

“I Can’t Believe She Gave Me a C!”: Measuring Entitlement in Higher Education

Jason P. Kopp, Tracy E. Zinn, Sara J. Finney, & Daniel P. Jurich

James Madison University

Correspondence regarding this manuscript should be addressed to: Jason P. Kopp, Center for Assessment and Research Studies, MSC 6806, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22807. E-mail: koppjp@dukes.jmu.edu.

“I Can’t Believe She Gave Me a C!”: Measuring Entitlement in Higher Education

Theoretical Framework

“But I came to class nearly every day! I deserve at least a B.”

“I know I didn’t meet the deadline, but I deserve an extension because of my unique circumstance.”

Anecdotal evidence suggests that comments like these from college students are becoming more common. Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice (1994) stated, “Even the most talented students often seem to think that the route to success is less a matter of hard work, good study habits, and meeting deadlines than of doing extra-credit projects, being creative, and circumventing authoritarian rules with clever excuses and well-phrased requests for special treatment” (p. 5). These types of behaviors are often labeled as instances of “entitlement”. Although entitlement has traditionally been conceptualized as an aspect of narcissism (Emmons, 1987), researchers have increasingly examined entitlement as an independent construct. Additionally, there has been a growing interest in academic entitlement (AE), or entitlement specific to academic settings (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008; Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008). Despite this increased interest, only three measures of AE exist, each with questionable psychometric properties (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Greenberger et al, 2008). Given this, our goal was to create a measure of AE and gather validity evidence for the newly-created measure. To complete this task, it was necessary to thoroughly review the research literature on entitlement.

What is entitlement?

Entitlement that is not context-specific (hereafter referred to as “generalized entitlement”) refers to “unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance

with his or her expectations” (DSM-IV-TR 2000 Fourth Edition). Generalized entitlement is not simply the prediction that one will obtain a certain outcome, but that one ought to obtain a certain outcome (Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004). Generalized entitlement is a component of narcissism, and thus is included as a subscale on the Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Narcissistic individuals are “characterized by a highly-positive or inflated self-concept” (Campbell, W. K., Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002, p. 359). This high self-regard then translates into the narcissistic individual feeling entitled to certain privileges and rewards, due to their superiority over others. The narcissistic individual feels “better” than others, so they are entitled to “better” things in life.

The concept of entitlement has been gaining increasing attention in the popular media. A Lexis/Nexis™ (2010) search of the term “sense of entitlement” found over 900 newspaper articles and over 30 magazine articles published in two years (January 2008 through January 2010). Many researchers have argued that narcissism and generalized entitlement are increasing (Twenge, 2007; Twenge & Campbell, W. K., 2009; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, 2008), although there has been some degree of argument against that hypothesis (e.g., Donnellan, Trzesniewski, & Robins 2009; Trzesniewski & Donnellan, 2010). Nonetheless, there is a widespread perception that entitlement is increasing, particularly among the younger generations (Berman, 2007; Irvine, 2005).

What could be the effects of an overall increase in generalized entitlement? Studies investigating the outcomes of a heightened sense of entitlement have found a host of maladaptive characteristics. When a person feels that he or she is entitled to a certain outcome and does not receive it, the response is often one of anger, rather than one of disappointment (Major, 1994). As such, entitlement has been found to correlate positively with hostility, dominance, difficulty

with relationships, aggression, intention to harm, greed, and taking items that belong to others (Campbell, W. K., et al, 2004; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Individuals high on entitlement are also less likely to forgive and more likely to hold grudges (Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, 2004). In sum, research suggests that generalized entitlement is associated with a host of negative traits and behaviors. If entitlement is undergoing a widespread increase, then these negative behaviors could also be increasing.

Academic Entitlement

AE is the expectation that one should receive certain positive academic outcomes (e.g., high grades) in academic settings, often independent of performance. Many view AE as a significant problem in higher education (Dubovsky, 1986; Twenge, 2009). The increase in AE in higher education seems to be related to students experiencing greater rewards for equivalent performance in K-12 education. For example, student test scores on K-12 international assessment instruments have remained relatively constant over time, but grades have increased tremendously. This suggests that students are receiving higher grades for equivalent performance (Twenge & Campbell, W. K., 2008). These students then arrive at college with a history of receiving good grades for minimal effort, which is a recipe for AE at the post-secondary level. This “unbalanced sense of reciprocity” is often reflected in different standards between professors and students for what work should earn an “A” (Zinn et al., in press). For example, academically entitled students might feel that three hours of work on a paper should result in an “A”, whereas their professors might view that effort as minimal or irrelevant, grading the paper instead on accuracy and completeness. This fundamental difference in opinion can lead to increased conflict between professors and students.

W. K. Campbell and colleagues (2004) suggested that entitlement is a personality variable that is stable across time and situations. However, we and others feel that entitlement beliefs may differ across specific contexts, hence the need for context-specific measures of entitlement such as AE. “Students who behave in an entitled fashion in their academic coursework may not display this behavior with their peers, family, or health professionals, and they may not internalize more general entitlement statements as applying to them” (Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009, p. 983). Generalized entitlement stems from research on narcissism, and the two primary measures of generalized entitlement, the PES (Campbell, W. K., et al., 2004) and NPI Entitlement subscale (Raskin & Terry, 1988), are both strongly rooted in research on narcissism. As such, a generally entitled person may feel entitled to various outcomes due to their feelings of superiority over others. By contrast, AE involves a feeling of entitlement related to students’ roles as customers. An entitled student feels that they deserve certain outcomes simply because they (or their parents) pay tuition, not because of any superiority that they feel they possess. Although a topic of much debate, many universities and colleges are marketing to students like any other business markets to prospective customers (Wright, 2008). Some in higher education believe this customer-like approach to recruit students carries over into students’ academics and interactions with professors. Although the students are, in a sense, paying money for a service, students may differ in their perceptions of what is being purchased. One student might believe he/she is buying the opportunity to interact with professors, whereas another might believe he/she is buying a grade or diploma. The former would likely not be viewed as an entitled student, whereas the latter would be. Thus, the academic environment has specific characteristics that may result in individuals reporting different levels of AE vs. generalized entitlement.

Measures of AE

Given the conceptual differences between generalized and academic entitlement, some researchers have attempted to create measures of AE (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). Although helpful in understanding the construct of AE, the measures are lacking with respect to some aspects of construct validity, as is reviewed below using Benson's (1998) strong program of construct validity as a framework.

