

2012

Conceptualizing Academic Entitlement: What are we Measuring?

Jeffrey Reinhardt
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Reinhardt, Jeffrey, "Conceptualizing Academic Entitlement: What are we Measuring?" (2012). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 41.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/41>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Conceptualizing Academic Entitlement:

What are we Measuring?

by

Jeffrey Reinhardt

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through Psychology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2012

© 2012 Jeffrey Reinhardt

Conceptualizing Academic Entitlement: What are we Measuring?

by

Jeffrey Reinhardt

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Todd Loughead
Faculty of Human Kinetics

Dr. Jill Singleton-Jackson
Department of Psychology

Dr. Stewart Page
Department of Psychology

Dr. Dennis Jackson, Advisor
Department of Psychology

Dr. Shelagh Towson, Chair of Defense
Department of Psychology

April 20, 2012

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices.

Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

The issue of academic entitlement has received increased attention from researchers in recent years. While these studies have attempted to measure academic entitlement (AE), these attempts appear to be assessing differing dimensions. As well, attempts by these studies to define AE have been either inconsistent or non-existent. The aim of the present study was to determine the dimensions of AE and place it within a nomological network. An exploratory factor analysis indicated that there were seven distinct dimensions of AE, which include narcissism, professors agency, arguing for grades, expectations for grade increase, professors etiquette, reward for effort, and input on classroom operations. Relationships were found between AE and psychological entitlement, academic motivation, academic self-efficacy, and academic goal orientation. With AE being distinct from psychological entitlement and related to the majority of its proposed nomological network, this study suggests that AE is a valid construct within the realm of educational psychology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I must sincerely thank Dr. Dennis Jackson for all of his ideas, advice, guidance, and time provided during the course of this project, and for being willing to supervise me in spite of that not being the original plan. Also, a very special thank you goes to Jenn Voth, whose invaluable assistance and encouragement kept both me and the project on track.

My overwhelming gratitude also goes to my Mom, my brother Keith, Courtney Williston, Jim Leether, Jon Fawcett and the Fernandes family, who went above and beyond to help and support me over the course of last few years. I couldn't have done it without each of you and cannot begin to repay your kindness.

Finally, I must express my gratitude to my friends in Halifax and abroad, and to all of my friends at the University of Windsor, especially Sobia Ali-Faisal, Dusty Johnstone, Marc Frey, and Iris Lin, for your continued support and encouragement and for the times we have shared. I thank you and wish you all the best.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	
Implications	1
Defining Academic Entitlement	3
Measuring Academic Entitlement	5
Exploring the Constructs	7
Purpose	20
Outcome Expectations	21
II. METHODS	
Testing Procedures	24
Measures	24
Statistical Analyses	32
III. RESULTS	
Demographics	37
Data Analysis	37
Factor Structure	42
Factor Description	60
Nomological Network	68
IV. DISCUSSION	
Factors of Academic Entitlement	77
Relating Constructs	79
Conclusions	84
Limitations	86
Future Directions	87
REFERENCES	91

APPENDICES

Questionnaires	99
NSSE Contract.....	117
VITA AUCTORIS	119

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Measure Statistics	41
Table 2: List of Removed Items	45
Table 3: Factor Structure of Academic Entitlement	46
Table 4: Factor Correlations	46
Table 5: Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items	47
Table 6: Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items	52
Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Entitlement Items	57
Table 8: Measure x Factor Breakdown of Entitlement Items	66
Table 9: Prior Factor x Factor Breakdown of Entitlement Items	67
Table 10: Results of Canonical Correlation Analysis	71
Table 11: Canonical Weights and Structure Coefficients for Canonical Dimension 1	72
Table 12: Canonical Weights and Structure Coefficients for Canonical Dimension 2	73
Table 13: Bivariate Correlations among Variables of Interest	76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 2002 the Millennial generation began to arrive on university campuses, and since that time a trend of student entitlement appears to be spreading across universities. According to Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, and Reinhardt (2011) entitled students are those who are used to having choice and control, and receiving instant gratification. Consequently, they are students who believe they are entitled to a passing grade, with no consideration of the quality of the work that they have done. They also believe that they can argue for higher marks (because they deserve them) and are surprised when they do not receive a high grade (Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008). Twenge (2006) has suggested that students arrive on university campuses with an existing sense of entitlement, that is reinforced through successful attempts at getting their grades adjusted and through a consumer-based model of education that has become prevalent among universities (Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2010).

Implications

The literature suggests that there are potentially serious implications for student entitlement, such as grade inflation (Mansfield, 2001; Rojstaczer, 2003), academic dishonesty (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2009), and potentially the degradation of the integrity of the academic institution (Morrow, 1994). These are serious issues that affect almost every university campus, however, there is reason to believe that the manners in which universities recruit students may be contributing to and reinforcing the entitled beliefs of students.

Student recruitment and retention is of increasing priority for post-secondary institutions (Maringe, 2006). With tuition costs perpetually on the rise (e.g., Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), 2010; Canadian Federation of Students, 2009; Statistics Canada, 2009), as well as operational costs ever increasing (e.g., Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, 2001; O'Neill, 2010), it is important for universities to admit and retain as many students as possible. The current competition between universities means that schools are required to market themselves to potential students (Abaya, 2008). Much like the advertisements that students see for other products and services marketed towards them (Gingras, 2009), the marketing that is aimed at potential students often contains buzz-word messages about what the school offers and what students stand to gain in return for their enrollment. Given this advertising strategy, it is not inconceivable that students could view the university experience as a purchased service, as opposed to an educational opportunity (Maringe, 2006). When conceptualized in this manner, the student is paying for a service, where the outcome is a degree and a job; consequently, they feel entitled to complain when they feel they are not being provided adequate service. Within this model students are not inclined to perceive themselves as being jointly responsible for their own academic success. Rather, it is the instructors' responsibility to ensure that students receive the marks they feel they are entitled to (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). This is where the concept of grade inflation enters the picture, as students who complain about lower than expected marks are sometimes rewarded for their complaining, further reinforcing the entitled behaviour (Mansfield, 2001; Rojstaczer, 2003).

Before academic entitlement became a topic of systematic investigation, Morrow (1994) expressed concern over the erosion of academic standards. Morrow noted there was a shift in achievement in the academic setting towards confusing achievement with a sense of being entitled to good grades and, at the end, a degree based on effort rather than learning. This sense of entitlement, when taken to the extreme, can severely damage the institution of higher education to the point where the degrees that are handed out become meaningless. Their meaning would have eroded to such a point because there would have been no educational achievement, nothing to indicate that knowledge and skills were gained through the educational process. Morrow also noted that cheating and plagiarism further corrupted actual achievement, which in turn further decays the value of a university degree. Taken to the extreme, this suggests that if the existing culture of academic entitlement is allowed to continue and flourish, the institution of academia may become meaningless.

Defining Academic Entitlement

Despite a number of studies attempting to examine the domain of academic entitlement (e.g., Greenberger et al., 2008; Chowning & Campbell, 2009), there has been no clear, consistent definition of academic entitlement, and the definitions that do exist tend to vary. For instance, though they did discuss some implications of academic entitlement, Ciani et al. (2008) did not attempt to define it. Achacoso (2002) defined academic entitlement as a dichotomous construct, where there is a belief component and an action component. Thus far, Achacoso is the only researcher to have devoted any serious attention to any sort of entitlement actions. Greenberger et al. (2008) defines academic entitlement in terms of what attitudes an instructor might see the

student exhibit. To them, academic entitlement is "...a construct that includes expectations of high grades for modest effort and demanding attitudes towards teachers..." (Greenberger et al., 2008, p. 1193). In order for research and discussion to occur, there needs to be a common understanding of what constitutes academic entitlement.

In spite of some differences and inconsistencies in defining the construct, there is a consistent theme that runs through the current definitions of academic entitlement and it is that this form of entitlement has a negative connotation (Jackson, Singleton-Jackson, & Frey, 2011). The current thinking posits that students who hold entitled beliefs in an academic setting are students who think that they should be receiving more than they deserve. In other words, entitled students are those who believed that they are "entitled to or deserving of certain goods and services to be provided by their institutions and professors that is outside of the students' actual performance or responsibilities inside the classroom" (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010, p. 344). This includes demanding higher grades though they did not do the work or did not achieve sufficiently to warrant a higher grade, that instructors should be available to the student whenever the student wants them, and expecting that instructors should make exceptions for them.

To date, the clearest definition of the construct of academic entitlement, as put forth in research:

... should contain the following facets: 1) that academic entitlement reflects a belief that some reward is deserved that is not justified based on academic achievement (as defined by Morrow, 1993); 2) that academic entitlement beliefs imply a diminished role for personal responsibility in academic achievement; and,

3) that academic entitlement beliefs also implies unrealistic expectations about the role of instructors and demanding attitudes and behaviors on the behalf of students. (Jackson et al., 2011, p. 56).

With the proposed definitions of academic entitlement, where they exist, being generally unclear or inconsistent and there being, as a result, no universally agreed upon definition, it is difficult to construct a measure of academic entitlement that accurately measures the construct. Despite the inconsistency in definitions of academic entitlement, a number of different measures have been constructed and, because of this inconsistency, the measures vary in how they assess academic entitlement. Each of these measures will be discussed.

Measuring Academic Entitlement

Although attempts to define the construct of academic entitlement have been inconsistent, there have been attempts to measure it. This study focuses on four main measures of academic entitlement developed by Achacoso (2002), Greenberger et al. (2008), Chowning and Campbell (2009), and pilot items developed as a result of research conducted by Singleton-Jackson et al. (2010), respectively.

Achacoso (2002) developed a 12-item measure of academic entitlement using a combination of exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis that resulted in a two-factor measure of academic entitlement. The two factors were interpreted as entitlement beliefs and entitlement actions. The entitlement beliefs factor examined the strength of students' beliefs of entitlement, and an example of a corresponding question would be "I should only be required to do a minimal amount of thinking to get an A in a

class.” The entitlement actions factor examined the kind of actions an entitled student would take, such as “I would argue with the professor to get more points on a test.”

Greenberger et al. (2008) developed a scale consisting of 15-items measuring academic entitlement. While it is unclear how the measure was developed, the majority of the items do assess overall academic entitlement. These items conceptualize academic entitlement in broader terms than the items Achacoso developed. Some of the items on the measure query students confusing effort with achievement (that they should be rewarded for their effort), feeling that they should be accommodated, a lack of etiquette, and a general sense of entitlement (Jackson et al., 2011). Some example items include “If I have attended most classes for a course, I deserve a good grade;” “A professor should be willing to lend me his/her course notes if I ask for them;” and “A professor should not be annoyed with me if I receive an important call during class.”

Chowning and Campbell (2009) developed, utilizing exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis methods, a 15-item, two-factor measure of academic entitlement. The factors that Chowning and Campbell extracted were externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. The first factor, externalized responsibility, is a 10-item factor that assesses the students’ sense of responsibility for their own academic success and includes the example “I believe that the university does not provide me with the resources I need to succeed in college.” The second factor, entitled expectations, is a 5-item factor that assesses students’ self-serving expectations of professors and course policies. An example would be “My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.” A common theme that runs through both of these factors is that of a lack of responsibility on the part of the students, suggesting that a major component of

academic entitlement is that students are not taking responsibility for their own performance and achievement and, instead, placing that responsibility on others (i.e. professors or other students).

The final measure of academic entitlement is a pilot measure developed as the result of research conducted by Singleton-Jackson et al. (2010). This measure includes 12 items that were developed from responses given during focus group sessions with undergraduate students. This measure asked questions pertaining to attitudes toward education, the role of the instructor, as well as about consumerism. Some questions include “I am a customer of this university;” “When taking classes in my major area, my professors should ensure that I pass;” and “Professors work for students.”

Currently, the variability in measurement tools means that it is difficult to determine whether or not academic entitlement is being accurately measured. Having an accurate and comprehensive tool is critical to the successful measurement of academic entitlement and determining both the characteristics of entitled students and the sources of entitlement. The variability in the existing measures of academic entitlement suggests that academic entitlement may be a multi-faceted construct, comprised of multiple domains. Using items from the existing measurement tools, which have all approached academic entitlement from slightly different angles, is a useful starting point when it comes to identifying the overarching factors that serve to describe the domains of academic entitlement.

Exploring the Constructs

In order to better understand the construct of academic entitlement, and to ensure that it is a valid and unique construct in its own right, a nomological network needs to be

created. A nomological network, or nomothetic span, is a network of relationships between a measure and other measures (Embretson, 1983). This nomological network includes constructs that may be related to, have some overlap with, or differ from academic entitlement, yet be distinct enough that academic entitlement assesses a unique construct absent in the other constructs. In terms of this study, the nomological network for academic entitlement includes the constructs of psychological entitlement, academic motivation, student engagement, goal orientation, and academic self-efficacy. Each of these constructs will be briefly discussed as follows.

Academic Entitlement. Previous investigations have attempted to examine the relationships between academic entitlement and a number of constructs. In their first part of their study, Greenberger et al. (2008), while developing their measure of academic entitlement, examined the relationships between academic entitlement and a number of constructs including psychological entitlement, self-esteem, narcissism, work orientation and social commitment. The researchers had hypothesised that there were elements of each of these constructs present in a student who was academically entitled. When examining psychological entitlement specifically, Greenberger et al. speculated that, though related to entitlement in an academic setting, a domain specific concept of academic entitlement would be different from psychological entitlement. Their results indicated that there was a moderate relationship between academic entitlement and psychological entitlement, indicating that while they are related constructs, the domain specific academic entitlement is a unique phenomenon from general psychological entitlement.

Greenberger et al. (2008) also found that academic entitlement was positively related to narcissism and negatively related to self-esteem, work orientation, and social commitment. These results indicated that entitled students tended to be more narcissistic, had lower self-esteem, had a lower work ethic, and were more likely to put themselves ahead of the greater good than students who were not academically entitled. In the second part of their study, Greenberger et al. set out to examine the relationships between parental factors, motivation, and dishonesty and academic entitlement, and found that academic entitlement was positively associated with parental academic expectations, parental comparison expectations (how the student compares to others), parental rewarding for grades, as well with achievement anxiety, extrinsic motivation, and academic dishonesty. Interestingly, there was no significant relationship between academic entitlement and grade point average.

Like Greenberger et al. (2008), Chowning and Campbell (2009) also found evidence that academic entitlement was a domain-specific construct that was only moderately related to that of a global sense psychological entitlement. They found that it was possible for students to display a sense of entitlement solely in their academic lives but not towards family or life in general. In creating their measure of academic entitlement, Chowning and Campbell also compared their measure of academic entitlement to a number of different constructs, including narcissism, self-esteem, psychological entitlement, and general personality, and again, consistent with Greenberger et al., found only a moderate relationship between academic entitlement and psychological entitlement, further reinforcing the idea that, while related, academic entitlement is a distinct construct. Chowning and Campbell also found significant

positive relationships with narcissism, specifically with the entitlement/exploitativeness subscale of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) along with the measure as a whole, and state-trait grandiosity, which assesses narcissism while factoring out self-esteem. Significant negative relationships were also found with personal control (which assesses locus of control in personal achievement), self-esteem, need for cognition (which assesses the tendency to engage in and enjoy cognitively demanding tasks), and agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion subscales of the Big Five Personality Inventory. Overall, this paints the image of an entitled student as one who is narcissistic, lower in self-esteem, feels less personal control, is less agreeable, conscientious, and academically inclined than a student who is less academically entitled.

Chowning and Campbell (2009) also found that, when asking students about appropriate and inappropriate behaviours in the classroom and the likelihood that the students themselves would engage in that behaviour, students who were more entitled were much less likely to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate classroom behaviours, were less likely to behave in an appropriate manner and were more likely to behave in an inappropriate manner than those students who were less academically entitled. They also found that students who were more entitled were more likely to rate instructors lower after receiving negative feedback than less-entitled students.

In examining gender differences in academic entitlement, Ciani et al. (2008) found that men tended to exhibit more entitled beliefs and behaviours than women, regardless of classroom context or factors unique to the classroom setting, such as course content and gender of the instructor. Ciani et al. also looked for any change in levels of academic entitlement over time and found that while there appeared to be an increase in

entitlement from first year to final year students, there was no significant change in levels of entitlement from year to year, and no significant change from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester, suggesting that any change in a sense of entitlement may take place gradually over time. Ciani et al. suggest that a student's experience in university may lead to an increased sense of entitlement from first year to fourth year. However, given that their study was cross-sectional in nature, it is difficult to say with certainty whether this is a stable trend or if entitlement is peaking or has peaked without conducting the study longitudinally.

Psychological Entitlement. Psychological entitlement is conceptually situated very closely with the construct of academic entitlement. Psychological entitlement is a general concept of beliefs that an individual holds, in which they feel they deserve rewards and preferential treatment though they may not have accomplished anything, or accomplished an insufficient amount, to warrant such treatment. To that end, Harvey and Martinko (2009) define psychological entitlement as “expectations concerning rewards and compensation that are not necessarily based on actual performance levels” (p. 460). This theme also runs throughout academic entitlement as is it the expectation of a reward for minimal effort. Psychological entitlement appears to be a relatively stable trait (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004).

Harvey and Martinko (2009) conducted a LexisNexis search in 2007 of major newspapers and found that the term “sense of entitlement” turned up in 996 instances, up from around 400 in 2003 (Campbell et al., 2004). This increase in media references to entitlement suggest that a general sense of entitlement may be being experienced by an increasing number of people in multiple sectors of society, including the business world

(Harvey & Martinko). In their review of psychological entitlement as it pertains to the business world, Harvey and Martinko indicated that while little research has been done to examine the nomological network, negative outcomes such as perceived inequity, job dissatisfaction, and corruption have been linked to psychological entitlement. They also stated that “entitled perceptions among young employees are increasing” (p. 460). They also found that entitled individuals were more likely to take credit for positive outcomes and blame others for negative outcomes, regardless of any evidence that suggests otherwise.

