic work and to the realities of how much pure tensile strength and devotion will be required of the student to take them to their goal of graduation and finally, to the many life sacrifices that an education demands. Early acclimation to these realities may be one of the best methods to avoid any misunderstandings, ill-conceived or unreasonable and biased student perceptions, and finally to our focus in this research study; which is erroneous student expectations of academic entitlement. Conversely, the institution must identify, understand, and recognize the wants, needs, desires, and requirements

end-line consumers. The primary goal of higher education is to introduce knowledge, provide an environment for intellectual growth, and to ensure that students are given every opportunity to hone their work related skills in preparation for a successful professional career. It may be posited that if this aspect of the student and higher-learning equation is not recognized, (by either the student or the institution of higher learning) than the reputation of the learning institution may be diminished in the eyes of society and of business at large and the students who matriculate from that learning institution will have a diminished value in the eyes of the end consumer which is the external stakeholder (business and society).

Paradox of Effort Perceptions, Participation, and Grading

When examining the results presented, a paradox among the responses arose. One aspect from the survey results focused upon student individual perceptions, as they related to effort and perceptions of grading, as well as fairness in grading ("I get the grades I deserve"). Survey results clearly indicated a high level of support for the concept of rewarding effort (via awarding of high grades) regardless of the level of mastery of the topic or skills being taught.

Student expectations that "effort" be a consideration in the grading process are not a new phenomenon. Unfortunately such an expectation is riddled with concerns of equity, fairness, and objectivity because it is impossible for faculty to accurately gauge effort, not only outside of the classroom environment, but also within it. Learning is a highly individualized process, and the effort required, for any task, will vary dramatically from person to person. Teachers can recall students who exerted the minimum levels of effort required within a course yet had a mastery of the subject matter at hand, as demonstrated by their achievement of the requisite learning and course outcomes. Such mastery may come not from the minimum effort but from prior knowledge, raw intellect, or other internal factors. This assumption derives from the response ratios identified in Table 1; particularly for questions 11 and 18. Question 11 asked if discussion grades should be based more on participation than on the quality of the answers provided. Question 18 asked where "in the interest of fairness, additional assignments to increase grades should not be al-

lowed". For question 11 only 28.9% of respondents strongly agreed/agreed; however, while this percentage may appear small it is still significant enough (nearly 1 in 3) to indicate the value of "effort" (number of times participating) to the respondent and leading to a heightened sense of entitlement. The t-test indicated a statistically reliable difference between the mean of ReadGrd that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.96, s = 1.007) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.30, s = .849), $t(1149) = 5.977$, $p = .000$, $\alpha = .05$. For question 18 only 40.3% agreed, implying that 59.7% believed additional assignments should be allowed to increase grades. The t-test (Table 4) indicated statistically reliable difference between the mean of DBFocus that the EfftGrp1 has (M = 2.53, s = 1.309) and that the EfftGrp2 has (M = 3.00, s = 1.351), $t(1161) = 5.722$, $p = .000$, $\alpha = .05$. Such an entitlement belief diminishes the value of the actual course set assignments since students may anticipate they will be automatically granted the opportunity to improve the final course grade through extra work.

The survey results directly suggest faculty may, indeed, already be taking some measure of "effort" into consideration while grading students' work. Responses on question 7 indicate that 90.1% of the students were in agreement that they received the grade deserved. Of course this is tempered by the level of subjectivity in grading, which will vary based upon the topic and mode of assessment utilized. But it must be repeated that there is no consistent and accurate way to measure and administer effort as a grade attribute. If faculty factor "effort" into the awarding of grades, as was suggested by the students' responses, it is being done unconsciously or subconsciously. Additional exploration of this topic from the faculty perspective will be necessary to obtain further understanding.

CONCLUSION

From data reviewed, the authors can clearly state that a large percentage of college students arrive in the classroom with a sense of entitlement related to academics and accommodation. Although students can and should expect courtesy, quality, and respect, they should also expect to exhibit those same traits in their dealing with other students, faculty, and administration. Students should not expect a quid pro quo or equal relationship with the academic institution or with faculty. In this evaluation of self-entitlement perceptions, results indicated that surveyed students expected and anticipated that they were positioned within the classroom in a dominant customer-business role rather than in a traditional teacher-student role.

A disconnect between the student and the academic institution occurs when students, who expect to simply be given a good grade or who want classroom requirements, deadlines, and so on, waived or changed at their whim, or based upon personal rather than emergency or professional reasons, find there is significant difference between their perception and academic reality. Such paradoxes and contradictions (enforcement of classroom etiquette, deadlines, and assignment requirements compared to student entitlement expectations) subsequently create negative attitudes about the school and the faculty.