Benson (1998) detailed a process for conducting a strong program of construct validity involving three stages: a *substantive* stage, a *structural* stage, and an *external* stage. The *substantive* stage involves clearly defining the construct to be measured, both theoretically and empirically. The theoretical domain includes specifying the breadth of the construct, the various dimensions of the construct, and relationships the construct has with other constructs and behaviors. The empirical domain is more specific; it specifies what observed variables will be used to represent the construct. In the *structural* stage, researchers examine how the observed variables relate to one another, typically using factor analysis and reliability estimates. Finally, the *external* stage consists of examining relationships between the construct of interest and other constructs, to assess if these relationships align with theoretical expectations established in the *substantive* stage. That is, expectations regarding how the measure of interest relates to other measures should be strongly grounded in theory and prior research, and then tested empirically. Outlined below are the characteristics of three measures of AE, along with an evaluation of how these characteristics align with Benson's (1998) construct validity process.

Achacoso (2002) Academic Entitlement Scale (AES)

The 12 items of the *Academic Entitlement Scale (AES)* developed by Achacoso (2002) were best represented empirically by two factors of AE: Entitlement Beliefs (e.g., Instructors

should bend the rules for me) and Entitlement Actions (e.g., If I felt I deserved a higher grade, I would tell the instructor). Achacoso (2002) defined entitlement as the feeling that one *ought* to receive something, or an assumption that a certain positive outcome should occur. AE was then defined as a sense of entitlement specific to education. A pool of 50 items was written based on interviews with instructors, asking them to give examples of entitled student behaviors. An additional 25 items were added based on focus-groups with students. Although Achacoso (2002) presented an exhaustive review of the research on entitlement, the link between this research and scale development was ambiguous. For example, it is unclear if a particular factor structure was expected given previous research (i.e., one factor versus multiple factor model). Moreover, little information was presented regarding whether the items were written to cover the breadth of AE, or just particular dimensions or aspects of AE. Benson (1998) emphasized that “the empirical domain is a reflection of the theoretical domain” (Benson, 1998, p. 12). That is, items should map directly onto dimensions of the construct outlined in the *substantive* stage. Despite a thorough review of the literature, the usage of this review to inform the creation of items is vague, making the *substantive* stage inadequately addressed.

There were also several methodological concerns regarding the *structural* stage of the validity process. Results from both an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and multiple confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were used to remove items to create a 12-item, two-factor scale. However, Achacoso (2002) continually modified the scale through the multiple CFA analyses in order to maximize fit, and never assessed the final structure using an independent sample. Thus, it is possible that the final two-factor solution simply fits the idiosyncrasies of that sample. These issues constitute a significant challenge to the structural validity of the scale. Furthermore, the model-data fit interpretations by Achacoso (2002) were questionable (e.g.,

questionable interpretation of global fit indices and no assessment of local misfit). Thus, Achacoso (2002) failed to adequately assess the fit of the two-dimensional model.

Achacoso (2002) attempted to address the *external* stage of the validity process, but there were issues with this stage as well. In order to provide evidence that the construct is being represented by the scale, Benson (1998) recommends that hypothesized directional relationships be determined before analyses are conducted. The AES (Achacoso, 2002) was related to a number of variables, including self-regulation and causal attributions, but a priori directional hypotheses were not made for the majority of these variables. Further, the pattern of relationships between AE and self-regulation fail to make sense. Students who scored high on the Entitlement Actions subscale were more likely to engage in various self-regulation strategies. Entitlement is theoretically related to external locus of control and work avoidance, so this pattern of relationships is not consistent with theory. The entitled student should be *less* likely to self-regulate, not more likely. Little attempt was given at explaining these relationships. The issues outlined above render the quality of the AES questionable at best.

Greenberger et al. (2008) Academic Entitlement (AE) Scale

Greenberger and colleagues (2008) developed a 15-item Academic Entitlement (AE) Scale to assess entitlement in higher education. They endorsed the Campbell et al. (2004) definition of entitlement: “a pervasive sense that one deserves more and is entitled to more than others” (p. 31). According to Greenberger and colleagues (2008), AE is entitlement specific to educational settings. Very little information regarding scale development was provided, so it is difficult to assess the attention paid to the substantive stage of the validity process. The measure possesses adequate reliability ($\alpha = .87$), but the structure of the scale has not been investigated, thus the computation of this reliability index is premature. In an attempt to gather external

validity evidence, Greenberger and colleagues (2008) correlated the AE scale with multiple measures, and found it to be positively correlated with other measures of entitlement and the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988), and negatively correlated with self-esteem, work orientation, and social commitment. However, no a priori hypotheses were stated for these associations. Given the lack of evidence supporting the three stages of the validity process, inferences made from the AE scale may be suspect.

Chowning & N. J. Campbell (2009) Academic Entitlement (AE) Scale

Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) conducted a series of studies focused on creating and investigating a new measure of AE, the *Academic Entitlement (AE) Scale*. Like the Achacoso (2002) scale, Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) reviewed the research literature on entitlement. However, they made no mention of the prior two scales (Achacoso, 2002; Greenberger et al., 2008). AE was defined as “the tendency to possess an expectation of academic success without taking personal responsibility for that success” (Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009, p. 982). Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) based this definition of AE on the concept of collegiate incivility in academic settings. Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) believed collegiate incivility (e.g., talking on a cell phone during class) was an outcome of AE. Given this theoretical framework, Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) wrote items to represent two aspects of AE: Externalized Responsibility (ER) and Entitled Expectations (EE). We feel as if the breadth of the AE construct was inadequately represented and the theoretical dimensions not linked with the empirical domain. In addition, some items appeared to represent constructs related to, but distinct from, AE. For example, “I am not motivated to put a lot of effort into group work, because another group member will end up doing it” appears to represent the construct of work avoidance (Archer, 1994; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen, 1985). Further,

“Most professors do not really know what they are talking about” appears to represent perceived quality of instruction. Moreover, several items refer to contexts (e.g., group work) that some students may not have experienced and limiting their utility. These are substantive issues that should be addressed before this scale is put into use.