In developing their measure of psychological entitlement, Campbell et al. (2004) compared their measure to a number of related constructs. Their findings indicated that those individuals who tended to be more entitled are also those who have an inflated view of themselves and also tended to score higher in narcissism. Individuals with a greater sense of entitlement also appeared to be less agreeable and less emotionally stable than those who are less entitled. Campbell et al. also found that individuals with a greater sense of entitlement felt they were more deserving than others, were more selfish in their romantic relationships (including low empathy and respect for their partners), more aggressive towards individuals who criticized them, and were more motivated by acquisition desires rather than self-protection.

Given the similarity between the constructs of psychological entitlement and academic entitlement, there should be a positive relationship between these two constructs. However, as Harvey and Martinko (2009) noted that different fields tend to define entitlement somewhat differently, the relationship between the constructs should not be so strong as to indicate that they are the same construct. This relationship should

appear as the two constructs being moderately correlated ($r = .40$ to $.70$) with one another. A strong correlation between psychological and academic entitlement ($r \geq .70$) would indicate that the constructs are essentially assessing the same concepts, or would demonstrate convergent validity (Urbina, 2004), in this case indicating that the academic entitlement scale would be a redundant measure (Goldberg, 1977).

Academic Motivation. Motivation is the drive that individuals have to see tasks through to completion. There are three basic types of motivation which are intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation is the drive to pursue an activity for personal pleasure. Extrinsic motivation is the pursuit of an activity or goal out of necessity or obligation. Finally, amotivation is the absence of drive or motivation to pursue an activity, with reasons ranging from not valuing the task to feeling unable to complete the task (Fairchild, Horst, Finney, & Barron, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Briere, Senecal, & Vallieres, 1992). Vallerand et al. were able to further refine both Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation, according to Vallerand et al., includes the factors knowledge (deriving satisfaction from learning), accomplishment (deriving satisfaction from completing or challenging oneself in doing more than required), and stimulation (deriving pleasure from being engaged in a task). Extrinsic motivation constitutes external regulation (behaviour regulated by external rewards or constraints), introjected regulation (behaviour is engaged in because a task is supposed to be done), and identified regulation (the internalization of extrinsic motivations or adopting something as important). Motivation can be applied to many settings, including an academic setting (Fairchild et al., 2005). In an academic setting, motivation refers to the drive, both the orientation of the drive and the level of the drive,

which allows students to complete their academic tasks. The extent to which a student is motivated is an important factor in student outcomes during university. Specifically, motivation is related to a number of academically related outcomes such as curiosity, persistence, learning, and performance (Vallerand et al., 1992).

A number of studies have attempted to study how academic motivation manifests itself in the school environment. The findings indicate that intrinsic motivation is associated with lower levels of burnout while extrinsic motivation and amotivation are associated with higher levels of burnout (Pisarik, 2009). Yoshida et al. (2008) concluded that superficial tasks tend to support motivation in students who are generally less academically motivated, while more challenging tasks keeps motivation high in those students who are already highly motivated, and it was also found that perceived academic confidence and self-motivation has a positive effect on motivation, which tends to lead to an increase in academic performance (Fortier, Vallerand, & Guay, 1995). In validating the Academic Motivation Scale (Vallerand et al., 1992), Fairchild et al. (2005) found relationships between each of the subscales and a number of related measures. Fairchild et al. found that intrinsic motivation was positively related to work and mastery orientations and negatively related to motivation to avoid failure and work avoidance. Extrinsic motivation showed positive relationships with competitiveness, mastery and performance approach orientations, and a motivation to avoid failure and a negative relationship with work avoidance. Amotivation was positively associated with work avoidance and a motivation to avoid failure and negatively associated with mastery and work orientations.

With academic performance being an outcome of motivation in an academic setting, and the focus of entitled students being on their performance or achievement, it is likely that there is a relationship between motivation type and academic entitlement. Since extrinsic motivation places an emphasis on external reinforcers, such as grades, on doing a task, it is likely that entitled students are driven by extrinsic motivation. It is likely then that those students who are more intrinsically motivated are less likely to hold academically entitled beliefs.

Student Engagement. The concept of student engagement basically encompasses a sense of involvement in any activity that students participate or get involved with (Cecil, 2007). These activities include everything from how engaged students are with their class material and with the school itself to how engaged they are with school events and other students. In the context of the concept of academic entitlement outlined previously, an emphasis has been placed on assessing student engagement factors that more directly relate to scholastic aspects of the post-secondary experience. Authors of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, 2011), a self-report measure that is widely used by many post-secondary institutions as an assessment and comparison tool, state that there are five factors, or „benchmarks,“ that indicate engagement on various aspects of students“ educational experience. These factors are level of academic challenge, which asks questions about how engaged students are with the level of difficulty of their courses and programs; active and collaborative learning, which assesses how engaged students are in their classes by way of asking questions, group projects, and presentations; student-faculty interaction, which assesses how engaged students are with their interaction with faculty members; enriching educational experience, which asks

students if they have been engaged by learning opportunities and experiences that take place outside of the normal classroom environment, for example internships; and supportive campus environment, which assesses the students perception of the institutions ability to help students achieve their goals and provide supportive relationships with school personnel. These five factors constitute the construct of student engagement.

Student engagement is associated with a number of positive outcomes. Students who are engaged are more likely to complete school, retain higher grades, do well on achievement tests, and generally experience academic success (Sharkey, You, & Schnoebelen, 2008). Student engagement also predicted “development during the first college year on multiple objective measures of student development, including effective reasoning and problem solving, well-being, inclination to inquire and lifelong learning, intercultural effectiveness, leadership, moral character, and integration of learning” (Pascarella et al., 2009; as cited in Kuh, 2009, p. 687). Kuh (2009) also noted that student engagement had a positive relationship with achievement, satisfaction, persistence, and cognitive and non-cognitive gains in learning and development.

Given the positive outcomes that high student engagement with learning can have on educational outcomes, students who are not as engaged in school are not as likely to highly achieve as those who are. In the context of academic entitlement, engagement may manifest itself in a number of ways. First, students who have a greater sense of entitlement may not feel as engaged with their studies, resulting in lower achievement and the demonstration of entitled beliefs when they do not achieve the marks they believe they deserve, even if they did not earn them. Alternately, students with a greater sense of

entitlement may actually be more engaged, as they are taking an active interest in their courses, even if they are expecting things above and beyond what is appropriate (e.g., extensions or exemptions from course work, arguing for an undeserved higher grade). Lastly, students who display a greater sense of entitlement may exhibit similar levels of engagement as less entitled students, but these more entitled students may be engaged in different areas of their academic lives. These students may be engaged in university life outside of the classroom, and may expect instructors to take this into account when assigning grades. This means that students with a greater sense of entitlement would expect the instructor to increase grades, give extensions or exceptions for work not completed on time due to university life outside of the classroom.

Academic Goal Orientation. In the context of academic pursuits, academic goal orientation "...has emerged as a predominant framework for understanding achievement motivation..." (Finney et al., 2004, p. 365), which indicates how a student or learner approaches academic tasks. How a student approaches academic tasks may have an impact on their display of entitled behaviours if their academic goal has not been realized. Born out of the motivation literature, academic goal orientation specifies four ways in which the student is motivated to learn. The four academic goal orientations are mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, and performance avoidance (Elliott & McGregor, 2001).

Mastery approach, considered the more desirable of the two approach orientations a student can take, involves a focus on skill and knowledge acquisition, as well as increasing comprehension. Alternately, mastery avoidance involves not losing any currently held abilities or knowledge, or forgetting or misunderstanding things they had

been taught (Finney et al., 2004). Performance approach orientation is employed by a student who is striving for higher grades or other measurable outcome, to outperform other students, or to be acknowledged for their achievements, whereas performance avoidance refers to students who are aiming to avoid negative judgements of them or to avoid demonstrating a lack of ability (Kolić-Vehovec, Rončević, & Bajšanski, 2008). A performance approach orientation is associated with both positive and negative outcomes. Students with this orientation are more persistent and achieve higher grades, but also tend to process information shallowly. Students with the performance avoidance orientation generally are distracted, have low intrinsic motivation, and have a shallow processing of information (Elliot, 1999, Finney et al., 2004). Ryan and Deci (2000) have suggested that while students may differ in their academic goal orientation, they may well be equally motivated, as they have found that students with performance avoidance orientations can be as motivated as a performance approach oriented student, despite the difference in orientation and source of motivation.

According to Greenberger et al. (2008), certain parenting practices may result in “achievement anxiety” resulting in a focus on grades instead of mastery and learning, with extrinsic rewards for achievement likely exacerbating the problem. Also, since entitled individuals are seeking ways to get „marks for little or no effort“ (Jackson et al, 2010), students with a greater sense of entitlement are likely be students who have a performance approach or performance avoidance goal orientation. Jackson et al. (2011) found evidence to suggest that this may be the case. Jackson et al. found significant correlations between performance avoidance orientation and the control factor of academic entitlement ($r = .188$) as well as the reward for effort factor ($r = .148$). In

addition, performance approach orientation also correlated significantly with the control factor ($r = .142$) and the reward for effort factor ($r = .165$). This suggests that students with a greater sense of entitlement may be more performance oriented in their approach to their education rather than being mastery oriented. Also important to note, this study found a significant negative correlation ($r = -.194$) between mastery orientation and the accommodation factor, suggesting mastery oriented students are less entitled academically. Based on these findings, in the context of academic entitlement, a performance avoidance orientation is most likely to elicit entitlement reactions as students would typically be looking to avoid negative evaluations of them, followed by a performance approach orientation, as these students are likely striving to achieve better grades than others, with both likely to feel that they have to fight to raise an unacceptable grade, regardless of whether they earned that grade.

Academic Self-Efficacy. Self-efficacy can be conceived of as being “a person's estimate of his or her capacity to orchestrate performance on a specific task” (Gist & Mitchell, 1992, p. 183). It refers to the competence one has when attempting to complete a task. Self-Efficacy can vary depending on how one perceives their past experiences, where one individual may struggle with a task and another may not, both are competent and successfully complete the task, but the individual who struggled would feel less competent (Wood & Locke, 1987). Self-efficacy exists in many domains of a persons’ life, not the least of which is in learning and achievement. Academic self-efficacy refers to the students’ belief that they can successfully execute academic tasks at a given educational level (Bong, 2004). For example, a second year student may feel a strong sense of self-efficacy for completing a term paper in a first year undergraduate class, but

may feel a lessened sense of self-efficacy for completing a term paper for a fourth year undergraduate class. Student achievement has been linked to higher levels of self-efficacy (Wood & Locke, 1987; Lampert, 2007), and academic success can lead to increased levels of self-efficacy when attributed to stable factors (Bong, 2004). Academic self-efficacy can also have an effect on “academic grades (Elias & Loomis, 2000; Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1986), academic major selection (Betz & Hackett, 1983), academic major persistence (Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1984), and academic motivation (Bandura, 1977)” (Elias & MacDonald, 2007, p. 2520). Elias and Loomis (2000) also noted that self-efficacy is related to reading and writing achievements and that higher self-efficacy in a subject field is related to picking a major and persisting at that major. Academic self-efficacy has also been related to classroom performance, levels of stress, health and satisfaction, as well as a commitment to stay in school through perceived future demand (coping) and expectations of being able to perform in the future (Chemers, Hu, & Garcia, 2001).

Although both high academic entitlement and high self-efficacy can result in increased grades, the manner in which they do so is different. While students who have higher self-efficacy may feel more confident about completing the work satisfactorily, students with a greater sense of entitlement may have higher self-efficacy and may feel more comfortable and confident in asking for higher grades, and will expect instructors to accommodate them by raising their grade, for example.

Purpose

In order to determine what factors constitute academic entitlement and to distinguish academic entitlement as an independent and valid construct, it must be demonstrated that

each of the constructs of psychological entitlement, academic goal orientation, academic motivation, student engagement, and academic self-efficacy represent related, but inherently distinct factors from that of academic entitlement. Therefore, the aims of this research project are two-fold. The first aim was to examine the factor structure of academic entitlement to better understand what dimensions underlie the construct. The second aim of this research project was to place it in the nomological network as it relates to academic entitlement in order to validate it as a unique construct.

Outcome Expectations

In order to validate the construct that is academic entitlement, the potential relationships between academic entitlement and its theorised nomological network must be explored. The first, and possibly most important expected outcome, is that academic entitlement is different from, but related to, psychological entitlement. Based on prior research (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009), those who score high in academic entitlement should also be psychologically entitled. Those who are less academically entitled should also be less psychologically entitled. In line with Chowning and Campbell's prior findings of moderate correlations ($r = .18$ to $.38$), between academic and psychological entitlement, moderate correlations of approximately $r = .40$ are expected to be found in this study between academic entitlement and psychological entitlement.

The second expected outcome looks at the relationship between academic entitlement and goal orientation in learning. In line with the findings of Jackson et al. (2011) discussed previously, academically entitled students are hypothesised to be more performance-based learners. Specifically, students who are more academically entitled

are hypothesised to have a stronger performance-avoidance orientation, though, to a lesser extent, those students who are more performance approach oriented should display academically entitled beliefs as well. Weak to moderate correlations are expected for these relationships. It is not expected that those students who are more academically entitled will demonstrate mastery-related approaches to learning (near zero correlation is expected).

The third expected outcome relates to academic motivation, specifically to whether the student is intrinsically or extrinsically motivated in their learning. Those students who are more academically entitled are hypothesised to be more extrinsically motivated, with academic entitlement scores relating significantly to external, identified, and introjected regulation (moderate positive correlations expected). The goals of students with a greater sense of entitlement are typically more extrinsically based (get high grades, graduate, get a job), and as such these students are likely to be motivated by these external goals. Students with a greater sense of entitlement are hypothesised to not differ significantly on whether they are intrinsically motivated or amotivated (no correlation expected).

The fourth expected outcome relates academic entitlement to student engagement. There are a number of possible relationships that could occur between these two constructs. The first is that there will be a negative relationship between academic entitlement and student engagement. While these students may be engaged enough in their studies to care about the grades they are receiving in their courses, they are not engaged enough to properly complete the assigned coursework. A significant negative correlation is expected for this relationship. The second is that there is a positive

relationship between academic entitlement and student engagement, as students with a greater sense of entitlement are actively taking an interest in the outcome of their courses. A significant positive correlation is expected for this relationship. The third is that students who hold a greater sense of entitlement may be more engaged in some ways and less engaged in others. These more entitled students may be more engaged with aspects of student life outside of the classroom and less engaged with aspects of student life inside of the classroom. Again, significant correlations are expected for these relationships, with a positive correlation existing between academic entitlement and engagement outside of the classroom and a negative correlation between academic entitlement and engagement inside of the classroom.

The fifth and final expected outcome examines the relationship between academic entitlement and academic self-efficacy. It is expected that there is a negative relationship between academic entitlement and academic self-efficacy. Specifically, students who hold more entitled beliefs may be less likely to feel confident in their abilities to adequately complete tests and assignments, thereby seeking to raise their grade despite the fact they did not adequately complete the assigned task. Students who experience high self-efficacy are less likely to feel entitled, as they have adequately completed the assigned tasks and have achieved the higher grades that they deserve as a result.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Testing Procedures

A convenience sample of students from first through fourth year psychology courses at the University of Windsor was utilised for the study. Participants were recruited through the Psychology Departments Participant Pool system, which allows students to participate in experiments for bonus points in their eligible psychology classes. The survey was presented in an online format and accessible through the participant pool. Participants were randomly assigned to complete one of six versions of the survey, with each version containing a number of questionnaires relating to academic entitlement, psychological entitlement, academic self-efficacy, academic motivation, academic goal orientation, and student engagement. Each version presented the same questionnaires in a different sequence in an attempt to reduce questionnaire order effects. There were a number of questionnaires that were used to assess academic entitlement. Upon completion of the questionnaires and a brief demographics form, participants were thanked for their participation and prompted to submit their data, which was then collected and stored on a secure server until retrieved for analysis. Participants were then asked for their name and student ID, which was stored separately, so they could be given their bonus mark for the participant pool.

Measures

Academic Entitlement. Academic entitlement was assessed using a number of instruments. These instruments include scales developed by Greenberger et al. (2007), Chowning & Campbell (2009), Achacoso (2002), and in part by the author (Singleton-

Jackson et al., 2011). These instruments assess the extent to which a student holds entitled beliefs and attitudes in an academic setting. Questions include “Teachers often give me lower grades than I deserve on paper assignments” (Greenberger et al., 2007), “When taking classes in my major area, my professors should ensure that I pass” (Jackson et al., 2011), “My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams” (Chowning & Campbell, 2009), and “It’s alright to lie to an instructor to get the grade I deserve” (Achacoso, 2002). These measures were described in more detail above. Responses to all measures were scored on a 1 to 6 („strongly disagree“ to „strongly agree“) 6-point Likert scale.

Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES). The PES (Campbell et al., 2004) is a 9-item scale measuring a general sense of entitlement, or the belief that one is deserving of more, and should get more, than they really should. This instrument is meant to measure feelings of global entitlement not tied to any one domain. Items include “I deserve more things in my life” and “things should go my way.” The measure is scored in a 7-point Likert scale ranging from „strongly disagree“ (1) to „strongly agree“ (7). Campbell et al. reported reliability between $\alpha=.85$ to $\alpha=.88$. Significant correlations with a number of other measures support the validity of this scale. Campbell et al. (2004) found that the PES correlated significantly with other related constructs, including narcissism ($r = .50, p < .01$), exploitiveness ($r = .32, p < .01$), and the entitlement subscale of the NPI ($r = .52, p < .01$).

Campbell et al. (2004) also tested the validity of the PES by examining how the PES relates to a behavioural task (relating how many Halloween candies participants took to their entitlement score), and how the PES relates to a hypothetical self-report

behaviour task (relating the salary participants think they should get compared to other workers to their entitlement score). When controlling for the NPI entitlement subscale, Campbell et al. found that participants who were more entitled tended to take more candy ($r = .20, p = .08$) and were more likely to believe that they deserved higher hypothetical salaries than their hypothetical co-workers ($r = .25, p < .05$). These results indicate that the PES is a valid measure.