The goal of this paper was to identify and examine student academic entitlement perceptions and to verify their existence within post-secondary education. Through this work, it has been ascertained that in post-secondary institutions should not assume that students enter the post-secondary educational environment knowing what is expected. Converse to past beliefs that students are prepared this student brings to light that students understand what is expected of them; but that rather, students should be exposed to the concepts/expectations of good time management, the amount of time, the necessary sacrifices, the amount of effort and the production of high-quality assessment products so they may earn, not given, a high quality educational experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researchers highly recommend that incoming and continuing students be presented and advised of university expectations honestly, completely, and directly, to create or foster a fully understood student-university relationship. Such expectations should be clearly laid out by the institution of higher learning and all students should be required to read and acknowledge their understanding of the institution of higher learning expectations. This may elicit additional cost as such a requirement may seem absurd at the college level, but doing so should have a direct impact on academic-entitlement perceptions and strengthen the students' collegiate experience.

The efficacy of the data is undeniable. In this article, the researchers' goal was to address academic entitlement beliefs from a global perspective. Further research into the student academic entitlement paradox must continue in order to further understand and resolve the negative impressions that such a paradox may create.

REFERENCES

Aleamoni, L.M. (1999). Student rating myths versus facts from 1924 – 1988, Journal of Personal Evaluation and Education, 13, 153-166.

Ansburg, P. (2001). *Students' expectations of workload and grade distribution by class difficulty.* Paper presented at the 109th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Benton, T. H. (2006). A tough-love manifesto for professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/srticle/A-Tough-Love-Manifesto-for/46823

Boysen, G. (2008). Revenge and student evaluations of Teaching. *Teaching of Psychology, 35,* 218-222.

Brodie, D. A. (1998). Do students report that easy professors are excellent teachers? Canadian *Journal of Higher Education, 28,* 1-20.

Campbell, K. 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.

Ciani, K. D., Summers, J. J., & Easter, M. A. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement among college students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 169*(4), 332-344.

Correa, E. (2006). Pedagogy of the obsessed shifting the focus. *College Quarterly, 9*(3).

Ellis, L., Burke, D. M., Lomire, P., & McCormack, D. R. (2003). Student grades and average ratings of instructional quality: the need for adjustment. *Journal of Educational Research,* 97(1).

Gill, J. (2009). Students sense of entitlement angers academics. *Times Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=4054&sectioncode=26

Glater, J. D. (2006, February 21). To: Professor @University.edu: Subject: Why It's All About me. *The New York Times.*

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chuansheng, C., & Farrugia, S. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational Factors. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 37,* 1193-1204.

Greenwald, A., & Gilmore, G. (1997). No pain, no gain? The importance of measuring course workload in student ratings of instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(4), 743-751.

Hansen, B. (1991). Is no an outdated word? Some people think so. *Children Today, 20*(1), 22-24.

Heckert, T. A, Latier, A., Ringwald-Burton, A., & Drazen, C. (2006). Relations among student effort, perceived difficulty appropriateness, and student evaluations of the teaching: Is it possible to "buy" better evaluations through lenient grading? *College Student Journal, 40*(3), 588-596.

Krautman, A. C., & Sander, W. (1999). Grades and student evaluations of teachers. *Economics of Education Review, 18,* 59-63.

Landrum, R. E. (1999). Student expectations of grade inflation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 32*(2), 124-125.

Lippman, S., Bulanda, R. E., & Wagenaar, T. C. (2009). Student entitlement: Issues and strategies for confronting entitlement in the classroom and beyond. *College Teaching, 57*(4), 197-204.

Neath, I. (1996). How to improve your teaching evaluations without improving your teaching. *Psychological Reports, 78,* 1363-1372.

Needham, D. (1978). Student effort, learning, and course evaluation. *Journal of Economic Education, 10,* 115-123.

Plous, S. (1993). The psychology of judgment and decision making. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Roosevelt, M. (2009, February 17). Student expectations seen as causing grade disputes [Editorial]. *The New York Times.*

Sherr, L. (2010). A sense of entitlement. *Town & Country, 1164*(5361), 78-79

Sheth, J., & Mittal, B. (1996). A framework for managing customer expectations. *Journal of Market-Focused Management, 1*(2), 137-158.

Snare, C. E. (1997). Implications of considering students as consumers. *College Teaching, 45,* 4.

Svanum, S. & Bigatti, S. (2006). Grade expectations: Informed or uninformed optimism. *Teaching of Psychology, 33*(1). 14-18.

Trout, P. A. (1997). Disengaged students and the decline of academic standards. *Academic Questions, 10*(2), 46-56.

Trout, P. A., Platt, M., & Crumbley, D. L. (1997). How to improve your teaching evaluation scores without improving your teaching. *Montana Professor Academic Journal, 7*(3), 1363 -1372.

Wachtel, H. (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness. A brief review. A*ssessment and Evolution in Higher Education, 23,* 191-211.