There were also some issues with the *AE* scale regarding the *structural* stage. An initial pool of 31 items was analyzed using a principal components analysis (PCA) with quartimax rotation. EFA would have been more appropriate than PCA, given that AE is conceptualized as a latent construct (Benson & Nasser, 1998). That is, PCA fails to address measurement error, which produces biased results (Snook & Gorsuch, 1989). There are also issues with using orthogonal rotation, which forces the uncovered components to be uncorrelated, which may not reflect reality (see Preacher & MacCallum, 2003, for an overview of the problems associated with using PCA with orthogonal rotation). The researchers utilized the PCA results to produce a 15-item scale with items associated with two components: an ER factor (e.g., “For group assignments, it is acceptable to take a back seat and let others do most of the work if I am busy.”) and an EE factor (e.g., “My professors are obligated to help me prepare for exams.”) The ER factor focused on placing the responsibility for education on others, rather than with the entitled student himself. The EE factor focused on the classroom and grading policies, with the entitled student expecting special allowances to be made for them. We believe this EE component is too broad and poorly defined. In a sense, externalized responsibility *also* involves entitled expectations – the expectation that others will take responsibility for the entitled student’s education. That is, EE subsumes ER. In addition, there may be further specific entitled expectations that were not represented in the Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) conceptualization. As this EE factor was only represented by five items, the PCA would not

separate these items into separate factors or components, as there would be insufficient indicators for each factor. Since different entitled expectations were not discussed by Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009), we have no way of knowing whether these items cover all relevant entitled expectations. Further delineating what these specific expectations are is crucially important to understanding and measuring AE.

The Cronbach's coefficient alpha value for the two subscales ranged from .71 to .83 for ER and from .62 to .69 for EE. The somewhat low reliability for the EE subscale is concerning, especially given its stability across the various studies conducted by Chowning and N. J. Campbell. This may be due to the heterogenous nature of the EE factor, as discussed above. CFA was conducted using a separate sample to test the two-factor model of ER and EE. Interestingly, Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) noted the two-factor model fit. Given the lack of examination of localized model-data fit, the use of insensitive fit indices (e.g., GFI), and the less than adequate value of the CFI (.897), the adequacy of model-data fit is in question. These structural issues should be addressed before the AE scale is utilized in practice.

Despite the issues relevant to the structural stage of the validity process, the researchers undertook the *external* stage of the validity process. As predicted, ER was negatively related to conscientiousness and agreeableness, and positively related to state-trait grandiosity. ER was also found to be correlated with, but distinct from, the entitlement subscale of the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988). While these relationships provide validity evidence for the ER subscale, the EE subscale was only weakly or not related to the majority of the external variables. This may be due to the low reliability attenuating the relationships between the variables. Moreover, hypotheses for the EE subscale were never stated. Both subscales were related to the likelihood and appropriateness of student behavior, relating the scale back to its basis in *collegiate*

incivility. Although Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) provided some external validity evidence for the ER subscale, the low reliability of the EE subscale and lack of clearly stated hypotheses prevented external validity evidence from being properly assessed. The external stage should be re-examined after the structure and hence the scoring of the items is better understood. Overall, the scale is promising, but more work is needed before it is used in practice.

Purpose

Given the issues with the few existing measures of AE, our goal was to develop a measure of AE that conforms to a strong program of construct validity. In order to address the three stages of the validity process outlined by Benson (1998), we pose several research questions:

- 1) *Substantive*: Can a measure that represents AE be created that is strongly guided by theory? What aspects of AE are salient and ubiquitous enough to warrant items on the measure?
- 2) *Structural*: Do the newly created AE items relate to one another as expected? Is AE a multi-dimensional construct or unidimensional? Is the reliability of the scores adequate?
- 3) *External*: Do scores from the AEQ relate to scores from measures of other constructs in theoretically predictable ways?

By addressing all three aspects of Benson's (1998) framework for construct validity, our goal is to create a measure of AE that is well-grounded in theory.

The Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (AEQ)

As part of the *substantive* stage of the validity process, Benson (1998) recommends that any measure be written with a strong theoretical basis. That is, prior research should be

exhaustively reviewed, and items should be written to directly address the different aspects of the construct. In general, the authors of the other three measures of AE sufficiently reviewed the literature on entitlement, but failed to write items that addressed all aspects of the AE construct. The first published work pertaining to entitlement in education focused on entitlement in medical education (Dubovsky, 1986). Based on observations and anecdotal experiences with medical students, Dubovsky explained that entitlement in education has five characteristics. First, entitled students view knowledge as “a right that should be delivered with a minimum of exertion and discomfort on the part of the ‘consumer’ (p. 1672)”. Second, the entitled student feels that others will provide all of the information that is necessary. In other words, the entitled student relies heavily on external guidance from professors. Third, the entitled student feels that inadequacies associated with learning are due to problems with the teacher or system, rather than the student’s own shortcomings. Fourth, the entitled student feels that everyone should receive equal recognition or reward, regardless of effort or ability. Finally, the entitled student is comfortable with aggressive or confrontational interactions with professors or administrators in the event of conflict.

Several of the Dubovsky (1986) facets (the first, second, and third) are related to external locus of control. These three components are crucially important in describing entitled individuals in higher education. Entitled students feel that “education should be delivered with a minimum of exertion and discomfort” (Dubovsky, 1986, p. 1672). In order to service that expectation, entitled students also expect professors to “provide all of the education that will be necessary” (Dubovsky, 1986, p. 1672). Since the entitled student expects a large amount of external guidance, the student places the responsibility for failure on the professor or the education system. An entitled student would be more likely to make statements such as, “The

teacher gave me an F”, rather than “I failed the class.” These three aspects of entitlement align with ER described by Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009). As a result, these three aspects were included in our conceptualization of the construct.

The relationship between effort and entitlement, as discussed in the fourth aspect of the Dubovsky (1986) framework, is somewhat confusing. On one hand, students expect equal recognition regardless of individual effort (Dubovsky, 1986). However, entitled students also believe that they should be rewarded for effort, rather than outcomes (Zinn et al., in press). We believe entitled students are, at their core, work avoidant and generally feel that they should be rewarded independent of effort *or* performance. If entitled students put forth very little effort on their assignments, but reach desired performance criteria, they believe that they deserve good grades despite their low effort. However, if entitled students put forth a larger amount of effort for their assignments, but fail to perform adequately, they feel they should be graded on effort. This contradiction is exacerbated by the large discrepancy between students and faculty on what constitutes “sufficient effort” (Adams, 2005; Zinn et al., in press). Similarly, entitled students feel all students should receive equal rewards (Dubovsky, 1986), but also feel they should be acknowledged as special (Campbell, W. K., et al., 2004). These double standards perfectly conform to our conceptualization of entitled students; they expect positive outcomes regardless of effort *or* performance. Hence, we differ with Dubovsky (1986) in that we do not believe an expectation of equal rewards is a core component of AE. Instead, it is a means to the end of unconditional rewards when entitled students do not put forth sufficient effort or performance.