College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). The College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (Owen & Froman, 1988) measures how confident students are in undertaking academic-related behaviours by asking them 33 self-report items and directing them to indicate how confident they are in carrying out those behaviours. Items include rating how confident they are in “writing a high quality term paper” and “understanding difficult passages in text books.” This measure is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from „lots“ (A) to „little“ (E). Reported reliability ranged from $\alpha = .85$ to $\alpha = .90$ (Lampert, 2007). Owen and Froman originally found a three factor structure for the measure (overt, social situations, cognitive operations, and technical skills), however Owen recommends using the total score for this measure, treating the scale as one factor (Carifio & Rhodes, 2002).

While little research into the construct validity of the CASES instrument has been conducted (Carifio & Rhodes, 2002), Carifio and Rhodes did find relationships between the CASES instrument and hope ($r = .45-.49, p < .01$), optimism ($r = .58, p < .01$), and self-confidence ($r = .38, p < .01$). Choi (2005) found that CASES instrument correlated with measures of general self-efficacy ($r = .59, p < .01$), course-specific self-efficacy ($r = .40, p < .01$), academic self-concept ($r = .61, p < .01$), course-specific self-concept ($r =$

.38, $p < .01$), and term grades ($r = .22$, $p < .01$). Although Lambert (2007) also found a relationship between academic self-efficacy and grades ($r = .38$, $p < .05$), he did not find a relationship with academic self-concept ($r = .20$, $p > .05$) while utilizing the same measures, suggesting that the relationship between these two constructs is still unclear.

Academic Motivation Scale College Edition (AMS-C). The AMS-C (Vallerand et al., 1992) is a 28 items instrument that measures motivation towards education. This instrument assesses three types of motivation across seven subscales: intrinsic motivation (to know, to accomplish things, to experience stimulation), extrinsic motivation (external, introjected, identified regulation), and amotivation. Some example questions include “For the pleasure I experience while surpassing myself in my studies” (intrinsic), “Because eventually it will enable me to enter the job market in a field that I like” (extrinsic), and “I once had good reasons for going to college; however, now I wonder whether I should continue” (amotivation). This instrument utilises a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from „does not correspond at all“ (1) to „corresponds exactly“ (7)) and reported a reliability coefficient of $\alpha = .81$.

In validating their measure, Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Briere, Senecal, & Vallieres (1993) compared the Academic Motivation Scale to a number of motivational antecedents and consequences. They found that intrinsic motivation was most strongly related to concentration in class ($r = .27$ to $.34$, $p < .05$), positive emotions in class ($r = .24$ to $.33$, $p < .05$), academic satisfaction ($r = .23$ to $.32$, $p < .05$), autonomy supportive classroom climate ($r = .16$ to $.21$, $p < .05$), and optimism in education ($r = .37$ to $.57$, $p < .05$). Extrinsic motivation was most strongly related to positive emotions in class ($r = .15$ to $.31$, $p < .05$) and optimism in education ($r = .18$ to $.57$, $p < .05$). Amotivation was

negatively related to all of the constructs they examined, including the ones listed previously ($r = -.11$ to $-.54$, $p < .05$), with the exception of a positive relationship between amotivation and an impersonal classroom climate ($r = .25$, $p < .05$). As noted previously, Fairchild et al. (2005) also examined the validity of the Academic Motivation Scale by examining its relationship to a number of other measures. These relationships include correlations between intrinsic motivation and the Work and Family Orientation (WOFO) Scale ($r = .10$ to $.47$, $p < .01$), Motive to Avoid Failure Scale ($r = -.15$ to $-.22$, $p < .01$), the intrinsic motivation factor of the Work Preference Inventory ($r = .46$ to $.55$, $p < .01$), and the work avoidance factor of the Attitudes Towards Learning Scale ($r = -.30$ to $-.37$, $p < .01$). For extrinsic motivation, the relationships include the Attitudes Toward Learning Scale ($r = .09$ to $.35$, $p < .01$; $r = -.21$ to $-.24$, $p < .01$ for the work avoidance factor), and the extrinsic motivation factor of the Work Preference Inventory ($r = .24$ to $.38$, $p < .01$). Finally, amotivation correlated with the Motive to Avoid Failure Scale ($r = .17$, $p < .01$), the mastery approach ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$) and work avoidance ($r = .22$, $p < .01$) subscales of the Attitudes Toward Learning Scale, and was negatively related to grade point average ($r = -.10$, $p < .01$).

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE instrument contains a wide array of items designed to measure how engaged a student is in their post-secondary education on educational, institutional, and extra-curricular activities. Only five factors were utilised from the overall instrument that pertained to educational engagement. These five factors are level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experience, and supportive campus environment. How engaged students are with each of these factors indicates how

engaged they are overall in their university education (NSSE, 2011). Types of questions and response anchors varied extensively. The level of academic challenge factor was scored on a 4-point likert scale, ranging from very often (1) to never (4) and from very much (1) to very little (4), as well as on a 5-point likert scale ranging from none (1) to more than 20 (5) times per year and on an 8-point likert scale ranging from 0 times per week (1) to more than 30 times per week (8). Some items on this factor were reverse scored. The active and collaborative learning factor was scored on a 4-point likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 4 (never). These items were reverse scored. The student-faculty interaction factor was scored on a 4-point likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 4 (never) and from 1 (do) to 5 (have not decided), with these items being reverse scored. The enriching educational experience factor was scored on a 4-point likert scale ranging from 1 (do) to 5 (have not decided) and on an 8-point likert scale ranging from 0 times per week (1) to more than 30 times per week (8), with the 4-point likert scale items being reverse scored. Finally, the supportive campus environment factor was scored on a 4-point likert scale ranging from very much (1) to very little (4) and on a 7-point likert scale with multiple response anchors including unfriendly, unsupportive, sense of alienation (1) to friendly, supportive, sense of belonging (7); unavailable, unhelpful, unsympathetic (1) to available, helpful, sympathetic (7); and unhelpful, inconsiderate, rigid (1) to helpful, considerate, flexible (7). The 4-point likert scale items in this factor were reverse scored.

According to NSSE (2005), the NSSE questionnaire is high in both content and construct validity and is highly related to the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) (NSSE, 2010). In trying to predict educational outcomes from the

NSSE survey, Pascarella, Seifert, and Blaich (2010) examined the relationships between the NSSE survey and seven liberal arts outcomes for first year college students. They found significant partial correlations between level of academic challenge and effective reasoning and problem solving ($r = .43$) and with positive attitude toward literacy ($r = .51$), between active and collaborative learning and openness to diversity/challenge ($r = .56$), between enriching educational experience and effective reasoning and problem solving ($r = .44$), moral character ($r = .44$), university diversity ($r = .57$) and openness to diversity/challenge ($r = .41$), and finally between supportive campus environment and university diversity ($r = .48$), openness to diversity/challenge ($r = .43$), and psychological well-being ($r = .73$). However, student-faculty interaction did not correlate with any of the liberal arts outcomes. Significance values were not reported.

Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ). Academic goal orientation, which refers the learning aims students have with regards to academic work, was assessed by the following four 3-item subscales, each measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from „not at all true of me“ (1) to „very true of me“ (7) (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Finney et al., 2004; Bong, 2001).

Mastery-approach orientation. Mastery-approach orientation refers to a student whose goal is to develop new skills and abilities, increase their comprehension, and generally master a subject area (e.g., “I want to learn as much as possible this semester”). Coefficient alpha was .76.

Mastery-avoidance orientation. Mastery-avoidance orientation refers to a student who does not want to forget learned knowledge or misunderstand what they are learning

(e.g., “I am afraid that I may not understand the content of my courses as thoroughly as I’d like”). Coefficient alpha was .74.

Performance-approach orientation. Performance-approach orientation refers to students who want to achieve high grades and generally outperform their classmates (e.g., “I want to do better than other students this semester”). Coefficient alpha was .88.

Performance-avoidance orientation. Performance-avoidance orientation refers to students who want to avoid poor grades and avoid demonstrating a lack of ability (e.g., “One of my main goals in my classes this semester is to avoid looking like I’m stupid or that I do worse than others in my classes”). Coefficient alpha ranged from .73 to .80 on this subscale, with Jackson et al. (2011) having found a reliability coefficient of $\alpha=.74$. Items in the performance-avoidance factor were replaced with modified items developed by Bong (2001) as the original items developed by Finney et al. performed poorly. The items developed by Bong appear to have stronger psychometric properties. The items developed by Bong were modified by the researcher to reflect consistent wording with the Finney et al. scale, which examines learning orientations from a general academic perspective as opposed to a course specific level.

In developing the original measure, Elliot and McGregor (2001) validated the measure against a number of constructs, including need for achievement (assessed by the WOFO scale), motive to avoid failure, self-determination, and perceived class engagement. Relationships were found between the workmastery (the two subscales of work and mastery mentioned previously were collapsed to make one factor) subscale of the WOFO scale and mastery approach orientation ($r = .29, p < .01$), as well as the competitiveness subscale of the WOFO and performance approach orientation ($r = .37, p$

< .01). motive to avoid failure was correlated with the mastery avoidance ($r = .28, p < .01$), performance approach ($r = .23, p < .01$), and performance avoidance ($r = .31, p < .01$) orientations. Self-determination was found to positively relate to mastery approach orientation ($r = .22, p < .01$) and negatively relate to both mastery avoidance ($r = -.17, p < .05$) and performance avoidance ($r = -.17, p < .05$) orientations. Perceived class engagement was related to both mastery approach ($r = .43, p < .01$) and mastery avoidance ($r = .19, p < .05$) orientations. Bong (2001), who developed the performance avoidance subscale used in this study, found that the performance avoidance orientation positively related to self-efficacy ($r = .25$ to $.34, p < .05$) and to task value ($r = .17$ to $.34, p < .05$) for English speaking middle school students, as these students may derive self-efficacy and value from the task by not looking incapable of doing the task.

Demographics Questionnaire. Participants were asked to complete a demographics form asking basic demographic data including age, gender, ethnicity, as well as some items asking about total annual family income, country of origin for both themselves and their parents, and their cumulative GPA.

Statistical Analyses

In examining the validity of a construct, such as academic entitlement, Benson (1998) lists three stages of “strong validation.” These stages are the substantive stage, the structural stage, and the external stage. In the substantive stage, the theoretical groundwork for the construct validation is laid out. This includes describing and defining the constructs of interest, as well as gathering evidence of how the constructs are related. This first stage was conducted above. The next stage is structural stage. This stage focuses on analyzing the structure, or the internal consistency, of the observed variables

in the construct. Typically, this stage is assessed by conducting both an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Inter-item correlations can also be used to determine the consistency of the observed variables. Finally, the external stage involves finding evidence that the construct of interest is actually assessing what it is supposed to assess. This is typically done through group differences and correlational analysis by relating the construct of interest with other constructs that are theoretically related to the original construct.

It is important to note here that this study is part of a larger project involving academic entitlement. The ultimate goal of the overarching project is to refine the construct of academic entitlement and to create a single, encompassing measure of academic entitlement, which includes determining what individual factors, if any, are present in academic entitlement. The aim of this exploratory study is to place academic entitlement into a nomological network by deriving the factor structure of the academic entitlement measures and to compare them to other established, theoretically related constructs with the goal of establishing academic entitlement as a distinct construct. The results of this study will be used to guide the creation of a new overall measure of academic entitlement. To that end, factor analysis will be utilised to determine the factor structure of the academic entitlement construct, and a correlational analysis will be used to examine the relationships between academic entitlement and other related constructs.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The first step in determining the factor structure of academic entitlement was to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Preacher and MacCallum (2003) describe EFA as "...a method of discovering the number and nature of latent variables that explain the variation and covariation in a set of

measured variables” (p. 13). The utility of running an EFA for the current research is that it can help determine the number and nature of factors for the observed variables in academic entitlement when there is no prior theory regarding the factor structure.

Analysis. In order to assess how many factors may make up academic entitlement, a number of approaches were used. These approaches included assessing eigenvalues and the scree plot, conducting a parallel test and a Minimum Average Partial (MAP) test. First, for interpreting eigenvalues, any factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 is considered a potentially interpretable factor, however, this does not always reflect the true number of factors in the construct, and should be regarded as a minimum number of likely factors in the construct (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). Second, the scree plot was assessed, which plots the ordinal values of the eigenvalues (1st eigenvalue, 2nd eigenvalue, etc.) against the actual eigenvalues. Where the line in the plot levels off is where the cut off is for determining factors. So the number of eigenvalues before the first point where the line levels off indicates the number of factors that should be retained (Stevens, 2002). Third, a parallel test was used, which involved comparing the eigenvalues obtained in the data set against those eigenvalues obtained from completely random data. The number of eigenvalues in the data set found to be higher than the eigenvalues obtained from the random data represents the number of factors that should be retained (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). Finally, the MAP (Minimum Average Partial) test was utilized. The aim of the MAP test was to determine the number of common factors that achieve the best factor solution by focusing “...on the relative amounts of systematic and unsystematic variance remaining in a correlation matrix after extractions of increasing numbers of components” (O’Connor, 2000, p. 396).

The best factor solution is identified when the average squared partial correlations (residuals) computed by the test stop decreasing and start increasing. For example if the average residuals decrease after extracting the first four factors, but increase once the fifth factor is extracted, then a four factor solution is identified.

Principle axis factoring using a Varimax prerotation followed by a Promax rotation was then used to simplify the factor pattern loadings of the measured variables. An oblique rotation allowed the factors to correlate and produce better estimates of the true factor structure as well as better simple structure than an orthogonal rotation if the latent variables are correlated (Brown, 2006; Fabrigar et al., 1999). Estimating factor correlations can reveal a higher order structure or expose any redundant factors (Brown, 2006). To determine which measured variables load onto each factor, the factor pattern matrix and the factor structure matrix were examined. The factor pattern matrix indicates how influential the factor is to each measured variable partialling out the other factors. The factor structure matrix indicates how strongly the measured variables are correlated to each factor. Strong correlations here indicate that the measured variable maps onto that factor (Stevens, 2002). Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) cite factor loadings higher than .62 as a very good cut-off, and .71 as an excellent cut-off for determining an items loading on a factor. Items that have high loadings on more than one factor are said to be cross loaded, which could indicate a poor item, poor a priori factor structure, or insufficient power in the analysis (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

Construct Validity. In the interest of assessing the validity of the construct, academic entitlement, a Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) was employed. CCA is a multivariate technique which breaks down the association between two sets of variables,

allowing for the parsimonious description of the relationships between the two sets of variables (Stevens, 2002), which in this case are the factors of academic entitlement extracted from the preceding factor analyses and the related constructs. CCA examines a number of uncorrelated linear combinations (up to the number of variables contained in the smaller of the two variable sets) and ranks them, with the first few pairs of associations often accounting for most of the variance in the analysis. The variance explained by each of the variables on its canonical variable indicates how much influence the variables have on the relationship between its canonical variable with the other canonical variable. This indicates the extent of the influence each of the variables have in the analysis. Also, like factor analysis, CCA is a larger sample technique which can create problems with ranking the linear combinations if the sample size is too small (Stevens, 2002). CCA is being employed to understand the extent to which academic entitlement might be redundant with already existing constructs, such as psychological entitlement.

Bivariate correlation analysis was also conducted to examine the relationships between each of the constructs. By allowing each of the related constructs (psychological entitlement, academic motivation, academic self-efficacy, academic goal orientation, and student engagement) to correlate with the factors of academic entitlement, the expected outcomes stated earlier will be able to be tested. These correlations indicate the extent to which academic entitlement is related to the other related constructs. The results should provide support for the hypothesized nomological network of academic entitlement, and separate academic entitlement as a related, yet distinct construct from psychological entitlement.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Demographics

Participants for this study were recruited from the Psychology participant pool system at the University of Windsor. The sample consisted of 607 undergraduate participants, 515 females (84.8%) and 89 males (14.7%). One person identified as transgender and two individuals did not specify. The mean age of the participants was 21.5 years of age ($SD = 4.72$; range = 17 – 53). The majority of participants, 452, were Caucasian (74.6%), 49 participants were of Middle Eastern descent (8.1%), 28 participants were Asian (4.6%), 22 participants were African American (3.6%), eight participants were Indian (1.3%), six participants were Hispanic (1.0%), two participants were Aboriginal (0.3%), 14 identified as mixed race (2.3%) and 25 identified as other (4.1%). Participants' progress through their undergraduate programs varied, with 15.8% being in their first year of study, 26.4% being in their second year of study, 28.9% being in their third year of study, and 28.9% currently enrolled in their fourth year of study or higher. Participants had an average GPA of 8.74 ($SD = 2.09$, range = 3 – 13). An overwhelming majority (97.2%) of participants were Canadian students, with 2.5% of participants identifying as International students and 0.2% identifying as American students.

Data Analysis

Before an EFA can be conducted, the variables need to be screened for missing data, normality, and outliers. Initially, a sample size of 690 was obtained for the current study. Participants who had failed to complete the study (resulting in an incomplete

response set for that participant) were removed from the data set. By not completing the study, the participants had withdrawn their consent for any data that had been collected to be used in any analyses and thus were not counted as part of the initial 690 participants. Participants who did not vary their responses (displayed fixed responding) were also removed from the data set. These participants were identified by computing the standard deviations for each of 5 random blocks of 10 items and any participants who had standard deviations of zero for at least two of these blocks were removed, as they were likely not responding to the questions being asked. As a result, only nine participants were removed from the data set as a result of fixed responding.