Similarly, we do not feel as if confrontations with authority, described by Dubovsky (1986), is a core component of entitlement. Achacoso (2002) differentiated between entitled belief and actions. Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) also discussed collegiate incivility as an

outcome stemming from entitlement, not a core component of entitlement itself. We agree with this conceptualization. Whether the entitled student actually confronts a professor is an outcome of several variables. An entitled student may feel as if the professor is not grading the way they should, but may not be assertive or aggressive enough to confront the professor. There is also evidence that people are poor judges of their past behavior (Perone, 1988; Guerin & Foster, 1994), so responses on a self-report measure for entitled actions may be of questionable validity. In short, we do not include confrontation as an aspect of AE.

However, the entitled student may *feel* as if they should have control over classroom policies, even if they do not directly confront a professor in order to assert that control. Achacoso (2002) described a situation where an entitled student attempted to change class grading policies: “a student might tell [the professor] that he or she had worked so hard on an assignment and would request [the professor] change the grade based on his or her reported effort” (p. 2). An entitled student may also request that the workload for a class be shifted to allow for vacations. This desire for control is consistent with the entitled students’ views of themselves as “customers”. In the entitled student’s perceived role as “customer,” the entitled student views the role of their professors similar to that of food vendors. A food vendor customer is able to tell the vendor exactly what they want, but it is up to the vendor to prepare the food and deliver a satisfactory product. Similarly, entitled students feel they have the right to tell the professor exactly what they want, but it is up to the professor to deliver the knowledge appropriately. We believe that this desire for control is key to understanding AE.

Another aspect of AE, not mentioned in the original conceptualization of AE by Dubovsky (1986), is the idea that students feel entitled to certain outcomes because they are paying tuition. For several years now, the academy has been concerned about the increasingly

common identification of students as customers (Hersh & Merrow, 2005). Students feel as if they are paying for a service, so positive outcomes should be expected from professors and administrators, even if the student has not put forth sufficient performance. Others have commented that this trend has been perpetuated by college administrations mimicking corporate entities, and seeking to be as user-friendly as possible to the students. This could be eroding the traditional student-teacher expectations within academia (Shelley, 2005). This feeling of deservedness *because the student paid tuition* can be viewed as a distinct aspect of AE.

When examining the original conceptualization of entitlement in education, as well as the contemporary literature on AE, there appears to be five key facets of AE. Thus, for the current study, we wrote items to represent these facets:

- 1) *KR*: “[K]nowledge is a right that should be delivered with a minimum of exertion and discomfort on the part of the ‘consumer’” (Dubovsky, 1986, p. 1672; see also Campbell, W. K., et al., 2004; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009).
- 2) *OP*: “[O]thers will provide all of the education that will be necessary” (Dubovsky, 1986, p. 1672; see also Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009).
- 3) *PL*: “[P]roblems in learning are due to the inadequacies of the teacher, the course, or the system, rather than to the student’s own shortcomings” (Dubovsky, 1986, p. 1673; see also Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009).
- 4) *SC*: Students should have control over class policies (Achacoso, 2002).
- 5) *DT*: Certain outcomes are deserved because the student pays tuition (Hersh & Merrow, 2005; Shelley, 2005).

These facets seem to be consistent features of entitlement when reviewing research in the academic domain (Achocoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Dubovsky, 1986), and

thus we believe these facets cover the breadth of the construct. Achocoso (2002) touched upon these topics in describing the AE construct, but failed to represent them in the actual scale. Similarly, Chowning and N. J. Campbell (2009) broadly represented the first three facets from our understanding of their ER subscale. However, we feel that specifying the three components of this broader facet better addresses the breadth of the manifestations of ER. As discussed below, items were written to map onto these facets of AE (empirical domain) and their properties were empirically studied (structural and external stages of validity process).

Method

Item Writing and Factor Analysis

Utilizing the body of research described above, we mapped 42 items onto the five hypothesized facets of AE. This 42-item pool included 8 items from a 14-item scale developed by N. J. Campbell and Budzek (2006), as well as 34 new items. We then evaluated this initial 42-item pool for face validity, deciding to remove a total of 16 items. Eleven items were removed because the researchers believed they measured constructs other than AE, such as work avoidance or aggression. One item was removed because it referenced a specific policy at a particular university, limiting the eventual utility of the *AEQ* at other universities. Four items were removed because they represented uncivil behaviors, which we believe are outcomes of AE, not an aspect of the construct itself.

After this initial evaluation, the remaining 26 items were evaluated empirically (see Appendix). We tested a total of three confirmatory factor models. We tested a one-factor model of AE to assess the unidimensionality of the various facets of entitlement. Given the structure supported by Achacoso (2002), this may make sense. That is, we did not include any “entitled actions,” items, and Achacoso (2002) modeled entitled beliefs as a single factor. However, we

expected misfit associated with the one-factor model because, as we mentioned above, we conceptualized academic entitlement as being composed of five facets. Thus, we expected the items representing each facet to be more highly correlated with each other than with items representing other facets, resulting in misfit of the unidimensional model. As such, we also tested a five-factor model, with items representing the five facets described above. As this was the first factor analysis of this item pool, we expected some misfit due to redundant wording and poorly functioning items. Regardless, we were particularly interested in the relationships between the five facets of AE. If the facets were moderately correlated, then AE may be best represented as multidimensional and a profile of five subscale scores would be reported. However, if the five facets were highly correlated, then AE may be essentially unidimensional. In order to thoroughly assess dimensionality, a bifactor model, which models a general AE factor in addition to five facet factors, was also estimated (Reise, Morizot, & Hays, 2007; Reise, Moore, & Haviland, in press).

In a bifactor model (Chen, West, & Sousa, 2006) each item is allowed to relate to a general factor, as well as a facet factor. The general factor and the facet factors are orthogonal. This allows the common variance across all items to be modeled (general factor), as well as systematic residual variance between items related to the same facet after controlling for the general factor (facet factors). For the AEQ data, each item was allowed to represent its corresponding facet factor from the five-factor solution, as well as a general AE factor. This allowed us to model both the variance shared across all items, as well as systematic residual variance shared between items written to represent a particular facet. Results from the bifactor model are then used to inform the scoring of the measure.

Participants and Procedure

Responses to the AEQ were gathered from 2,152 students participating in a university-wide assessment session at a mid-sized, southeastern university. All incoming freshmen were required to participate in a large-scale assessment session the weekend before classes began. The students were given a battery of both knowledge and developmental measures, including the *AEQ*.

Participants with missing responses on any of the *AEQ* items were removed, resulting in a sample of 2,097. Six outliers were identified using Mahalanobis distance. These individuals seemed to respond in ways indicative of response sets (5,5,5,5..., or 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,6,5,4...), justifying their removal. Thus, the final sample was 2,091, consisting of 1343 women and 746 men, with an average age of 18.4 years ($SD = .423$). The sample included 5 American Indian students, 100 Asian students, 73 Black students, 70 Hispanic students, 11 Pacific Islander students, 1689 Caucasian students, and 141 students who did not specify their ethnic background.

As this was the first empirical evaluation of the *AEQ* items, we anticipated modifications to the scale. Modifying a scale and/or altering the model using a single sample has the risk of fitting the idiosyncrasies of the sample (MacCallum, Roznowski, & Necowitz, 1992). To address this issue, the sample was randomly split into two approximately equal-sized subsamples (Sample A, $N = 1046$; Sample B, $N = 1045$). Sample A was used to initially examine the factor structure and item functioning and subsequently make modifications, whereas Sample B was used to assess the stability of item functioning and test any new models uncovered using the Sample A.

Of the original sample of 2091, a subset of 1560 were administered five measures used to gather external validity evidence: the Psychological Entitlement Scale (Campbell, W. K., et al.,

2004), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989), the Levenson's Locus of Control Scale (Levenson, 1973), the Achievement Goal Questionnaire (Finney et al., 2004), and the Student Opinion Scale (Thelk, Sundre, Horst, & Finney, 2009).

External Measures

Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES). The *Psychological Entitlement Scale* (PES; Campbell, W. K., et al., 2004) is a nine-item measure of general entitlement. Participants were asked to respond to the items using a scale of 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 7 ("Strongly Agree"). There is evidence that the scale is unidimensional (Campbell, W. K., et al., 2004), with one item reverse-coded. Thus, after reverse-coding, the items were summed to form a total score, with a higher score representing higher levels of generalized entitlement. An example item from the scale is "I honestly feel I'm just more deserving than others." For the current sample, Cronbach's alpha for the PES was .87. Given the PES is a measure of general entitlement, whereas the AEQ is a measure of AE, we would expect a moderate positive correlation between the two measures. However, a very strong correlation ($r > .80$) would indicate that the two measures are not distinct. As mentioned previously, there are crucial differences between academic and generalized entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009), so we expected a moderate correlation between the two measures.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE). The *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* (RSE; Rosenberg, 1989) is a 10-item, unidimensional scale designed to assess level of positive self-regard. Participants are asked to respond to items using a scale from 1 ("Strongly Agree") to 4 ("Strongly Disagree"). The scale is scored as a total score, after five items are reverse-coded. The Cronbach's alpha using the current sample was .88. Self-esteem is defined generally as the level of positive feeling towards one's self (Rosenberg, 1989). Similarly, the definition of narcissism

includes “a pervasive pattern of grandiosity” (DSM-IV-TR 2000 Fourth Edition), or a sense of superiority, so we would expect narcissism and self-esteem to be positively related. W. K. Campbell and colleagues (2002) found that narcissism and self-esteem are empirically related, but distinct constructs. Although entitlement is a component of narcissism, researchers have found that entitlement is only weakly related to self-esteem (Campbell et al., 2004). A weak or nonexistent relationship between RSE scores and AEQ scores would provide evidence that the AEQ is measuring entitlement, as opposed to narcissism. Therefore, we believe that RSE scores will have a weak or nonexistent relationship with AEQ scores.

Levenson’s Locus of Control Scale (LOC). The *Levenson’s Locus of Control Scale* (LOC; Levenson, 1973) is a 24-item, multidimensional scale designed to assess different aspects of locus of control. Participants are asked to respond to various statements on a scale of 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 6 (“Strongly Agree”). The scale consists of three subscales which have been empirically supported in factor analytic studies: Chance, Powerful Others, and Internal, each consisting of eight items (Levenson, 1973; Presson, Clark, & Benassi, 1997). The Chance subscale involves attributing control of one’s circumstances to the forces of chance. The Powerful Others subscale involves attributing control of one’s circumstances to other, more powerful people. The Internal subscale involves attributing control of one’s circumstances to one’s own power. Cronbach’s alpha values for the Chance, Powerful Others, and Internal subscales for the current sample were .73, .76, and .54, respectively. According to theory, a key aspect of entitlement involves an external locus of control for failure, as well as relying on others for educational guidance (Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Dubovsky, 1986). Therefore, we expected the AEQ would be positively related to both the Chance and Powerful Others

subscales, which relate to external locus of control, and negatively related to the Internal subscale.

Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ). The *Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ;* Finney et al., 2004; Pieper, 2003) is a five-factor measure representing why students engage in achievement related tasks. The *AGQ* contains five subscales: *Mastery-Approach (MAP)*, *Mastery-Avoidance (MAV)*, *Performance-Approach (PAP)*, *Performance-Avoidance (PAV)*, and *Work Avoidance (WAV)*. Only the MAP and WAV subscales were used in this study. The MAP subscale represents the motive to master material in a course with the goal being to develop competence. The WAV subscale represents putting forth the least amount of effort possible to complete a task. The Cronbach's alpha values for the current sample for the MAP and WAV subscales of the measure were .74 and .77, respectively. Recall, a key aspect of entitlement is the expectation of rewards (e.g., high grades) without reciprocal effort. This focus on extrinsic rewards over self-developed competence should result in a negative correlation between the AEQ and the MAP subscale. In addition, the unwillingness of entitled individuals to reciprocate effort would suggest a positive relationship between the AEQ and WAV factors.

Student Opinion Scale (SOS). The *Student Opinion Scale (SOS;* Thelk et al., 2009) is a 10-item, multidimensional measure designed to assess motivation over a low-stakes assessment session. Participants are asked to respond to items using a scale of 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"). The measure consists of an effort subscale and an importance subscale, but only the effort subscale was used in the current study. The effort subscale consisted of five items measuring the degree to which the student put forth effort over the course of the assessment session. The Cronbach's alpha values for the effort subscale for the current sample was .83. Consistent with the unwillingness of entitled individuals to exert effort, we would expect entitled

students to be less likely to exert effort over the course of a low-stakes testing situation. As such, we expected the AEQ and Effort subscale factors would be negatively related.