On the whole, there were 667 missing data points out of 134,171 total data points, amounting to 0.495% of all cases in the data set that were missing. Little's test demonstrated that the missing data was not missing completely at random (MCAR) (Little's MCAR test $\chi^2_{(51856)} = 54120.663, p < .001$). It appears more likely that the data was missing at random (MAR), given that the small portion of the data that was missing displayed no discernible pattern. As the 667 missing data fields were spread across the data set, a listwise deletion method for removing missing data would have resulted in a removal of almost half of the data and therefore, was not employed. Instead, the missing data values were imputed using the Expectation-Maximization method, which is a Maximum Likelihood technique for estimating missing data. This method estimates the missing data by using present values from the rest of the data set to estimate each missing value, adding in a small amount of error. The values imputed for the missing data are then re-estimated iteratively using the entire data set (including the imputed missing data

values) until the successive iterations start producing similar values for the missing data (Acock, 2005; Howell, 2009).

Normality and outliers were assessed using AMOS 18.0 for Windows and SPSS 19 for Windows. Univariate normality was assessed using histograms and examining skewness and kurtosis statistics. The histograms indicated a lack of univariate normality; however there were no excessive skewness or kurtosis values, as all variables fell below their critical cut off values (Stevens, 2002). The assumption of multivariate normality was not met, as the value for multivariate kurtosis was significantly higher than its critical value. Outliers were assessed using squared Mahalanobis" distance, which identified 74 observations that significantly ($p < .001$) differed from the centroid. These 74 observations were deleted from the data set, resulting in a final sample size of 607.

Cronbach"s alpha was used to assess the reliability of each of the measures. The reliability coefficients for each measure are summarized in Table 1. Overall, the alpha coefficients reported in the present study are generally consistent with prior research (Achacoso, 2002; Campbell et al., 2004; Greenberger et al., 2007; Owen & Froman, 1988; Vallerand et al., 1992), with a couple of notable exceptions. In their scale development paper, Chowning and Campbell (2009) reported reliability coefficients for the externalized responsibility and entitled expectations subscales as $\alpha = .81$ and $\alpha = .62$, respectively. However, in the present study, reliability coefficients for these two subscales were found to be $\alpha = .59$ for externalized responsibility and $\alpha = .72$ for entitled expectations. Also, the original authors of the academic goal orientation measure (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Finney et al., 2004; Bong, 2001) reported reliability coefficients

ranging from $\alpha = .73$ to $\alpha = .88$, whereas the current study found higher reliability coefficients for each subscale, ranging from $\alpha = .83$ to $\alpha = .93$.

Table 1

Summary of Measure Statistics

Measure	<i>M</i>	SD	α	Range	Org. α
Academic Entitlement Scales	195.15	38.32	.95	1-6	-
Greenberger et al. (2008)	35.19	10.65	.87	1-6	.87
Pilot Items	44.20	7.72	.76	1-6	-
Chowning & Campbell (2009)	41.69	7.88	.73	1-6	-
Externalized	25.68	4.64	.59	1-6	.81
Responsibility					
Entitled Expectations	16.01	4.70	.72	1-6	.62
WSU Items	22.06	6.24	.79	1-6	-
Achacoso (2002)	42.42	10.71	.88	1-6	.83
Additional Items	9.58	3.77	.73	1-6	-
Psychological Entitlement Scale	28.29	9.23	.85	1-7	.85 - .88
Academic Motivation Scale	131.19	19.79	.89	1-7	.81
Intrinsic Motivation – Knowledge	21.76	4.52	.89	1-7	.79 - .90
Intrinsic Motivation –	19.10	5.29	.88	1-7	.83 - .90
Accomplishment					
Intrinsic Motivation – Stimulation	15.82	5.79	.87	1-7	.80 - .88
Extrinsic Motivation – Identified	23.70	3.51	.75	1-7	.62 - .78
Extrinsic Motivation – Introjected	20.93	5.12	.87	1-7	.73 - .84
Extrinsic Motivation – External	23.13	4.38	.84	1-7	.83 - .89
Amotivation	6.75	4.09	.89	1-7	.83 - .91
Academic Self-Efficacy	134.93	9.39	.83	1-5	.85 - .90
Academic Goal Orientation	54.53	11.12	.82	1-7	-
Mastery Approach	16.63	3.26	.84	1-7	.76
Mastery Avoidance	12.52	4.62	.89	1-7	.74
Performance Approach	15.14	4.52	.93	1-7	.88
Performance Avoidance	10.24	4.59	.83	1-7	.73 - .80
Student Engagement	103.11	14.29	.84	var	-
Level of Academic Challenge	37.11	5.80	.67	var	.73 - .77
Active and Collaborative	13.78	3.31	.66	var	.67
Learning					
Student-Faculty Interaction	10.90	3.15	.73	var	.71 - .74
Enriching Educational	20.18	3.83	.54	var	.60 - .66
Experiences					
Supportive Campus Environment	21.14	4.51	.73	var	.79 - .80

Note. Org. α = Original Cronbach's Alpha found, if known, by original authors of the measure. var = Range varies for the items within each subscale.

Factor Structure

The exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) version 9.2 for Windows. The routines used to conduct analyses for assessing the number of factor were the parallel tests developed by O'Connor (2000) and Velicer's (1976) Minimum Average Partial test (MAP). Versions of these routines that do not assume normality, including the resampling parallel test, were used (Jackson et al., 2011).

Previous researchers have found a number of different factor structures for academic entitlement (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Jackson et al., 2011) using a small number of items. Given the exploratory nature of the present study, a much larger set of academic entitlement items, taking from a variety of sources, were used and therefore, it was expected that the factor structure would vary from that of previous research. Because of this, there was no hypothesised number of factors or factor structure.

All 74 academic entitlement items were analyzed. The eigenvalues and scree plot suggested an eight factor solution, whereas the parallel test suggested a 15 factor solution and the MAP test suggested a seven factor solution. In addition to examining a seven, eight, and 15 factor solution, a four factor solution and a nine factor solution were also examined. A four factor solution was tested, as prior research by Jackson et al. (2011) indicated to a four factor solution for academic entitlement. A nine factor solution was also tested to ensure that the eight factor solution was not under-factoring, as the previous tests indicated that the likely factor solution was close to seven or eight factors. Ultimately, the eight factor solution appeared to be the best solution. The four factor solution appeared to under-factor. Each factor was difficult to interpret and there were a

high number of cross loadings. Alternately, the 15 factor solution seemed to over-factor. Some of the factors could be interpreted in similar ways and a number of the factors had no items with high loadings. The seven factor and nine factor solutions seemed to be much closer to the appropriate factor solution, though the seven factor solution seemed to under-factor, making interpretation of the factors difficult, and the nine factor solution seemed to over-factor, resulting in weaker factor loadings and one factor containing only two items. The eight factor solution was the easiest to interpret, with generally acceptable factor loadings and the fewest cross loadings.

In order to analyze the relationship between academic entitlement and its hypothesised nomological network, the best possible factor structure for academic entitlement needs to be found. While the eight factor solution provided an interpretable solution, there were a number of items that either did not load well onto any of the factors or cross loaded onto a number of factors. Items that did not load well onto a factor, cross loaded onto a number of factors, had low communalities or were not conceptually relevant to the factor the item loaded onto were eliminated from the analysis. This resulted in removing 13 items from the analysis (see Table 2). The EFA was re-run on the remaining 61 items. In determining the new number of factors of academic entitlement, the eigenvalues and MAP test indicated a six factor solution, while the scree plot indicated a seven factor solution and the parallel test again indicated a 15 factor solution. Because the 15 factor solution proved to be a poor solution with 74 items, it was unlikely that it would provide a better solution with fewer items, so the solution was not pursued. The six factor and seven factor solutions were tested, with the six factor solution seeming to under-factor, as one of the factors could conceptually be broken down into two distinct

factors. The seven factor solution (Table 5) seemed to provide the most interpretable solution, with the two distinct factors emerging from the one combined factor found in the six factor solution, as well as having fewer cross loadings. A description of the factor structure for the seven factor solution can be found in Table 3.

Table 2

List of Removed Items

	Item
Q2	When taking classes in my major area, my professors should ensure that I pass.
Q6	I feel I have been poorly treated if a professor cancels an appointment with me on the same day as we were supposed to meet.
Q7	I am a customer of this university.
Q19	A professor should be willing to meet with me at a time that works best for me, even if inconvenient for the professor.
Q20	A professor should let me arrange to turn in an assignment late if the due date interferes with my personal plans.
Q21	Professors have an obligation to be up-to-date in their field.
Q23	Learning things that will not help me to obtain a job is useful in its own right.
Q33	Most professors do not really know what they are talking about.
Q35	I believe that it is my responsibility to seek out the resources to succeed in university.
Q38	Professors are just employees who get money for teaching.
Q44	Professors should be available during the summers, even if they are not teaching.
Q45	Professors should not count off for grammar on written assignments.
Q51	If I do not do well, it is usually the professor's fault.

Table 3

Factor Structure of Academic Entitlement

Factor	Label	# of Items
1	Narcissism	24
2	Professors Agency	9
3	Arguing for Grades	7
4	Expectations for Grade Increase	6
5	Professors" Etiquette	8
6	Reward for Effort	4
7	Input on Classroom Operations	3

Table 4

Factor Correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Factor 1	-						
Factor 2	.10	-					
Factor 3	.15	.17	-				
Factor 4	.41	.25	.30	-			
Factor 5	.38	.26	.14	.38	-		
Factor 6	.39	.26	.27	.35	.23	-	
Factor 7	.16	.07	.38	.20	.07	.36	-
M	39.86	32.08	24.21	17.00	16.67	12.82	11.34
SD	13.09	7.02	6.36	5.96	6.09	4.19	2.98

Table 5

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q60 I should get special treatment in my courses.	.83	-.03	.01	.04	-.02	-.04	.04
Q59 I should only be required to do a minimal amount of thinking to get an A in a class.	.82	.06	-.07	-.03	-.07	.05	.04
Q57 I should put in minimal effort to learn the material for a class.	.81	.08	.04	-.13	-.13	.09	.01
Q62 Doing well in school should not take too much effort on my part.	.69	.04	.03	-.05	-.07	.06	.06
Q36 For group assignments, it is acceptable to take a back seat and let others do most of the work if I am busy.	.67	.09	-.08	.03	.03	-.07	-.09
Q49 If I miss an appointment with a professor, it is no big deal even if he or she came to campus just for the appointment.	.67	-.01	-.06	-.05	.20	-.10	-.04
Q58 It is all right to lie to a professor to get the grade I deserve.	.65	.05	.04	.13	.01	-.06	-.09
Q56 I should not have to think too hard to learn the material for a class.	.63	.07	.04	-.08	-.17	.26	.12
Q54 Professors should bend the rules for me.	.62	-.13	.06	.05	-.01	.12	.09
Q71 It is okay for me to demand that a professor make an exception for me.	.62	-.17	.10	.16	.19	-.04	.08
Q73 It is appropriate to ask a professor to raise my grade without providing a reason.	.61	-.04	.01	.22	.01	-.12	-.08
Q47 I should be able to makeup exams any time I want.	.57	-.09	-.01	.08	.20	.07	-.01
Q55 A professor should modify course requirements to help me.	.54	-.13	.06	.02	.04	.19	.21
Q31 I am not motivated to put a lot of effort into group work, because another group member will end up doing it.	.54	.11	-.03	.00	.09	-.00	-.22
Q48 If I miss a test I should not have to explain to the professor why.	.52	-.01	.05	.01	.16	-.01	-.07
Q37 For group work, I should receive the same grade as the other group members regardless of my level of effort.	.48	.05	.00	.01	.00	.00	-.17

Note. High factor loadings for each factor are in boldface.

Table 5 (cont.)

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q46 Professors should respond to e-mails within 30 minutes.	.48	.03	-.04	-.03	.30	-.01	-.00
Q34 If I do poorly in a course and I could not make my professors office hours, the fault lies with my professor.	.47	.19	-.05	.02	.18	.02	-.07
Q30 If I miss class, it is my responsibility to get the notes.	.43	-.01	-.16	.02	.13	.07	-.10
Q61 I get very angry when a professor will not take my work even though it is late.	.42	.02	.15	.07	.15	-.02	.11
Q3 The tuition I pay entitles me to a passing grade.	.37	.18	-.05	.10	.13	.20	.00
Q29 It is unnecessary for me to participate in class when the professor is paid for teaching, not for asking questions.	.33	.27	.01	-.01	.15	-.06	-.16
Q32 I believe that the university does not provide me with the resources I need to succeed in college.	.30	.21	-.13	.06	.14	-.04	.04
Q63 I cannot tolerate it when a professor does not accommodate my personal situation.	.29	.00	.23	-.01	.14	.09	.23
Q39 My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.	-.00	.45	.02	.16	.03	.07	.09
Q50 It is the professor's responsibility to teach me.	.02	.45	.14	-.09	.06	-.02	.17
Q27 Information on exams should be based on material taught to me in lecture.	-.01	.42	.06	-.08	-.06	.16	.29
Q40 Professors must be entertaining to be good.	.02	.40	.10	.03	.10	.04	.03
Q52 Professors should tell students exactly what will and will not be on a test.	.15	.37	.01	.01	.07	.20	.15
Q4 The purpose of obtaining a university degree is to get a job when you are finished.	-.02	.37	.05	.01	-.01	.09	.03
Q22 Professors work for students.	.11	.36	.01	.04	.09	-.16	.27

Note. High factor loadings for each factor are in boldface.

Table 5 (cont.)

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q53 I should not be responsible for knowing anything that was not discussed in class.	.26	.35	.01	-.01	.05	.12	.17
Q42 I should never receive a zero on an assignment that I turned in.	.00	.31	.06	.10	.08	.20	-.02
Q68 If I felt a professor's grading was unfair, it would be appropriate for me to tell the professor.	-.16	.05	.78	-.06	-.01	.04	.03
Q69 If I felt I deserved a higher grade, I would feel that I have to tell the professor.	-.13	.00	.74	.11	-.02	.03	-.01
Q66 It is okay to attempt to negotiate my grade with my professor.	-.01	.06	.66	.08	.01	.06	-.13
Q64 It is acceptable to confront a professor to argue about my grade.	.18	.08	.60	.01	.04	-.04	-.05
Q67 There is nothing wrong with arguing with the professor to get more points on a test.	.24	.08	.59	.11	.14	-.09	-.12
Q65 If a test or assignment is unfair, students should tell the professor	-.17	.13	.57	-.07	.06	.06	.14
Q70 Students should complain to the Dean or higher level of authority to get the grade they deserve.	.21	-.07	.37	.22	.02	-.06	.02
Q74 I would ask a professor to raise my grade to avoid losing a Scholarship or other funding	.05	.02	.09	.72	-.15	-.04	.07
Q72 I would ask a professor to raise my grade to prevent me from being placed on academic probation.	.11	-.02	.15	.64	-.07	-.02	.10
Q43 My professors should curve my grade if I am close to the next letter grade.	.01	.26	-.06	.50	.05	.23	-.04
Q41 My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.	.09	.13	-.01	.49	.10	.19	-.03
Q75 Professors should always round up on points in order to give students a higher grade.	.12	.29	.07	.37	-.09	.18	.03

Note. High factor loadings for each factor are in boldface.

Table 5 (cont.)

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q5	If I have explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think he/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade.	.04	.01	.04	.35	.01	.34	.11
Q18	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond quickly to a phone message I left him or her.	.21	.07	.08	-.13	.54	.02	.11
Q14	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond the same day to an e-mail I sent.	.20	.13	.06	-.13	.50	-.01	.08
Q12	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on exams.	.18	.06	-.04	.01	.46	.33	.02
Q10	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on paper assignments.	.06	.07	-.04	.04	.42	.37	-.05
Q17	A professor should not be annoyed with me if I receive an important call during class.	.13	.11	.10	.00	.38	-.02	.06
Q11	When my personal plans conflict with an exam the professor should let me take the exam at a different time.	.27	-.15	.02	-.05	.35	.26	.08
Q16	Professors have no right to be annoyed with me if I tend to come late to class or tend to leave early.	.19	.10	.11	.05	.32	-.04	-.05
Q13	A professor should be willing to lend me his/her course notes if I ask for them.	.23	-.06	-.05	.19	.28	.10	.18
Q9	If I have attended most classes for a course, I deserve a good grade.	-.00	.20	.01	.03	.06	.75	-.14
Q8	If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a good grade.	.02	.16	.04	.03	.06	.75	-.16
Q28	My effort in a course should be taken into account in the final grade.	-.05	.27	-.02	.17	-.09	.40	.23

Note. High factor loadings for each factor are in boldface.

Table 5 (cont.)

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q15	If I am not happy with my grade the professor should allow me to do an additional assignment.	.05	.05	.00	.28	.23	.29	.13
Q26	Courses should be designed to take into account student needs	-.15	.31	-.01	.05	.07	-.13	.72
Q25	Courses should be taught that take into account students Individual learning styles.	-.08	.23	-.09	.09	.04	-.05	.71
Q24	I deserve to have more say in how my classes are organized.	-.02	.20	.00	.26	.15	-.07	.42

Note. High factor loadings for each factor are in boldface.

Table 6

Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q60 I should get special treatment in my courses.	.83	.05	.14	.35	.29	.30	.16
Q59 I should only be required to do a minimal amount of thinking to get an A in a class.	.80	.12	.07	.29	.25	.35	.16
Q57 I should put in minimal effort to learn the material for a class.	.76	.13	.14	.22	.18	.36	.16
Q62 Doing well in school should not take too much effort on my part.	.68	.11	.15	.25	.20	.33	.19
Q36 For group assignments, it is acceptable to take a back seat and let others do most of the work if I am busy.	.65	.14	-.01	.27	.29	.17	-.03
Q49 If I miss an appointment with a professor, it is no big deal even if he or she came to campus just for the appointment.	.67	.06	.00	.24	.40	.15	.01
Q58 It is all right to lie to a professor to get the grade I deserve.	.69	.14	.14	.39	.31	.24	.04
Q56 I should not have to think too hard to learn the material for a class.	.67	.15	.22	.26	.13	.51	.31
Q54 Professors should bend the rules for me.	.70	-.01	.21	.35	.26	.39	.26
Q71 It is okay for me to demand that a professor make an exception for me.	.75	-.01	.25	.47	.45	.31	.24
Q73 It is appropriate to ask a professor to raise my grade without providing a reason.	.64	.05	.09	.41	.28	.16	.02
Q47 I should be able to makeup exams any time I want.	.69	.06	.13	.38	.44	.34	.13
Q55 A professor should modify course requirements to help me.	.66	.02	.26	.35	.29	.47	.38
Q31 I am not motivated to put a lot of effort into group work, because another group member will end up doing it.	.54	.17	-.01	.23	.31	.16	-.14
Q48 If I miss a test I should not have to explain to the professor why.	.57	.09	.12	.28	.36	.21	.04
Q37 For group work, I should receive the same grade as the other group members regardless of my level of effort.	.47	.09	.02	.19	.19	.15	-.08
Q46 Professors should respond to e-mails within 30 minutes.	.57	.13	.06	.26	.46	.22	.07

Table 6 (cont.)

Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q34 If I do poorly in a course and I could not make my professors office hours, the fault lies with my professor.	.55	.28	.06	.30	.40	.26	.02
Q30 If I miss class, it is my responsibility to get the notes.	.48	.06	-.10	.20	.29	.19	-.06
Q61 I get very angry when a professor will not take my work even though it is late.	.53	.15	.29	.36	.36	.29	.25
Q3 The tuition I pay entitles me to a passing grade.	.55	.32	.13	.40	.40	.44	.15
Q29 It is unnecessary for me to participate in class when the professor is paid for teaching, not for asking questions.	.35	.31	.04	.19	.31	.10	-.10
Q32 I believe that the university does not provide me with the resources I need to succeed in college.	.37	.26	-.01	.24	.31	.16	.06
Q63 I cannot tolerate it when a professor does not accommodate my personal situation.	.44	.14	.40	.31	.31	.37	.40
Q39 My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.	.16	.53	.20	.33	.23	.28	.18
Q50 It is the professor's responsibility to teach me.	.09	.47	.26	.12	.18	.19	.24
Q27 Information on exams should be based on material taught to me in lecture.	.10	.46	.26	.13	.08	.35	.38
Q40 Professors must be entertaining to be good.	.15	.47	.22	.23	.25	.22	.12
Q52 Professors should tell students exactly what will and will not be on a test.	.31	.47	.22	.29	.28	.43	.28
Q4 The purpose of obtaining a university degree is to get a job when you are finished.	.07	.40	.15	.14	.11	.21	.11
Q22 Professors work for students.	.18	.38	.17	.21	.23	.11	.27
Q53 I should not be responsible for knowing anything that was not discussed in class.	.38	.44	.21	.28	.28	.39	.29
Q42 I should never receive a zero on an assignment that I turned in.	.19	.42	.20	.29	.25	.35	.13

Table 6 (cont.)

Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q68 If I felt a professor's grading was unfair, it would be appropriate for me to tell the professor.	-.05	.16	.76	.13	.03	.18	.31
Q69 If I felt I deserved a higher grade, I would feel that I have to tell the professor.	.03	.15	.76	.28	.09	.21	.28
Q66 It is okay to attempt to negotiate my grade with my professor.	.13	.21	.66	.29	.15	.23	.16
Q64 It is acceptable to confront a professor to argue about my grade.	.27	.20	.62	.27	.20	.20	.20
Q67 There is nothing wrong with arguing with the professor to get more points on a test.	.38	.23	.62	.40	.35	.20	.14
Q65 If a test or assignment is unfair, students should tell the professor	-.04	.23	.62	.13	.10	.22	.35
Q70 Students should complain to the Dean or higher level of authority to get the grade they deserve.	.33	.06	.45	.39	.21	.19	.21
Q74 I would ask a professor to raise my grade to avoid losing a Scholarship or other funding	.30	.18	.31	.72	.16	.26	.23
Q72 I would ask a professor to raise my grade to prevent me from being placed on academic probation.	.37	.16	.38	.71	.23	.30	.29
Q43 My professors should curve my grade if I am close to the next letter grade.	.33	.45	.19	.64	.35	.46	.15
Q41 My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.	.41	.34	.23	.66	.40	.44	.17
Q75 Professors should always round up on points in order to give students a higher grade.	.36	.43	.30	.55	.23	.44	.23
Q5 If I have explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think he/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade.	.33	.20	.28	.52	.25	.53	.32

Table 6 (cont.)

Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q18 I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond quickly to a phone message I left him or her.	.41	.22	.21	.23	.61	.26	.20
Q14 I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond the same day to an e-mail I sent.	.37	.26	.17	.20	.57	.22	.15
Q12 Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on exams.	.49	.29	.16	.39	.62	.52	.19
Q10 Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on paper assignments.	.37	.28	.13	.35	.55	.49	.12
Q17 A professor should not be annoyed with me if I receive an important call during class.	.31	.24	.21	.26	.47	.20	.15
Q11 When my personal plans conflict with an exam the professor should let me take the exam at a different time.	.48	.03	.17	.27	.46	.42	.23
Q16 Professors have no right to be annoyed with me if I tend to come late to class or tend to leave early.	.34	.23	.19	.29	.45	.17	.05
Q13 A professor should be willing to lend me his/her course notes if I ask for them.	.47	.11	.16	.43	.46	.35	.28
Q9 If I have attended most classes for a course, I deserve a good grade.	.32	.41	.21	.34	.28	.78	.16
Q8 If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a good grade.	.34	.38	.23	.35	.29	.78	.15
Q28 My effort in a course should be taken into account in the final grade.	.21	.40	.25	.36	.14	.57	.41
Q15 If I am not happy with my grade the professor should allow me to do an additional assignment.	.38	.27	.26	.53	.44	.52	.32
Q26 Courses should be designed to take into account student needs	-.01	.33	.29	.19	.14	.19	.68

Table 6 (cont.)

Structure Coefficients for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Academic Entitlement Items

Item		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Q25	Courses should be taught that take into account students Individual learning styles.	.08	.27	.22	.23	.13	.26	.68
Q24	I deserve to have more say in how my classes are organized.	.20	.31	.28	.42	.31	.25	.47

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Entitlement Items

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q60 I should get special treatment in my courses.	1.32	0.60
Q59 I should only be required to do a minimal amount of thinking to get an A in a class.	1.43	0.70
Q57 I should put in minimal effort to learn the material for a class.	1.55	0.74
Q62 Doing well in school should not take too much effort on my part.	1.55	0.75
Q36 For group assignments, it is acceptable to take a back seat and let others do most of the work if I am busy.	1.47	0.77
Q49 If I miss an appointment with a professor, it is no big deal even if he or she came to campus just for the appointment.	1.29	0.63
Q58 It is all right to lie to a professor to get the grade I deserve.	1.38	0.72
Q56 I should not have to think too hard to learn the material for a class.	1.88	0.95
Q54 Professors should bend the rules for me.	1.65	0.84
Q71 It is okay for me to demand that a professor make an exception for me.	1.56	0.82
Q73 It is appropriate to ask a professor to raise my grade without providing a reason.	1.39	0.76
Q47 I should be able to makeup exams any time I want.	1.55	0.82
Q55 A professor should modify course requirements to help me.	1.78	0.92
Q31 I am not motivated to put a lot of effort into group work, because another group member will end up doing it.	1.63	0.97
Q48 If I miss a test I should not have to explain to the professor why.	1.54	0.89
Q37 For group work, I should receive the same grade as the other group members regardless of my level of effort.	1.70	1.02
Q46 Professors should respond to e-mails within 30 minutes.	1.58	0.84
Q34 If I do poorly in a course and I could not make my professors office hours, the fault lies with my professor.	1.59	0.80
Q30 If I miss class, it is my responsibility to get the notes.*	1.53	0.79
Q61 I get very angry when a professor will not take my work even though it is late.	1.82	1.04
Q3 The tuition I pay entitles me to a passing grade.	1.87	1.16

Note. * indicates reverse scored item

Table 7 (cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Entitlement Items

	Item	M	SD
Q29	It is unnecessary for me to participate in class when the professor is paid for teaching, not for asking questions.	2.24	1.19
Q32	I believe that the university does not provide me with the resources I need to succeed in college.	2.29	1.13
Q63	I cannot tolerate it when a professor does not accommodate my personal situation.	2.27	1.20
Q39	My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.	3.35	1.29
Q50	It is the professor's responsibility to teach me.	3.88	1.31
Q27	Information on exams should be based on material taught to me in lecture.	4.38	1.18
Q40	Professors must be entertaining to be good.	3.29	1.22
Q52	Professors should tell students exactly what will and will not be on a test.	3.13	1.29
Q4	The purpose of obtaining a university degree is to get a job when you are finished.	4.46	1.29
Q22	Professors work for students.	3.22	1.32
Q53	I should not be responsible for knowing anything that was not discussed in class.	2.80	1.37
Q42	I should never receive a zero on an assignment that I turned in.	3.55	1.65
Q68	If I felt a professor's grading was unfair, it would be appropriate for me to tell the professor.	4.44	1.23
Q69	If I felt I deserved a higher grade, I would feel that I have to tell The professor.	4.02	1.31
Q66	It is okay to attempt to negotiate my grade with my professor.	3.55	1.39
Q64	It is acceptable to confront a professor to argue about my grade.	2.72	1.31
Q67	There is nothing wrong with arguing with the professor to get more points on a test.	2.57	1.30
Q65	If a test or assignment is unfair, students should tell the professor	4.45	1.17
Q70	Students should complain to the Dean or higher level of authority to get the grade they deserve.	2.47	1.28
Q74	I would ask a professor to raise my grade to avoid losing a Scholarship or other funding	2.65	1.40
Q72	I would ask a professor to raise my grade to prevent me from being placed on academic probation.	2.42	1.37
Q43	My professors should curve my grade if I am close to the next letter grade.	3.24	1.42
Q41	My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.	2.58	1.22

Table 7 (cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Entitlement Items

	Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q41	My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.	2.58	1.22
Q75	Professors should always round up on points in order to give students a higher grade.	3.13	1.42
Q5	If I have explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think He/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade.	2.98	1.23
Q18	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond quickly to a phone message I left him or her.	1.98	1.03
Q14	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond the same day to an e-mail I sent.	2.05	1.11
Q12	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on exams.	2.06	1.08
Q10	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on paper assignments.	2.43	1.18
Q17	A professor should not be annoyed with me if I receive an important call during class.	2.11	1.24
Q11	When my personal plans conflict with an exam the professor should let me take the exam at a different time.	1.90	1.11
Q16	Professors have no right to be annoyed with me if I tend to come late to class or tend to leave early.	2.10	1.30
Q13	A professor should be willing to lend me his/her course notes if I ask for them.	2.04	1.23
Q9	If I have attended most classes for a course, I deserve a good grade.	3.17	1.32
Q8	If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a good grade.	3.11	1.28
Q28	My effort in a course should be taken into account in the final grade.	3.86	1.32
Q15	If I am not happy with my grade the professor should allow me to do an additional assignment.	2.68	1.38
Q26	Courses should be designed to take into account student needs	4.22	1.14
Q25	Courses should be taught that take into account students individual learning styles.	3.90	1.29
Q24	I deserve to have more say in how my classes are organized.	3.23	1.17

Factor Description

The largest factor, narcissism, describes the degree to which students think highly of themselves and think that they are above the rules, requirements and etiquette of an academic setting. For example, students scoring high on this factor would likely agree with the statement “I should get special treatment in my courses.” This factor contains a number of sub-themes. These themes include getting reward for no effort, exemption from the rules, inconsiderate behaviour, and a lack of responsibility. Students who rank highly on this factor believe that they should only have to put in as little effort as possible to get a good grade (e.g. “I should only be required to do a minimal amount if thinking to get an A in a class”) and that professors should bend the rules for them or exempt them from the rules if they believe they should be exempt (e.g. “Professors should bend the rules for me”). These students high on narcissism also think that professors and instructors are there to serve students, with these students having no consideration for the professors or instructors time (e.g. “If I miss an appointment with a professor, it is no big deal even if he or she came to campus just for the appointment”). Finally, students who rank highly on this factor believe that they are not responsible for their academic performance. For example, they are not responsible for making up any missed work or that it was not their fault for not being able to make it to office hours (e.g. “If I do poorly in a course and I could not make my professors office hours, the fault lies with my professor”). At no point during data analysis did any of these themes separate out into their own factors, they always hung together as one factor. These themes even remained together as one factor when this factor was analyzed on its own, suggesting that these themes constitute a single, larger construct in academic entitlement.

The professors agency factor indicates the kind of service oriented behaviours and functions entitled students believe professors and instructors (and, to some extent, the school and all of its employees too) should perform to help students succeed. These behaviours and functions include professors helping students prepare for exams, only testing on material explicitly covered in lecture, teaching students (with the implication that students are not responsible for learning the class material), and not assigning a zero for work that has been submitted. An example question is “My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.”

Arguing for grades reflects the belief that students should get the grade they feel they deserve, and that they should not be shy about expressing that fact to the professor, course instructor, or even the dean of the faculty if they do not get the grade they feel they deserve. The items contained in this factor suggest that there is a duality to this factor. Some of the items seem to indicate an appropriate form of entitlement, where other items seem to indicate an inappropriate form of entitlement. In this context, appropriate entitlement would include bringing mistakes in grading or bad test items (i.e. items testing material that was not covered in lecture or in readings or assignments) to the attention of the professor so that those errors can be corrected. Items here would include “If a test or assignment is unfair, students should tell the professor” and “If I felt a professor’s grading was unfair, it would be appropriate for me to tell the professor.” These items can be interpreted to express that there is a legitimate problem with grading that should be addressed. Inappropriate entitlement, on the other hand, includes confronting a professor to argue for more points on a test or negotiate for a higher grade. These students may feel that either the grade they received did not reflect their perceived

academic performance, even if in reality it may have, or they may know they did not perform well and are attempting to increase their grade anyway. An example of an inappropriate entitlement item in this factor is “It is okay to attempt to negotiate my grade with my professor.”

Similarly, the expectations for grade increase factor also involve the students’ grades. However, this factor involves conditions under which grades should be increased, rather than simply arguing for grade increases. Here, entitled students would expect their grades to be increased if it would help them to avoid some negative consequence of the bad grade. For example, they would expect that a professor would raise their grade if it would keep them out of academic probation or to avoid losing a scholarship or other source of funding (e.g. “I would ask a professor to raise my grade to avoid losing a scholarship or other funding.”) Participants scoring high here would also expect their grade to be increased if they were close to the next letter grade or close to the grade they wanted (e.g., “My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.”) The key difference between this factor and arguing for grades is that there is an expectation that grade will increase under certain conditions, whereas the latter factor deals more with students’ behaviour to actively change their grades.

Professors etiquette is also a customer service oriented factor that involves certain behaviours students with a greater sense of entitlement expect the professor or course instructor to display or exhibit both during and outside of class time. It outlines expectations for interaction between students and professors that would be analogous to a customer service context, including response time to phone calls and emails sent by students and being provided extra services when students ask (which would include

changing exam times if it conflicts with students' personal plans and professors lending class notes to students). It also outlines expectations that professors should not get annoyed when students come and go during class time or if the student receives phone calls in class. An example question is "I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond the same day to an email I sent."

The reward for effort factor reflects the beliefs of students who are more entitled that they should be rewarded for simply putting effort into the coursework. This includes receiving credit for showing up to class, completing the assigned readings for a class, and being allowed to do extra work for make up for a bad grade. Students with high ratings on this factor expect to be rewarded not just for (or instead of) academic performance, but should be rewarded for simply putting effort into the course. An example question is "If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a good grade." This factor and expecting grades for no effort are conceptually related in that students expect that they should be able to make good grades with exerting little effort but if they must exert effort in their classes, they should be rewarded for it.

The final factor is input on classroom operations. This factor reflects an expectation that students should have input into how the courses and programs they are enrolled in are designed and administered. This would involve input on having the courses reflect the needs of and learning styles of the students in the class, and generally providing more input into how classes are organized. An example question is "Course should be taught that take into account students individual learning styles." This can relate to the idea of education as a consumer experience, as students feel they should have a say into a service they may feel they have purchased.

Table 8 displays the number of items from each original measure of academic entitlement that appear in each of the academic entitlement factors that were found in the current study. This provides a visual representation of the various ways each of the researchers conceptualized academic entitlement, and indicating the similarities and dissimilarities between each of the measures. As can be interpreted from the table, most of the measures have items that appear in the narcissism factor, with items from Chowning and Campbell's (2009) externalized responsibility factor and Achacoso's (2002) entitlement beliefs factor contributing the most items. The arguing for grades factor is entirely composed of items from Achacoso's (2002) entitlement actions factor, the professors etiquette factor is composed entirely of items from Greenberger et al.'s (2008) Academic Entitlement Scale, and the input on classroom operations is comprised of Pilot items. The professors responsibility, expectations for grade increase, and reward for effort factors include items from at least two of the original entitlement measures.

Table 9 displays how the factors of academic entitlement found by previous researchers, including four factors found by Jackson et al. (2011) who combined some of their pilot items and the measure designed by Greenberger et al. (2008) in finding the four factors, are represented in the factors of the current study, indicating whether the factors in the current study are mostly a collection of factors found by previous researchers, or if the factors found by previous researchers dissolve to create the factors found in the current study. In examining the table, it appears that both things are happening, with some of the previous factors breaking down into the factors in the current study and other previous factors are the same as some factors found in the current study. For example, the table displays that the product value factor essentially disappears,

as two of the items were removed from the analysis, and the third lands on the professors agency factor of the current study. In contrast, the input on classroom operations factor contains the exact same items and the exact same number of items as the control factor, though there is a slight difference in interpretation. Other prior factors seem to become part of larger factors in the current study and some have items in more than one of the current factors. For example, Chowning and Campbell's (2009) entitlement expectations factor contributes items to both the professors agency and expectations for grade increase factors, indicating there is some dissolution of some of the previously found factors into the factors of the current study.