Results

Data Screening

Prior to conducting the CFA, item response distributions were examined for floor or ceiling effects, which would suggest an item did not have utility for discriminating entitlement levels between participants. No floor or ceiling effects were found. Next, univariate and multivariate normality were examined for both samples. Absolute values greater than 2 for skewness and greater than 7 for kurtosis were considered indicative of non-normality (Finney & DiStefano, 2006; West, Finch, & Curran, 1995). Skewness ranged from -1.917 to 1.342 and kurtosis ranged from -0.977 to 5.488, indicating no univariate non-normality. Multivariate nonnormality was assessed using Mardia's normalized kurtosis coefficient. Mardia's coefficients for both samples suggested multivariate nonnormality (Sample A = 57.75; Sample B = 62.63). Given the nonnormality of the data, maximum likelihood estimation with the Satorra-Bentler adjustment to χ^2 values, fit indices, and standard errors (Satorra & Bentler, 1994) was employed.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

PRELIS 2.72 was used to produce the covariance matrix for the CFA, and LISREL 8.72 was used to conduct the CFA (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2005). To compare competing models, several different fit indices were examined. First, a chi-square difference ($\Delta\chi^2$) test was used to compare fit between models. This test assesses whether a more complex model (e.g., five-factor model), fits significantly better than a simpler model (e.g., one-factor model). If the test is not significant, the simpler model should be championed. In addition, we examined several global fit indices: the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), the robust root mean square error

of approximation (RMSEA), and the robust comparative fit index (CFI). In order to conclude adequate fit with nonnormal data, we used recommended cutoff values: SRMR value less than .07, RMSEA value less than .05, and CFI value greater than .95 (Yu & Muthén, 2002). In addition to global fit, we examined standardized residual covariances to assess local misfit.

Sample A

First, the hypothesized five-factor model was fit to Sample A (see Table 1). The model fit the data well globally, but there were several areas of local misfit. Specifically, there were large standardized covariance residuals associated with relationships between items representing *different* facets. Moreover, the five factors were highly correlated (see Table 2). The pattern of large covariance residuals and high factor correlations suggested a great deal of shared variance across items representing the different facets. Thus, a one-factor model may fit the data as well as a five-factor model. However, the one-factor model fit the data worse than the five-factor model (though global fit was still adequate), with large covariance residuals associated with items written to represent the *same* facet.

The high factor correlations present in the five-factor model, along with the pattern of misfit for both the five- and one-factor model, suggested that the five facets may represent “bloated specifics” (Reise, Waller, & Comrey, 2000) and a general factor of AE may represent the majority of the common variance across items. We tested this hypothesis using the bifactor model. A complete bifactor model (general AE factor and five orthogonal facet factors of entitlement) would not converge to an admissible solution. Specifically, the general entitlement factor accounted for the vast majority of the covariance between items representing the “knowledge is a right” (KR) facet factor, indicating a separate facet factor of KR didn’t exist. Thus, the full bifactor model was empirically underidentified due to over-factoring the data (i.e.,

the KR items did not share variance after controlling for general entitlement, as reflected by nonsignificant and extremely weak KR factor pattern coefficients and a negative error variance associated with one KR item). An incomplete bifactor model (see Chen et al., 2006), which simply did not model the KR factor, was then fit to the data. This incomplete bifactor model fit the data very well globally (see Table 1), and there were few large covariance residuals.

Next, we examined the pattern coefficients associated with both the general factor and the facet factors (see Table 3). Often, a unidimensional model will not fit a measure due to “bloated specifics,” or trivial factors that arise due to issues such as redundant wording (Reise et al., 2007). If the items primarily represent a general AE factor, the majority of the factor pattern coefficients for the general factor will be much larger than those for the facet factors. However, if the factor solution is truly multidimensional, we should find higher pattern coefficients for the facet factors than the general AE factor. If many of the items have equally high loadings on both the general and facet factors, then our data are truly represented by a bifactor model (i.e., the items are complex or multidimensional).

Overwhelmingly, pattern coefficients associated with the general factor were much higher than those associated with the facet factors. This suggests that the facet factors are simply “bloated specifics,” that represent minor residual covariances most likely due to item wording. This can cause a unidimensional model to have insufficient fit, even though the responses to the items are driven primarily by a single latent factor. As such, we revised the scale to align with a one-factor structure, while ensuring that the various facets were represented in the final item pool (Sijtsma, 2009).

Using the results from the bifactor model, items with low utility were removed. Specifically, items were only retained if they represented the general AE factor better than the

facet factor. Items were also removed if they were associated with a large residual covariance and inspection of the item pair revealed redundancy, in which case the item with the larger pattern coefficient for the general factor was retained. Additionally, we wanted to assure that the retained items covered the breadth of the AE construct. With this goal in mind, at least one item from each of the original five facets was retained. Using this method, eight items were selected to retain: 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 19. As expected, given these post-hoc modifications, the final eight-item, one-factor solution fit the data very well (see Table 1). R^2 values ranged from .21 to .54 (see Table 4). Reliability, as indexed using coefficient omega (McDonald, 1999), was .814, suggesting adequate reliability for the retained eight items.

Sample B

Sample B was used to examine the stability of results across samples. The global and local misfit of the 26 items to the five-, one-, and incomplete bifactor models found in Sample A generalized to Sample B. This provided further support for the eight-item AEQ. Importantly, Sample B served as the first *a priori* test of the eight-item, one-factor model. The unidimensional model fit the data very well (see Table 1). R^2 values ranged from .22 to .60 (see Table 4). In addition, there were no large covariance residuals between any of the eight items, suggesting that the entitlement factor accounts for most of the covariance between items. Omega was .84 for the eight items, suggesting stable and adequate reliability.

Relationships with External Variables

To investigate the relationship between the AE factor and external measures, it was necessary to adjust the external variables for unreliability. That is, the external variables were modeled as single-indicator latent variables, which were correlated with the AE factor. Thus, the

relationships between the *AEQ* factor and the external variables were modeled after controlling for measurement error (Brown, 2006).

The external variables were modeled as single-indicator factors through a multi-step process. First, the items for each external variable were summed to create composite scores. The percentage of the composite score variance that was attributable to measurement error was then calculated: $(1 - r_{xx}) * (Var_x)$, where r_{xx} is equal to the reliability of the external variable (Cronbach's alpha, in this case) and Var_x is the total variance of the external variable. The error variance of the composite indicator was then fixed to this value. Finally, the path to the composite from the factor was fixed to one. These single-indicator factors were then allowed to correlate with the *AEQ* factor, which was represented by the eight items.

The relationships between the *AEQ* and the external variables are presented in Table 5. Overall, the pattern of relationships confirms many of our hypotheses. The *AEQ* was positively correlated with *PES* scores, but the magnitude of the relationship indicates they are distinct. As predicted, the *AEQ* was related to *RSE* scores, but only weakly. This is consistent with the weak relationship between generalized entitlement and self-esteem found by W. K. Campbell and colleagues (2004). The *AEQ* related in generally predictable ways with the *LOC* subscales. There was a moderate positive correlation with both the *Chance* and *Powerful Others* subscales, but no significant relationship with the *Internal* subscale. This lack of relationship with the *Internal* subscale may be due to the low reliability of the *Internal* subscale. As expected, the *AEQ* was negatively related to the *MAP* subscale of the *AGQ*, and positively related to the *WAV* subscale. Finally, as predicted, the *AEQ* was negatively related to the effort subscale of the *SOS*, suggesting that entitled students put forth less effort over the course of the low-stakes testing session.

Conclusions and Critical Assessment

The purpose of this study was to develop a measure of AE that followed Benson's (1998) strong program of construct validity. This involved developing a measure that (a) aligned strongly with prior research and theory, (b) was internally consistent, (c) and related to other constructs in theoretically expected ways. After reviewing the AE literature in order to define the theoretical domain, we identified five key facets of AE. These facets overlapped with some of the facets of prior measures (e.g., Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008), but also departed from some of the conceptualizations. Specifically, our measure put more emphasis on the "students as customers" paradigm, and further defined elements relevant to external locus of control. This seemed necessary, given the emphasis on these elements in other AE research (Dubovsky, 1986; Hersh & Merrow, 2005; Shelley, 2005). As such, we felt that we firmly established the theoretical domain of AE.

We then mapped 26 items to the five facets we defined in the theoretical stage. To address structural validity, factor analyses were conducted to examine if the different facets would manifest as separate factors or as a general factor of AE. Using the bifactor model, we determined that the scale was essentially unidimensional, with some wording redundancy. Conceptual and statistical evaluation of the items led to the retention of eight items. Confirmatory factor analysis using an independent sample supported the unidimensional structure of the 8-item scale and the scores had high internal consistency. Our method for studying the structure of the items was firmly rooted in best measurement practice (Reise et al., 2000; Reise et al., in press). That is, possible structures for the AEQ were determined theoretically, and then evaluated empirically. This is in stark contrast to the procedures utilized when examining the other AE measures (e.g., Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J.,

2009), where the structures evaluated were not theoretically-based. By evaluating the structure of the AEQ in this way, and revising the scale accordingly, the core aspects of AE were preserved.

The pattern of relationships between the AEQ and external variables further justifies our process for revising the scale. The AEQ related to other constructs in theoretically expected ways. The AEQ was moderately correlated with the PES, suggesting the two measures are related yet distinct. Also, notice the stronger correlation between the AEQ and academic criteria (mastery approach, work avoidance, and test-taking effort) than the correlations between the PES and these criteria (see Table 5). Thus, if the PES was used to represent entitlement in an academic setting, the relationships between AE and these constructs would have been mistakenly interpreted as low, highlighting the need for a context-specific measure of AE. Overall, the pattern of relationships provides preliminary evidence that the AEQ adequately represents AE, and that AE is distinct from generalized entitlement.

Further, the pattern of relationships suggests that AE is an important developmental variable for college students. The pattern of correlations between the AEQ and other academic variables (see Table 5) suggests that AE could be relevant to college student success. AEQ scores were positively correlated with external locus of control, which prior research shows is negatively related to student success (Stupnisky et al., 2007). Additionally, AEQ scores were negatively related to mastery-approach goal orientation, which has been found to be positively associated with semester GPA (Finney et al., 2004). Finally, the AEQ was negatively correlated with test-taking effort, and positively associated with work-avoidance. This suggests that the entitled student is less willing to put forth effort, which could have dire consequences in an academic setting. This pattern of relationships indicates that AE may be a key variable to college student success and development, and further research should be done on this construct.

Future Research

This study provided initial validity evidence for a measure of AE. However, the validation process is never “complete” (Benson, 1998), and more research should be conducted to study the functioning of the AEQ. Not only do the conclusions supported by this study need to be confirmed using additional samples, but the current study illuminated the need for additional research on the AEQ corresponding to the three stages of Benson’s (1998) strong program of construct validity. Possible future studies relevant to each of the stages are outlined below, as well as some other future directions.

To further study the substantive validity of the AEQ, our conceptualization of AE should be critically evaluated by other researchers, to ensure that we properly covered the breadth of the construct. As stated earlier, there is some debate as to the important aspects of AE. Although we feel that the AEQ covers the breadth of AE, other researchers may have justification to include additional characteristics. As of right now, there is some evidence that all four measures of AE (e.g., the AEQ; Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008) are related to constructs relevant to academia and student development. However, no study has been conducted to determine which measure *best* predicts important academic outcomes. Thus, the AEQ should be directly compared to these other measures to assess its comparative utility to predict important academic variables. The “best” measure of AE could be a combination of items from multiple measures, and this should be evaluated empirically.

To address the structural validity of the AEQ, the structure of the AEQ needs to be assessed using additional samples. This is especially important given the current sample only included freshmen students and a large proportion of females. Measurement invariance studies need to be conducted using different student groups (year in school, gender, etc.). As

measurement invariance is established across different groups, the AEQ can be used for a greater number of purposes. For instance, measurement invariance across different years in school (e.g., freshman, sophomore, etc.) would allow researchers to examine AE longitudinally. In this study, the mean level of AE was 22.11 (on a scale ranging from 8 to 56) for incoming students at a mid-sized, somewhat selective university. The data are normally-distributed, meaning that approximately 68 % of students score within one standard deviation of the mean (between 15.36 and 28.86). As this is the first time utilizing the AEQ, it is difficult to assess whether this score should be considered high or low. However, most students are responding below the midpoint of the scale (at 32). Interestingly, other measures of academic entitlement (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, N. J., 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008) also found a relatively low level of entitlement with their samples, although it is difficult to directly compare the measures. It would be interesting to assess whether this level of entitlement increases or decreases over the course of a college career. Many proctors in the university-wide testing session report anecdotally that incoming students are relatively cooperative. By contrast, many proctors report that sophomores that are tested engage in higher levels of uncivil student behaviors, such as cell phone use and uncooperativeness. Student incivility may be caused by an increased level of AE (Chowning and Campbell, N. J., 2009). As students gain experience in the college environment, they may come to expect more accommodation from professors. Further research could assess changes in academic entitlement, and what variables are related to these changes.