However, it may not be as much that each of the previously found factors are either preserved or dissolved in the current study; it may be that the previous factors offer a way to place the current factors into context. An example would again be Chowning and Campbell's (2009) entitlement expectations factor. Since this factor contributes to both professors agency and expectations for grade increase, this could suggest that student expectations may be a component of those two factors. In either case, the data displayed in both Table 8 and Table 9 indicates that items from some prior measures and factors contributed to multiple new factors while other prior factors remained intact. This suggests that there may be multiple dimensions of academic entitlement, with some of those dimensions being shared among past research, and others being unique to individual studies.

Table 8

Measure x Factor Breakdown of Entitlement Items

Study Entitlement Factors	Original Entitlement Measures and Factors							
	Greenberger et al. (2008)	Chowning & Campbell (2009)		Achacoso (2002)		Pilot	WSU	Additional Items
		ER	EE	Beliefs	Actions			
Narcissism Professors		7		10	1	1	4	1
Agency Arguing for Grades			3			3	3	
Expectations for Grade Increase Professors	1		2		7			3
Etiquette	8							
Reward for Effort	3					1		
Input on Classroom Operations						3		

Note. Values indicate the number of items from the Original Entitlement Measures that appear in the corresponding Entitlement Factors from the current study. ER = Externalized Responsibility; EE = Entitled Expectations; Beliefs = Entitlement Beliefs; Actions = Entitlement Actions; Pilot = Pilot items developed by Jackson, Singleton-Jackson, & Frey (2011); WSU = Items developed at Wichita State University; Additional Items = Additional pilot items developed by Jackson, Singleton-Jackson, & Frey.

Table 9

Prior Factor x Factor Breakdown of Entitlement Items

Study Entitlement Factors	Factors Found in Prior Research							
	Chowning & Campbell (2009)		Achacoso (2002)		Jackson et al. (2011)			Product Value (3-item)
	ER (10-item)	EE (5-item)	Beliefs (10-item)	Actions (8-item)	Accommodation (7-item)	Reward for Effort (3-item)	Control (3-item)	
Narcissism (24-item)	7		10	1				
Professors Agency (9-item)		3						1
Arguing for Grades (7-item)				7				
Expectations for Grade Increase (6-item)		2				1		
Professors Etiquette (8-item)					5			
Reward for Effort (4-item)						2		
Input on Classroom Operations (3-item)								3

Note. Values indicate the number of items from prior entitlement factors that appear in the corresponding Entitlement Factors from the current study. Some items used in prior research were removed for the current study. ER = Externalized Responsibility; EE = Entitled Expectations; Beliefs = Entitlement Beliefs; Actions = Entitlement Actions.

Nomological Network

Canonical Correlation Analysis. The nomological network of academic entitlement was analyzed using canonical correlation analysis. The analysis was conducted using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) version 9.2 for Windows. There were two sets of variables with the first being the seven factors derived from the EFA, and the second set containing variables thought to be in the nomological network: psychological entitlement, academic goal orientation, academic motivation, student engagement, and academic self-efficacy. The purpose of this analysis was to understand the relationships between the two sets of variables. There were four significant canonical dimensions that were identified in the analysis. However, only two of the canonical dimensions were worth interpreting (see Table 10) as, when examining their squared canonical correlations, the other two dimensions explained 9.8% and 7.1% of the variance, respectively.

The first significant canonical dimension, which, when examining its squared canonical correlation, accounts for approximately 48% of the variance, identified the first academic entitlement factor (narcissism) as contributing the most weight to its canonical variable, followed by professors etiquette, and psychological entitlement, academic self-efficacy, intrinsic - knowledge, and amotivation as contributing the most weight and strongest correlations to their canonical variable (see Table 11). The canonical weights on this canonical dimension indicate that entitled students score highly on narcissism, psychological entitlement, and amotivation and score low on academic self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation – knowledge. The two factors that contribute the most variance, narcissism and psychological entitlement, indicate that students who are narcissistic in an

academic context are also likely to be generally entitled. When examining the redundancy analysis, the variate for the proposed nomological network accounts for 47.5% of the variance in the academic entitlement variate; however, the variate for the proposed nomological network only explains 15% of the variance in the individual academic entitlement factors. The academic entitlement variate explains 32% of the variance in the individual measures of the proposed nomological network. The large amount of variance contributed by both the narcissism factor of academic entitlement and psychological entitlement provides evidence that academic entitlement is a related construct to psychological entitlement. Also, the amount of variance contributed by academic entitlement and by the other three variables suggests that academic entitlement is related to other constructs in its proposed nomological network.

The second significant canonical dimension (see Table 10), accounting for approximately 16% of the variance in the analysis, according to its squared canonical correlation, identified the academic entitlement factors of narcissism (factor 1), professors agency (factor 2), and input on classroom operations (factor 7) as contributing the most variance to their canonical variable. The analysis also identified the constructs of psychological entitlement, academic self-efficacy, mastery avoidance goal orientation, active and collaborative learning, intrinsic motivation – knowledge, intrinsic motivation – accomplishment, intrinsic motivation – stimulation, extrinsic motivation – external regulation and extrinsic motivation – introjected regulation as contributing the most variance and having the strongest correlations to their canonical variable (see Table 12). On this canonical dimension, the directionality of the canonical weights indicate that entitled students appear to score low in narcissism, intrinsic motivation –

accomplishment, and intrinsic motivation – stimulation, and high on professors agency, input on classroom operations, psychological entitlement, academic self-efficacy, goal mastery avoidance, active and collaborative learning, intrinsic motivation – knowledge, extrinsic motivation – introjected regulation and extrinsic motivation – external regulation. The three factors that contribute the most variance to this canonical dimension, narcissism, professors agency and intrinsic motivation – stimulation, indicate that those entitled students who have high expectations of professor agency tend not to be narcissistic in an academic context and tend not to be stimulated or deriving enjoyment from their academic pursuits. For this canonical dimension, when examining the redundancy analysis, the variate for the proposed nomological network explains 16% of the variance in the academic entitlement variate and 4.5% of the variance in the individual academic entitlement factors. The academic entitlement variate explains 27.6% of the variance in the individual measures of the proposed nomological network.

The results of the CCA indicate that there is a relationship between the factors of academic entitlement and the proposed nomological network, suggesting that academic entitlement does belong in the proposed nomological network. The amount of variance accounted for by these two canonical dimensions provides evidence for convergent validity, indicating that there is a relationship. However, that fact that these dimensions do not account for all of the variance in the analysis suggest that, while each of these constructs are related, they are also unique constructs as well.

Table 10

Results of Canonical Correlation Analysis

Canonical Variable no.	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Squared Canonical Correlation	F-value	p-value
1.	.907	.69	.48	5.47	.000
2.	.193	.40	.16	2.63	.000
3.	.109	.31	.10	2.00	.000
4.	.077	.27	.07	1.62	.002

Table 11

Canonical Weights and Structure Coefficients for Canonical Dimension 1

Variable	Canonical Weights	Canonical Structure	Variable	Canonical Weights	Canonical Structure
Narcissism	.92	.98	Psychological Entitlement	.47	.62
Professors Agency	.04	.42	Academic Self-Efficacy	-.34	-.61
Arguing for Grades	-.17	.14	Mastery Approach Goal Orientation	-.18	-.42
Expectations for Grade Increase	-.03	.50	Mastery Avoidance Goal Orientation	.05	.24
Professors' Etiquette	.14	.74	Performance Approach Goal Orientation	.02	.03
Reward for Effort	.05	.50	Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	.18	.48
Input on Classroom Operations	-.02	.15	IM Knowledge (Motivation)	-.25	-.45
			IM Accomplishment (Motivation)	.03	-.28
			IM Stimulation (Motivation)	.18	-.05
			EM Identified Regulation (Motivation)	-.03	-.34
			EM Introjected Regulation (Motivation)	-.09	-.10
			EM External Regulation (Motivation)	-.03	-.06
			Amotivation (Motivation)	.29	.62
			Level of Academic Challenge (Engagement)	-.03	-.04
			Active and Collaborative Learning (Engagement)	.11	.08
			Student-Faculty Interaction (Engagement)	.11	.13
			Enriching Educational Experiences (Engagement)	.02	.09
			Supportive Campus Environment (Engagement)	-.02	-.15

Table 12

Canonical Weights and Structure Coefficients for Canonical Dimension 2

Variable	Canonical Weights	Canonical Structure	Variable	Canonical Weights	Canonical Structure
Narcissism	-.51	.01	Psychological Entitlement	.42	.43
Professors Agency	.80	.87	Academic Self-Efficacy	.32	.26
Arguing for Grades	.04	.41	Mastery Approach Goal Orientation	-.05	.14
Expectations for Grade Increase	.18	.50	Mastery Avoidance Goal Orientation	.39	.39
Professors' Etiquette	.02	.28	Performance Approach Goal Orientation	-.08	.20
Reward for Effort	.03	.51	Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	-.01	.20
Input on Classroom Operations	.28	.66	IM Knowledge (Motivation)	.28	.06
			IM Accomplishment (Motivation)	-.32	-.01
			IM Stimulation (Motivation)	-.52	-.26
			EM Identified Regulation (Motivation)	.18	.45
			EM Introjected Regulation (Motivation)	.28	.35
			EM External Regulation (Motivation)	.31	.60
			Amotivation (Motivation)	-.09	-.11
			Level of Academic Challenge (Engagement)	-.05	.08
			Active and Collaborative Learning (Engagement)	.31	.10
			Student-Faculty Interaction (Engagement)	-.03	-.03
			Enriching Educational Experiences (Engagement)	-.06	-.07
			Supportive Campus Environment (Engagement)	-.20	-.18

Bivariate Correlation Analysis. A bivariate correlation analysis was also conducted using SPSS 19 for Windows. A list of the correlations of interest can be found in Table 13. As expected, significant moderate positive correlations were found between each of the academic entitlement factors and psychological entitlement ($r = .18$ to $.49$). This result provides further evidence that academic entitlement and psychological entitlement are related but not redundant constructs. Significant correlations were also found between academic entitlement and academic goal orientation. Also as expected, performance avoidance goal orientation is positively correlated with five of the seven academic entitlement factors ($r = .21$ to $.32$) and performance approach orientation is weakly correlated with three of the seven academic entitlement factors ($r = .08$ to $.12$). Contrary to the expected outcomes for this analysis, moderate negative correlations were found between mastery approach orientation and five of the seven academic entitlement factors ($r = -.09$ to $-.28$) and positive correlations were found between mastery avoidance orientation and six of the seven academic entitlement factors ($r = .15$ to $.20$).

Generally, few relationships were found between academic entitlement and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation appears to be negatively related to the narcissism ($r = -.18$ to $-.29$), professors agency ($r = -.12$ to $-.15$), and professors etiquette ($r = -.13$ to $-.22$) factors of academic entitlement. The few significant results for extrinsic motivation were mixed. Identified regulation was found to be negatively related to narcissism ($r = -.23$) and to professors etiquette ($r = -.11$), while extrinsic motivation was weakly related to professors agency, expectations for grade increase, and reward for effort. Interestingly, amotivation had the strongest relationship with academic

entitlement, demonstrating significant positive relationships with five of the seven factors ($r = .14$ to $.42$).

There does not appear to be a strong relationship between academic entitlement and student engagement. For instance, the present findings show no significant relationships between level of academic challenge and any of the academic entitlement factors, nor are there any significant relationships between arguing for grades and any of the student engagement factors. There are a total of eight positive relationships between active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, and enriching educational experience and the remaining academic entitlement factors ($r = .08$ to $.12$). There are negative relationships between supportive campus environment and narcissism ($r = -.10$), professors agency ($r = -.10$), professors etiquette ($r = -.10$) and input on classroom operations ($r = -.11$).

As expected, there was a negative relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic entitlement. Academic self-efficacy was negatively related to narcissism ($r = -.39$), professors agency ($r = -.11$), professors etiquette ($r = -.51$), expectations for grade increase ($r = -.10$) and reward for effort ($r = -.12$). A weak positive correlation was found with arguing for grades ($r = .10$).

Table 13

Bivariate Correlations among Variables of Interest

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Narcissism	-						
2. Professors Agency	.41**	-					
3. Arguing for Grades	.28**	.39**	-				
4. Expectations for Grade Increase	.54**	.55**	.45**	-			
5. Professors' Etiquette	.69**	.50**	.33**	.53**	-		
6. Reward for Effort	.48**	.59**	.36**	.63**	.56**	-	
7. Input on Classroom Operations	.19**	.47**	.34**	.40**	.31**	.39**	-
8. Psychological Entitlement	.44**	.33**	.21**	.33**	.36**	.33**	.18**
9. Academic Self-Efficacy	-.39**	-.11**	.10*	-.10*	-.25**	-.12**	.04
10. Mastery Approach Goal Orientation	-.28**	-.10*	-.03	-.09*	-.22**	-.09*	.07
11. Mastery Avoidance Goal Orientation	.15**	.17**	.01	.17**	.17**	.17**	.20**
12. Performance Approach Goal Orientation	.03	.07	.09*	.12**	.05	.08*	.04
13. Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	.32**	.21**	.06	.24**	.27**	.23**	.08
14. IM Knowledge (Motivation)	-.29**	-.15**	.02	-.08	-.22**	-.07	.06
15. IM Accomplishment (Motivation)	-.18**	-.12**	-.00	-.04	-.13**	-.04	.04
16. IM Stimulation (Motivation)	-.03	-.15**	-.00	.01	-.03	.01	-.01
17. EM Identified Regulation (Motivation)	-.23**	.05	.06	.03	-.11**	.01	.07
18. EM Introjected Regulation (Motivation)	-.07	.09*	.04	.05	.00	.08*	.06
19. EM External Regulation (Motivation)	-.05	.21**	.05	.11**	.04	.08	.07
20. Amotivation (Motivation)	.42**	.14**	.06	.17**	.30**	.20**	.07
21. Level of Academic Challenge (Engagement)	-.03	-.00	.01	.06	.02	.05	.03
22. Active and Collaborative Learning (Engagement)	.06	.02	.01	.09*	.05	.08*	.12**
23. Student-Faculty Interaction (Engagement)	.10*	-.03	.08	.12**	.11**	.05	.12**
24. Enriching Educational Experiences (Engagement)	.07	-.06	-.04	.09*	.01	.02	.07
25. Supportive Campus Environment (Engagement)	-.11**	-.10*	-.05	-.05	-.10*	-.06	-.11**

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

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

There were two aims to the current study. The first was to extract an interpretable factor structure from the existing academic entitlement items questions created prior to the current study. It was expected that the interpretation of these factors would provide a conceptual framework of what facets contribute to the construct of academic entitlement. The second aim of the current study was to situate academic entitlement within a nomological network to provide validity to the construct by distinguishing it from other related constructs (in this case, psychological entitlement), and by relating academic entitlement to other constructs in educational psychology.

Factors of Academic Entitlement

When examining all of the items from the academic entitlement measures developed prior to the current study, including some pilot items created in part by the researcher, the current study identified seven factors that define the construct of academic entitlement. This suggests that academic entitlement is a multidimensional construct. The seven factors of academic entitlement are narcissism (factor 1), professors agency (factor 2), arguing for grades (factor 3), expectations for grade increase (factor 4), professors etiquette (factor 5), reward for effort (factor 6), and input on classroom operations (factor 7).

The seven factors that reflect academic entitlement appear to support the definition discussed earlier by Singleton-Jackson et al. (2011) and can also expand upon it. The definition proposed by Singleton-Jackson et al. contained three facets:

1) that academic entitlement reflects a belief that some reward is deserved that is not justified based on academic achievement (as defined by Morrow, 1993); 2) that academic entitlement beliefs imply a diminished role for personal responsibility in academic achievement; and, 3) that academic entitlement beliefs also implies unrealistic expectations about the role of instructors and demanding attitudes and behaviors on the behalf of students.” (p. 56).

Elements of these facets appear in the domains found in the current study. Namely, the factors of professors agency and expectations for grade increase can both be thought of in terms of the second part of the above definition, as both of those factors involve placing the responsibility for learning and achievement on the professor rather than on the student. Also, the reward for effort factor relates to the first part of the definition, that some reward is deserved though it may not be justified by the level of achievement. Finally, the professors agency factor relates to the third part of the definition, as this factor outlines what entitled students would expect from their instructors. In addition to supporting the above definition, the findings of the present study integrate the current theoretical perspectives on academic entitlement which suggest that entitled students expect to have input and control over professors, how they are graded/assessed, and over their path through university, and that narcissism plays a key role in academic entitlement, as these students seem to feel superior to faculty members and other students, and are generally inconsiderate of professors, administration, and other students. As noted in the introduction, if this type of entitled student is allowed to continue and flourish on university campuses, they may severely devalue university education, as these students seem to take no responsibility for their learning and are more interested in

receiving passing grades than gaining knowledge. If they graduate with passing grades and no knowledge to show for those grades, it lessens the perception of the degree to others (i.e., employers) which lessens the benefit of obtaining a degree for those students who did learn and gain knowledge.

This study was originally designed to include Confirmatory Factor Analysis, which would have been conducted following the Exploratory Factor Analysis, to confirm the factor structure found in the EFA. This analysis was removed for two reasons. The first reason is that the study is exploratory in nature and had no prior hypothesized factor structure and therefore it would have been difficult to confirm, particularly given the large number of items and some less than ideal factor loadings. The second reason for not conducting the CFA was because a new measure of academic entitlement will eventually be created by Jackson et al. as part of the larger project using new or modified items. This new measure will aim to more accurately and concisely assess academic entitlement than the previous attempts at assessing the construct. Given these two considerations, there was no need to confirm the factor structure with the current items.

Relating Constructs

The second aim of this study was to place academic entitlement in a nomological network, in order to validate academic entitlement as a construct and to ensure that academic entitlement was a unique construct in its own right. To accomplish this, the seven factors of academic entitlement were compared to measures of psychological entitlement, academic goal orientation, academic motivation, student engagement, and academic self-esteem.

The results provided support for the first expected outcome, that is, that academic entitlement is related to, yet distinct from, psychological entitlement. Results from the canonical correlation analysis indicated, particularly in the first canonical dimension, that there is strong convergent validity between academic and psychological entitlement. These two constructs are related to each other both conceptually and statistically in that generally those who exhibit traits of academic entitlement (specifically narcissism) are likely to exhibit the traits of psychological entitlement as well. Discriminant validity was also demonstrated between academic and psychological entitlement. This suggests that while these constructs are related constructs, they are not identical. Each construct is assessing a different aspect of entitlement; psychological entitlement assesses a general, global sense of entitlement, whereas academic entitlement reflects a sense of entitlement that is specific to the context of post-secondary education. This suggests that while students may exhibit traits of both academic and psychological entitlement, they may do so to a different extent or may exhibit one type of entitlement and not the other, meaning that they could be, for example, more entitled in an academic setting than they are in other areas of their lives. The bivariate correlational analysis also provides support for this conclusion, as moderate correlations were found between psychological entitlement and all of the factors of academic entitlement, suggesting that while these are related constructs, they are also distinct constructs.

Partial support was found for the second expected outcome, which stated that there would be a positive relationship between academic entitlement and performance goal orientations and no relationship between academic entitlement and mastery goal orientations. Bivariate correlational analyses suggest that there is indeed a positive

relationship between academic entitlement and performance avoidance and, to a lesser extent a positive relationship to performance approach as well. This suggests that entitled students are performance or grade oriented students in general. Interestingly, however, there was also a positive relationship between academic entitlement and mastery avoidance that was indicated in both the canonical and bivariate correlational analyses. This could suggest that students with a greater sense of entitlement are also students who are not as concerned about their performance so much as they are more concerned about needing to learn and master the material so they do not appear incompetent to professors and other students. This interpretation makes sense as the mastery avoidance orientation seemed to map onto all of the academic entitlement factors except for the arguing for grades factor. Where the arguing for grades factor describes students who are concerned about their grade and are willing to draw attention to their low grade in order to get it raised, mastery avoidant students would not care about drawing attention to a bad grade, unless to understand where they went wrong or to point out a mistake in grading, nor are they likely to receive a bad grade or care about their exact grade, as their aim is mastery over the subject matter, not performance.

Finally, the mastery approach orientation is negatively related to academic entitlement. While this relationship was not hypothesised, it does stand to reason that students who take a mastery approach orientation to their academic goals (their motivation is to gain knowledge rather than grades) would be less likely to be entitled. These students may be less likely to make comparisons to other students, argue for grades, or expect preferential treatment from professors. Specifically, mastery approach oriented students tend to not be high in narcissism or expect professors to cater to them

(low in the professors etiquette factor). If these measures were used as an assessment tool, students who have a mastery approach orientation to learning and were not narcissistic and did not expect professors to give them preferential treatment would be the ideal students a post-secondary institution would be looking to recruit. These students would place a high value on learning course material and would place the onus of that learning on themselves.

For the third expected outcome, there was some support to suggest that academically entitled students were less likely to be intrinsically motivated students. Specifically, students who display a greater sense of entitlement are not students who are motivated by the pleasure or the enjoyment of learning, and do not seem to derive any enjoyment from the learning process. Contrary to expectations, students who have a greater sense of entitlement were also less likely to be extrinsically motivated, specifically identified regulation motivated. Typically students would internalize their external motives to engage in the academic process, especially when there is a perception by the student of the internalization being a choice. However, students with a greater sense of entitlement may not internalize, or may not choose to internalize, motives for engaging in the academic process.

To a greater extent, however, the results suggest that students who are more academically entitled tend to be amotivated students. This is a particularly interesting finding in that it was expected that entitled students would be somehow motivated by comparisons to other students, getting good grades in their classes, and progressing to receiving their degree. However, it seems that students with a greater sense of entitlement may not be motivated academically at all. In fact, it may be the case that these students

may not be interested in learning and are expecting to coast through their degrees by simply being present, while placing all of the responsibility for their education onto others, and expecting to be rewarded when they are forced to exert effort for a course.

For the fourth expected outcome, there was some support to suggest that students with a greater sense of entitlement are marginally engaged students, though the results for this association are generally weak. These students seem to participate some in class, have some contact with faculty, and may find the campus environment not as supportive. These students may also have a slightly hostile view of their life on campus. Though given the weak relationships between engagement and entitlement, it is possible that how engaged a student is has little bearing on how entitled a student may be. However, there are positive associations between active and collaborative learning and expectations for grade increase, reward for effort, and input on classroom operations. This suggests that when students are contributing in class and participating in group assignments or activities, students who display a greater sense of entitlement may expect to be rewarded for expending effort in contributing and have input into the assignments or activities. Also, the positive associations between student-faculty interaction and narcissism, expectations for grade increase, professors etiquette, and input on classroom operations could indicate that students with a greater sense of entitlement may engage with faculty if that interaction will provide benefit solely for the student or allows the student to provide feedback and input to the professor on how grades are assigned or how the class is operated.

The current findings support the final expected outcome in that there was a negative association between academic entitlement and academic self-efficacy. In

particular, students with a greater sense of entitlement may be less likely to feel confident about their scholastic abilities, which in turn may result in not taking responsibility for their own academic performance but simply expecting rewards for effort. The one exception was a positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and arguing for grades. Students with a greater sense of self-efficacy will likely feel more confident in their ability to argue for increased grades. Successes at arguing for grade increases are also likely to result in increased self-efficacy, as students would feel increasingly confident in being able to get their grades increased in the future. This cycle could actually increase or reinforce entitlement in students, as they would feel rewarded for arguing for a grade if a grade increase is awarded, potentially making them more likely to do it again in the future because they would feel more confident in being successful. As mentioned previously, items in the arguing for grades factor assesses both appropriate and inappropriate forms of entitlement, where in some contexts it is appropriate to argue for grades (i.e. when a mistake is made in marking) and in this sense students should experience an increased sense of self-efficacy to speak up when there is a legitimate issue with grading. As academic entitlement is perceived in this study as an inherently negative construct, future research will need to revise these items to make this construct consistent with the current view of academic entitlement.

Conclusions

The aims of the current study were two-fold. The first aim of the current study was to examine the dimensions of academic entitlement to determine what constitutes the construct and to help aid in conceptualizing and defining academic entitlement. The second aim of the current study was to place academic entitlement in a nomological

network by relating and distinguishing the construct from hypothesised related constructs from the field of educational psychology.

The current study found that there are seven dimensions to academic entitlement (narcissism, professors agency, arguing for grades, expectations for grade increase, professors etiquette, reward for effort, and input on classroom operations), suggesting that academic entitlement is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. These dimensions generally support the definition put forth by Jackson et al. (2011), indicating that academic entitlement constitutes a belief of receiving reward regardless of achievement, a diminished role for personal responsibility in achievement, and unrealistic expectation of professors and demanding attitudes and behaviours on the part of students. The current study suggests that students with a greater sense of entitlement also expect control over professors and the grades they are assigned and suggests that narcissism is a key component in academic entitlement. These dimensions and the supported definition of academic entitlement can provide direction for future measures of, and investigation into, academic entitlement.

The current study also found support for academic entitlement fitting into a nomological network. In particular, it was found that academic entitlement is a distinct yet related to psychological entitlement. This indicates that students with a greater sense of entitlement may also be entitled, to varying degrees, in other aspects of their lives, not just academically, though this may not always be the case. Students with a greater sense of entitlement were also found to have an avoidant academic goal orientation, are generally amotivated in terms of learning, and have low self-efficacy in an academic setting. This paints a picture of students who are more interested in their grades as

opposed to learning and mastering the subject material taught in their classes. The associations found in this study suggest that academic entitlement is a valid construct in educational psychology.

Historically, the aim of a university education was to impart knowledge onto new generations of citizens (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997). The emphasis was placed on what Morrow (1994) refers to as educational achievement, which is the acquisition of knowledge, and that there was some expectation that students would take responsibility for their learning. In recent years, there seems to be an expectation that a university education serves more career and employment oriented purposes for students and that students seem to take a more consumeristic approach to higher education (Maringe, 2006). As it stands, the findings of this study reveal that entitled students may treat university education as a commodity, meaning that because they pay their money they should be entitled to degree, without having to accept any responsibility or ownership over as to how that degree is achieved.

Limitations

One of the aims of this study was to clarify a definition of academic entitlement by attempting to determine the dimensions of academic entitlement using the various existing measures created to assess the construct. While it is believed that this research is correctly identifying academic entitlement, this may not be the case. By using different pre-existing measures of academic entitlement, the results of the exploratory factor analysis may simply be factoring a representation of how other researchers" in this field are conceptualizing academic entitlement, rather than providing a complete assessment of the entire academic entitlement construct. Future research could focus on this issue by

conducting more focus groups and interviews with students, and by surveying and interviewing faculty members and staff members to either get a more complete conceptualization of academic entitlement through obtaining richer data from a variety of sources or to validate academic entitlement as it is currently conceptualized.

In addition, a measure as large as the one utilized in this study would likely not work in assessing the entitlement levels of students, as some items may seem redundant and participants may become fatigued while answering such a lengthy survey. This underscores the need to make more concise measure that encompasses each of the seven factors outlined above. A more concise measure will also allow for more concrete and meaningful associations with the other constructs.

A final limitation to the study is that there may be other variables influencing academic entitlement that were not taken into account in this study. Specifically, previous research has demonstrated that gender may play an important role. For example, women tend to score lower than men on academic entitlement (Ciani et al., 2008). As noted above, a majority of participants in this study are women, which could be influencing the responses on the academic entitlement items and thus introducing a gender bias to the proposed factor structure for academic entitlement, as well as how it relates to other constructs in educational psychology.

Future Directions

Research toward understanding academic entitlement should continually reassess our current definition of the construct. With entitled students inhabiting campuses across the country, it is important to develop a greater understanding of what constitutes entitlement and what types of factors impact these beliefs and expectations in students

(both entitled and not-entitled students), faculty, post-secondary institutions, and the academic system as a whole.

Future research should consider focusing on the conditions that promote entitlement, as well as some conditions that may impede or constrain these expectations and beliefs. In particular, future research assessing how universities are perceived by prospective students, and their reasoning behind attending university, may provide invaluable insight into root cause of entitlement. This knowledge may contribute to more appropriate methods of advertising higher education to prospective students and ways of recruiting students that value and take responsibility for their learning. Similarly, future research should also focus on how faculty members and administration may contribute to academic entitlement and if they see academic entitlement as a problem. Understanding how faculty and administration may contribute to academic entitlement could provide insight into ways entitlement may be perpetuated or even increased during the students' post-secondary education. Identifying any of these avenues could contribute to more appropriate interactions between faculty/administration and students, with the aim of reducing, or at least not enabling, entitlement in students.

It is also important for future research to examine if academic entitlement is a stable or fluid phenomenon and, if it is fluid, has it peaked or are students continuing to become more and more entitled with each successive year. Examining whether academic entitlement is stable or fluid could indicate how entrenched the sense of entitlement is in the student and indicate whether, and under what conditions, a student's sense of entitlement may change. If academic entitlement is a stable phenomenon, it should be determined if it is also a permanent phenomenon or if it is something that can be

changed. If academic entitlement is not a stable construct, it would be important to examine how it fluctuates and if it is increasing or decreasing over time, both during the course of their degrees (which some research suggests it might, though more investigation is needed), as well as increasing with each new year of undergraduate students over students from the previous year.

Future research should continue to examine how academic entitlement impacts their undergraduate education. In particular, research should focus on how their entitlement impacts their progress through their programs, as well as the quality of education received by the student, including how much they are actually learning or retaining and the level of difficulty in which the material is being delivered as well as issues surrounding grade inflation. Students' experiences post-graduation should also be examined, including whether or not they carry their entitlement into post-graduation jobs or careers (i.e., are they once entitled, always entitled?), if academic entitlement has helped or hindered in their ability to gain employment, and how their entitlement has effected their job performance.

The measure of academic entitlement utilized in this study is better suited as an exploratory tool rather than something that could be used for assessment purposes, for example. Utilizing the results of this exploratory study, creating a new, more useful measure of academic entitlement will be an important step in more accurately understanding this phenomenon. Ideally, the new measure would consist mostly of new items that would need to be concise, consistently phrased, consistent in scope by only assessing inappropriate forms of entitlement in each of the factors, as academic entitlement is considered as inappropriate in this study (i.e. the arguing for grades factor),

and encompassing the seven factors outlined above, as well as incorporating stronger psychometric properties (i.e., both stronger and more defined factor loadings). Such a measure can be used to provide clearer and more meaningful relationships between academic entitlement and other constructs. Another way this measure could be used is as an evaluation tool or as part of an evaluation package of questionnaires, which could include the academic goal orientation measure, for example, as this could provide schools with information about the students they are admitting. This information could either be used as an exclusionary tool, or as information to identify the entitled students and work with them to reduce or shift their entitled expectations. While it is unlikely that a post-secondary institution will use the measure in such a way, the potential for its use in this context is present. Continuing to study academic entitlement will serve to further validate the construct in the near term and help both researchers and educators better understand and address academic entitlement in the future.

REFERENCES

- Abaya, E. S. (2008, August 5). Marketing universities is a modern-day necessity. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from: <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/marketing-universities-is-a-modern-day-necessity.aspx>
- Achacoso, M. V. (2002). *“What do you mean my grade is not an A?” An investigation of academic entitlement, causal attributions, and self-regulation in college students.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Acock, A. C. (2005). Working with missing values. *Journal of Family and Marriage*, 67(11), 1012-1028.
- Benson, J. (1998). Developing a strong program of construct validation: A test anxiety sample. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 17(1), 10-17, 22.
- Bong, M. (2001). Between- and within-domain relations of academic motivation among middle and high school students: Self-efficacy, task-value, and achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 23-34.
- Bong, M. (2004). Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 287-297.
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research.* New York: Guilford.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, J. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of american colleges and universities* (4th edition). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Canada, Parliament, Senate. Standing Senate Committee on National Finance. (2001).

The role of the government in the financing of deferred maintenance costs in Canada's post-secondary institutions. Retrieved from: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/371/fina/rep/rep09oct01-e.htm>

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (2010, September 23). *Tuition on the rise... again:*

Students pay more as governments pays less. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/story/2008/05/15/f-highereducation-tuitionfees.html>

Canadian Federation of Students (2009). *Tuition fees in Canada.* Retrieved from:

<http://www.cfs-fcee.ca/html/english/research/factsheets/CFS-Fact%20Sheet-Tuition%20Fees.pdf>

Campbell, W. K., 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.

Carifio, J. & Rhodes, L. (2002). Construct validities and the empirical relationships

between optimism, hope, self-efficacy, and locus of control. *Work*, 19, 125-136.

Cecil, M.J. (2007). *The relationship between student responses on the national survey of*

student engagement (NSSE) and performance on the critical-thinking assessment test (CAT). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Chemers, M. M., Hu, L., & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first-year

college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55-64.

Choi, N. (2005). Self-efficacy and self-concept as predictors of college students"

academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(2), 197-205.

- Chowning, K. & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitlement expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 982-997.
- Ciani, K. D., Summers, J. J., & Easter, M. A. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 169(4), 332-344.
- Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- Elias, S. M. & Loomis, R. J. (2000). Using an academic self-efficacy scale to address university major persistence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(4), 450-454.
- Elias, S. M. & MacDonald, S. (2007). Using past performance, proxy efficacy, and academic self-efficacy to predict college performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(11), 2518-2531.
- Elliot, A. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 169-189.
- Elliot, A., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 501-519.
- Embretson (Whitely), S. (1983). Construct validity: Construct representation versus nomothetic span. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93(1), 179-197.

- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272-299.
- Finney, S. J., Pieper, S. L., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Examining the psychometric properties of the achievement goal questionnaire in a general academic context. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(2), 365- 382.
- Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., & Guay, F. (1995). Academic motivation and school performance: Toward a structural model. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 20, 257-274.
- Gingras, Y. (2009, January 12). Marketing can corrupt universities. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from: <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/marketing-can-corrupt-universities.aspx>
- Gist, M. E. & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- 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, 1193-1204.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1977). What if we administered the “wrong” inventory? The prediction of scores on personality research form scales from those on the california psychological inventory, and vice versa. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1(3), 339-354.

- 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, 459-476.
- Howell, D. C. (2009). Treatment of missing data. Retrieved from: http://www.uvm.edu/~dhowell/StatPages/More_Stuff/Missing_Data/Missing.html.
- Jackson, D. L., Singleton-Jackson, J. A., & Frey, M. P. (2011). Report of a measure of academic entitlement. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 1(3), 53-65.
- Kolić-Vehovec, S., Rončević, B., & Bajšanski, I. (2008). Motivational components of self-regulated learning and reading strategy use in university students: The role of goal orientation patterns. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18, 108-113.
- Kuh, G.D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 683-706.
- Lampert, J. N. (2007). The relationship of self-efficacy and self-concept to academic performance in a college sample: Testing competing models and measures. *School of Professional Psychology*, Paper 86. <http://commons.pacificu.edu/spp/86>
- Mansfield, H. C. (2001). Grade inflation: It's time to face the facts. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(30), pB24.
- Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6), 466-479.
- Morrow, W. (1994). Entitlement and achievement in education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 13, 33-47.

- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2005). *Frequently asked questions about NSSE's psychometric properties*. Retrieved March 2, 2012, from http://www.iun.edu/~nwadmin/oier/nsse/faq/2005/FAQ_2005_NSSE_Psychometric_Properties.pdf
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). *Validity BCSSE - NSSE relationships*. Retrieved February 12, 2011, from http://nsse.iub.edu/pdf/psychometric_portfolio/Validity_BCSSE-NSSE%20Relationships.pdf
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2011). *Benchmarks of effective educational practice*. Retrieved February 12, 2011, from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/pdf/nsse_benchmarks.pdf
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 32(3), 396-402.
- O'Neill, T. (2010). *Report on the university system in Nova Scotia*. Retrieved from the Premier of Nova Scotia website: <http://premier.gov.ns.ca/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/09/EducationReport.pdf>
- Owen, S. V. & Froman, R. D. (1988, April). *Development of a college academic self-efficacy scale*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Pascarella, E. T., Seifert, T. A., & Blaich, C. (2010, January). How effective are the NSSE benchmarks in predicting important educational outcomes. *Change*. Retrieved from <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/January-February%202010/full-how-effective.html>

- Pisarik, C. T. (2009). Motivational orientation and burnout among undergraduate college students. *College Student Journal*, 43(4), 1238-1252.
- Preacher, K. J. & MacCallum, R. C. (2003). Repairing tom swift's electric factor analysis machine. *Understanding Statistics*, 2(1), 13-43.
- Rojstaczer, S. (2003). *Grade inflation at American colleges and universities*. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from <http://www.gradeinflation.com>.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Singleton-Jackson, J. A., Jackson, D. L., & Reinhardt, J. (2010). Students as consumers of knowledge: Are they buying what we're selling? *Innovative Higher Education*, 35, 343-358.
- Singleton-Jackson, J. A., Jackson, D. L., & Reinhardt, J. (2011). Academic entitlement: Exploring definitions and dimensions of entitled students. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 5(9), 229-236.
- Sharkey, J. D., You, S., & Schnoebelen, K. (2008). Relations among school assets, individual resilience, and student engagement for youth grouped by level of family functioning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 402-418.
- Statistics Canada (2009). *University tuition fees*. Retrieved from the Statistics Canada website: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/091020/dq091020b-eng.htm>
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th edition). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper & Row.

- 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: Free Press.
- Urbina, S. (2004). *Essentials of psychological testing*. New Jersey: Wiley.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallieres, E. F. (1992). The academic motivation scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 1003-1017.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallieres, E. F. (1993). On the assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the academic motivation scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 159-172.
- Wood, R. E. & Locke, E. A. (1987). The relation of self-efficacy and grade goals to academic performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*, 1013-1024.
- Yoshida, M., Tanaka, M., Mizuno, K., Ishii, A., Nozaki, K., Urakawa, A., Cho, Y., Kataoka, Y., & Watanabe, Y. (2008). Factors influencing the academic motivation of individual college students. *International Journal of Neuroscience, 118*, 1400-1411.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaires

Academic Entitlement Scale (Greenberger et al., 2007)

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	If I have explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think he/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	I feel I have been poorly treated if a professor cancels an appointment with me on the same day as we were supposed to meet.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a good grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	If I have attended most classes for a course, I deserve a good grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on paper assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	When my personal plans conflict with an exam the professor should let me take the exam at a different time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Professors often give me lower grades than I deserve on exams	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	A professor should be willing to lend me his/her course notes if I ask for them	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond the same day to an e-mail I sent	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	If I'm not happy with my grade the professor should allow me to do an additional assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Professors have no right to be annoyed with me if I tend to come late to class or tend to leave early	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	A professor should not be annoyed with me if I receive an important call during class	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	I would think poorly of a professor who did not respond quickly to a phone message I left him or her	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	A professor should be willing to meet with me at a time that works best for me, even if inconvenient for the professor	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	A professor should let me arrange to turn in an assignment late if the due date interferes with my personal plans	1	2	3	4	5	6

Pilot Academic Entitlement Items

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	When taking classes in my major area, my professors should ensure that I pass.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The tuition I pay entitles me to a passing grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	The purpose of obtaining a university degree is to get a job when you are finished.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I am a customer of this university.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Professors have an obligation to be up-to-date in their field.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Professors work for students	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Learning things that will not help me to obtain a job is useful in its own right	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	I deserve to have more say in how my classes are organized	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Courses should be taught that take into account students' individual learning styles	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Courses should be designed to take into account student needs?	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Information on exams should be based on material taught to me in lecture	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	My effort in a course should be taken into account in the final grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Additional items.

These were written and administered as part of the student and faculty behaviour scales originally, and for some reason not included as AE pilot items.

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	I would ask a professor to raise my grade to prevent me from being placed on academic probation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	It is appropriate to ask a professor to raise my grade without providing a reason.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	I would ask a professor to raise my grade to avoid losing a scholarship or other funding?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Professors should always round up on points in order to give students a higher grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Academic Entitlement Scale (Chowning & Campbell, 2009)

Items 1-10 constitute the *Externalized Responsibility Subscale* and items 11-15 constitute the *Entitled Expectations Subscale*

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
1.	It is unnecessary for me to participate in class when the professor is paid for teaching, not for asking questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	If I miss class, it is my responsibility to get the notes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	I am not motivated to put a lot of effort into group work, because another group member will end up doing it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I believe that the university does not provide me with the resources I need to succeed in college.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Most professors do not really know what they are talking about.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	If I do poorly in a course and I could not make my professor's office hours, the fault lies with my professor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	I believe that it is my responsibility to seek out the resources to succeed in college.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	For group assignments, it is acceptable to take a back seat and let others do most of the work if I am busy.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	For group work, I should receive the same grade as the other group members regardless of my level of effort.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Professors are just employees who get money for teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Professors must be entertaining to be good.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I want.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	I should never receive a zero on an assignment that I turned in.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	My professors should curve my grade if I am close to the next letter grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6

WSU Pilot Items

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Professors should be available during the summers, even if they are not teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Professors should not count off for grammar on written assignments.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	Professors should respond to e-mails within 30 minutes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I should be able to make up exams any time I want.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	If I miss a test I should not have to explain to the professor why.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	If I miss an appointment with a professor, it is no big deal even if he or she came to campus just for the appointment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	It is the professor's responsibility to teach me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	If I do not do well, it is usually the professor's fault.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Professors should tell students exactly what will and will not be on a test.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	I should not be responsible for knowing anything that was not discussed in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Academic Entitlement Scale (Achacoso, 2002)

	Question	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Professors should bend the rules for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	A professor should modify course requirements to help me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	I should not have to think too hard to learn the material for a class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I should put in minimal effort to learn the material for a class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	It is all right to lie to a professor to get the grade I deserve.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	I should only be required to do a minimal amount of thinking to get an A in a class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	I should get special treatment in my courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	I get very angry when a professor will not take my work even though it is late.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Doing well in school should not take too much effort on my part.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	I cannot tolerate it when a professor does not accommodate my personal situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	It is acceptable to confront a professor to argue about my grade.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	If a test or assignment is unfair, students should tell the professor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	It is okay to attempt to negotiate my grade with my professor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	There is nothing wrong with arguing with the professor to get more points on a test.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	If I felt a professor's grading was unfair, it would be appropriate for me to tell the professor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	If I felt I deserved a higher grade, I would feel that I have to tell the professor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	Students should complain to the dean or higher level of authority to get the grade they deserve.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	It is okay for me to demand that a professor make an exception for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(original 21 items, bold=final 12 items)

College Questionnaire (Academic Self-Efficacy)

How much confidence do you have about doing each of the behaviours listed below?
Circle the letters that best represent your confidence.

A B C D E

Quite ←-----→ Very
A Lot CONFIDENCE Little

	Question	Lots			Little	
		A	B	C	D	E
1.	Taking well-organized notes during a lecture.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Participating in a class discussion.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Answering a question in a large class.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Answering a question in a small class.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching)	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Taking essay tests.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Writing a high quality term paper.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Tutoring another student.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Explaining a concept to another student.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don't understand.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Earning good marks in most courses.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Studying enough to understand content thoroughly.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Running for student government office.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Participating in extracurricular events (sports, clubs).	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Making professors respect you.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Attending class regularly.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Attending class consistently in a dull course.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Making a professor think you're paying attention in class.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Understanding most ideas you read in your texts.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Understanding most ideas presented in class.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Performing simple math computations.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Using a computer.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Mastering most content in a math course.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	Talking to a professor privately to get to know him or her.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Relating course content to material in other courses.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Challenging a professor's opinion in class.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Applying lecture content to a laboratory session.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Making good use of the library.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Getting good grades.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Spreading out studying instead of cramming.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Understanding difficult passages in textbooks.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Mastering content in a course you're not interested in.	A	B	C	D	E

Psychological Entitlement Scale

	Question	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	I honestly feel I'm just more deserving than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Great things should come to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	If I were on the Titanic, I would deserve to be on the <i>first</i> lifeboat!	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I demand the best because I'm worth it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	I do not necessarily deserve special treatment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	I deserve more things in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	People like me deserve an extra break now and then.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Things should go my way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I feel entitled to more of everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Academic Motivation Scale (AMS-C 28)

College Version

Why do you go to university?

Using the scale below, indicate to what extent each of the following items presently corresponds to one of the reasons why you go to college.

Does not correspond at all	Corresponds a little		Corresponds moderately		Corresponds a lot		Corresponds Exactly	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

1.	Because with only a high-school degree I would not find a high-paying job later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Because I experience pleasure and satisfaction while learning new things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Because I think that a college education will help me better prepare for the career I have chosen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	For the intense feelings I experience when I am communicating my own ideas to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Honestly, I don't know; I really feel that I am wasting my time in school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	For the pleasure I experience while surpassing myself in my studies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	To prove to myself that I am capable of completing my college degree.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	In order to obtain a more prestigious job later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	For the pleasure I experience when I discover new things never seen before.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Because eventually it will enable me to enter the job market in a field that I like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	For the pleasure that I experience when I read interesting authors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	I once had good reasons for going to college; however, now I wonder whether I should continue.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Does not correspond at all		Corresponds a little		Corresponds moderately		Corresponds a lot		Corresponds Exactly	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
13.	For the pleasure that I experience while I am surpassing myself in one of my personal accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
14.	Because of the fact that when I succeed in college I feel important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
15.	Because I want to have "the good life" later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
16.	For the pleasure that I experience in broadening my knowledge about subjects which appeal to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
17.	Because this will help me make a better choice regarding my career orientation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
18.	For the pleasure that I experience when I feel completely absorbed by what certain authors have written.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
19.	I can't see why I go to college and frankly, I couldn't care less.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
20.	For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult academic activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
21.	To show myself that I am an intelligent person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
22.	In order to have a better salary later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
23.	Because my studies allow me to continue to learn about many things that interest me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
24.	Because I believe that a few additional years of education will improve my competence as a worker.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
25.	For the "high" feeling that I experience while reading about various interesting subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
26.	I don't know; I can't understand what I am doing in school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
27.	Because college allows me to experience a personal satisfaction in my quest for excellence in my studies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
28.	Because I want to show myself that I can succeed in my studies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			

KEY FOR AMS-28

- # 2, 9, 16, 23 Intrinsic motivation - to know
- # 6, 13, 20, 27 Intrinsic motivation - toward accomplishment
- # 4, 11, 18, 25 Intrinsic motivation - to experience stimulation
- # 3, 10, 17, 24 Extrinsic motivation - identified
- # 7, 14, 21, 28 Extrinsic motivation - introjected
- # 1, 8, 15, 22 Extrinsic motivation - external regulation
- # 5, 12, 19, 26 Amotivation

Academic Goal Orientation

	Performance Approach	Not at all true of me		Somewhat true of me			Very True of me	
1.	My goal this semester is to get better grades than most of the other students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	It is important for me to do well compared to other students this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I want to do better than other students this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Performance Avoidance							
*4.	The reason I study for my classes this semester is so the teacher doesn't think that I know less than others in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*5.	One of my main goals in my classes this semester is to avoid looking like I'm stupid or that I do worse than others in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*6.	I worry about doing worse than the other students in my classes this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mastery Avoidance							
7.	I am afraid that I may not understand the content of my courses as thoroughly as I'd like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I worry that I may not learn all that I possibly could this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I am definitely concerned that I may not learn all that I can this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mastery Approach							
10.	Completely mastering the material in my courses is important to me this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I want to learn as much as possible this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	The most important thing for me this semester is to understand the content in my courses as thoroughly as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

*Adapted from Bong (2001).

NSSE Engagement Factors (2011 NSSE Survey)

1.	In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?	Very often	Often	Some-times	Never
a.	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions				
b.	Made a class presentation				
f.	Come to class without completing readings or assignments				
g.	Worked with other students on projects during class				
h.	Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments				
j.	Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)				
k.	Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course				
l.	Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment				
n.	Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor				
o.	Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor				
p.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class				
q.	Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance				
r.	Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations				

1.	In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?	Very often	Often	Some-times	Never
s.	Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)				
t.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)				

2.	During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?	Very much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
b.	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components				
c.	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships				
d.	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions				
e.	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations				

3.	During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?	None	1-4	5-10	11-20	More than 20
a.	Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings					
c.	Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more					
d.	Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages					
e.	Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages					

4.	In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete?	None	1-2	3-4	5-6	More than 6
a.	Number of problem sets that take you more than an hour to complete					
b.	Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete					

7.	Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?	Do	Plan to do	Do not plan to do	Have not decided
a.	Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment				
b.	Community service or volunteer work				
c.	Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together				
d.	Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements				
e.	Foreign language coursework				
f.	Study abroad				
g.	Independent study or self-designed major				
h.	Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)				

8.	Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution.								
a.	Relationships with other students	Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of alienation							Friendly, Supportive, Sense of belonging
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
b.	Relationships with faculty members	Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic							Available, Helpful, Sympathetic
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
c.	Relationships with administrative personnel and offices	Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid							Helpful, Considerate, Flexible
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

9.	About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?	Times per week							
		0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30
a.	Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)								
d.	Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)								

10,	To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?	Very much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
a.	Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work				
b.	Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically				
d.	Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)				
e.	Providing the support you need to thrive socially				

Factor Key:

Level of Academic Challenge:

1r, f; 2b, c, d, e; 3a, c, d, e; 4a, b; 9a; 10a

Active and Collaborative Learning

1a, b, g, h, j, k, t

Student-Faculty Interaction

1n, o, p, q, s; 7d

Enriching Educational Experience

1l; 7a, b, c, e, f, g, h; 9d

Supportive Campus Environment

8a, b, c; 10b, d, e

Items 1 - 4 and 7 - 10 used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-11 The Trustees of Indiana University

Demographics

Age:

Gender:

Male

Female

Transgender

Prefer not to say

Ethnicity:

Caucasian

African American

Hispanic

Indian

Middle Eastern

Native American

Asian

Mixed

Other

Are you a first year student at the University of Windsor - that is, did you begin taking classes here in the Fall of 2010 or Winter of 2011?

Yes

No

Have you taken university courses prior to attending the University of Windsor?

Yes (When? e.g. 2009-2010):

No

What is your major area of study?

What is your cumulative GPA?

Are you a:

Canadian student

American student

International student

What is your current year of study?

1

2

3


4+

In what country...
were you born?
was your mother born?
was your father born?

What is the approximate yearly income for your family household?

APPENDIX B

NSSE Contract




The College Student Report Item Usage Agreement

The National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE) survey instrument, *The College Student Report*, is copyrighted and the copyright is owned by The Trustees of Indiana University. Any use of survey items contained within *The College Student Report* is prohibited without prior written permission from Indiana University. When fully executed, this Agreement constitutes written permission from the University, on behalf of NSSE, for the party named below to use an item or items from *The College Student Report* in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

In consideration of the mutual promises below, the parties hereby agree as follows:

- 1) The University hereby grants **Jeff Reinhardt** ("Licensee") a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable license to use, reproduce, distribute, publicly display and perform, and create derivatives from, in all media now known or hereafter developed, the item(s) listed in the proposal attached as Exhibit A, solely for the purpose of including such item(s) in the survey activity described in Exhibit A, which is incorporated by reference into this Agreement. This license does not include any right to sublicense others. This license only covers the survey instrument, time frame, population, and other terms described in Exhibit A. Any different or repeated use of the item(s) shall require an additional license.
- 2) In exchange for the license granted in section 1, Licensee agrees:
 - a) there will be no licensing fee to use NSSE items for the purposes described in Exhibit A;
 - b) to provide to NSSE frequency distributions and means on the licensed item(s);
 - c) on the survey form itself, and in all publications or presentations of data obtained through the licensed item(s), to include the following citation: "Items xx and xx used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-11 The Trustees of Indiana University";
 - d) to provide to NSSE a copy of any derivatives of, or alterations to, the item(s) that Licensee makes for the purpose of Licensee's survey ("modified items"), for NSSE's own nonprofit, educational purposes, which shall include the use of the modified items in *The College Student Report* or any other survey instruments, reports, or other educational or professional materials that NSSE may develop or use in the future. Licensee hereby grants the University a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable, royalty-free license to use, reproduce, distribute, create derivatives from, and publicly display and perform the modified items, in any media now known or hereafter developed; and
 - e) to provide to NSSE, for its own nonprofit, educational purposes, a copy of all reports, presentations, analyses, or other materials in which the item(s) licensed under this

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
1900 East Tenth Street • Eigenmann Hall, Suite 419 • Bloomington, IN 47406
Phone: (812) 856-5824 • Fax: (812) 856-5150 • E-mail: nsse@indiana.edu • Web Address: www.nsse.iub.edu



Agreement, or modified items, and any responses to licensed or modified items, are presented, discussed, or analyzed. NSSE shall not make public any data it obtains under this subsection in a manner that identifies specific institutions or individuals, except with the consent of the Licensee.

3) This Agreement expires on April 30, 2012.

The undersigned hereby consent to the terms of this Agreement and confirm that they have all necessary authority to enter into this Agreement.

For The Trustees of Indiana University:

Alexander C. McCormick
Director
National Survey of Student Engagement

Date

For Licensee:

Jeff Reinhardt
M. A. Candidate
University of Windsor

Date

Dr. Dennis Jackson
Associate Professor
University of Windsor

Date

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
1900 East Tenth Street • Eigenmann Hall, Suite 419 • Bloomington, IN 47406
Phone: (812) 856-5824 • Fax: (812) 856-5150 • E-mail: nsse@indiana.edu • Web Address: www.nsse.iub.edu

VITA AUCTORIS

Jeffrey Reinhardt was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia in 1983. He graduated from J. L. Ilsley High School in 2002 and obtained a B.Sc. (Hons.) in Psychology from Saint Mary's University in 2007.