Regarding the external piece of the validity process, future research should focus on developing the nomological net for AE. Most importantly, AEQ scores should be related to relevant behavioral variables, such as class attendance or instances of student incivility. For example, if behavioral-based groups are hypothesized to have different levels of AE (such as

students who violate university conduct policies vs. non-violators), a mean-level difference in AEQ scores would provide strong validity evidence for the scale. Moreover, it could then be used to predict these uncivil behaviors, prompting intervention when needed. Additional behavioral variables, such as study skills, should also be examined as they could help explain different academic outcome variables, such as grades and graduation rates.

Educational Implications

Looking forward, it may be constructive for institutions of higher education to consider efforts to reduce AE. Twenge and W. K. Campbell (2009) theorized that appreciation and volunteerism could both be used to lower entitlement. Emmons and McCullough (2003) found that having people think about what they were grateful for increased well-being, health, exercise, and empathy. Infusing gratitude into students could be an effective way to combat entitlement. Student affairs programs could be specifically developed to reduce AE. AEQ scores could then be used to assess the effectiveness of these student affairs program. For instance, at our university, both our Judicial Affairs office and Community Service Learning program are interested in lowering entitlement attitudes of students as a result of their programming. The AEQ is being used to assess whether this goal is being met. As such, we believe the AEQ has potential for widespread use in a number of higher education contexts.

References

- 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* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/2486>
- Adams, J. R. (2005). What makes the grade. *Teaching of psychology, 32*, 21-24.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed., text revision)*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Archer, J. (1994). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivational processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260-267.
- Baumeister, R.F., Heatherton, T.F., & Tice, D.M. (1994). *Losing control: How and why people fail at self-regulation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Benson, J. (1998). Developing a strong program of construct validation: A test anxiety example. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 17*, 10-17.
- Benson, J., & Nasser, F. (1998). On the use of factor analysis as a research tool. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 23*, 13-33.
- Berman, S. (2007, March 13). "The Narcissistic Millennials." *New York Sun*. Retrieved from <http://www.nysun.com/parenting/narcissistic-millennials/50311/>
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Campbell, N. J. & Budzek, K. J. (2006, January). *Sense of entitlement: Implications in the classroom of a consumer attitude toward education*. Poster presented at the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology Conference, St Petersburg, Florida.

- 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*, 29-45.
- Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 358-368.
- Chen, F. F., West, S. G., & Sousa, K. H. (2006). A comparison of bifactor and second-order models of quality of life. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 41*, 189-225.
- Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled 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. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 169*, 332-344.
- Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W. (2009). An emerging epidemic of narcissism or much ado about nothing? *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 498-501.
- Dubovsky, Steven L. (1986). Coping with entitlement in medical education. *New England Journal of Medicine. 315*, 1672-1674.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11-17.
- Emmons, R. A., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: An experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 377-389.
- Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2004). Too

- proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 894-912.
- Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2006). Non-normal and categorical data in structural equation modeling. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: A second course* (pp. 269-314). United States: Information Age Publishing.
- 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*, 365-382.
- 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.
- Guerin, B., & Foster, T. M. (1994). Attitudes, beliefs, and behavior: Saying you like, saying you believe, and doing. *The Behavior Analyst*, *17*, 127-129.
- Hersh, R. H. & Merrow, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Declining by degrees: Higher education at risk*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Irvine, M. (2005, June 26). "Young labeled 'entitlement generation.'" *Associated Press*. Retrieved from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/business/230177_entitlement27.html
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. G. (2005). *LISREL 8.72* [Computer software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software.
- Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *41*, 397-404.
- MacCallum, R. C., Roznowski, M., & Necowitz, L. B. (1992). Model modifications in

- covariance structure analysis: The problem of capitalization on chance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 490-504.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.). *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *26*, 293-355.
- McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Nicholls, J. G., Patashnick, M., & Nolen, S. B. (1985). Adolescents' theories of education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*, 683-692.
- Perone, M. (1988). Laboratory lore and research practices in the experimental analysis of human behavior: Use and abuse of subjects' verbal reports. *The Behavior Analyst*, *11*, 71-75.
- Pieper, S. L. (2003). *Refining and Extending the 2 x 2 Achievement Goal Framework: Another Look at Work-Avoidance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=41&did=765205121&SrchMode=1&sid=24&Fmt=2&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1158164092&clientId=50078&cfc=1>
- Preacher, K. J., & MacCallum, R. C. (2003). Repairing Tom Swift's electric factor analysis machine. *Understanding Statistics*, *2*, 13-43.
- Presson, P. K., Clark, S. C., & Benassi, V. A. (1997). The Levenson locus of control scales: Confirmatory factor analyses and evaluation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *25*, 93-104.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality

- Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902.
- Reise, S. P., Moore, T. M., & Haviland, M. G. (in press). Bifactor models and rotations: Exploring the extent to which multidimensional data yield univocal scale scores. *Journal of Personality Assessment*.
- Reise, S. P., Waller, N. G., & Comrey, A. L. (2000). Factor analysis and scale revision. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 287-297.
- Reise, S. P., Morizot, J., & Hays, R. D. (2007). The role of the bifactor model in resolving dimensionality issues in health outcomes measures. *Journal of Quality of Life Research*, 16, 19-31.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Revised edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. (1994). Corrections to test statistics and standard errors on covariance structure analysis. In A. von Eye & C. C. Clogg (Eds.). *Latent variable analysis* (p. 299-419). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shelley, P. H. (2005, January 7). Colleges need to give students intensive care. *The Chronicle Review*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>
- Sijtsma, K. (2009). Reliability beyond theory and into practice. *Psychometrika*, 74, 169-173.
- Snook, S. C., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1989). Component analysis versus common factor analysis: A Monte Carlo study. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 148-154.
- Stupnisky, R. H., Renaud, R. D., Perry, R. P., Ruthig, J. C., Haynes, T. L., & Clifton, R. A. (2007). Comparing self-esteem and perceived control as predictors of first-year students' academic achievement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 10, 303-330.

Thelk, A. D., Sundre, D. L., Horst, S. J., & Finney, S. J. (2009). Motivation matters: Using the Student Opinion Scale (SOS) to make valid inferences about student performance.

Journal of General Education, 58, 129-151.

Twenge, J. M. (2007). *Generation Me: Why Today's Young Americans Are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled – and More Miserable than Ever Before*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Twenge, J. M. (2009). Generational changes and their impact in the classroom: Teaching generation me. *Medical Education, 43*, 398-405.

Twenge, J. M. & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Increases in positive self-views among high school students: Birth cohort changes in anticipated performance, self-satisfaction, self-liking, and self-competence. *Psychological Science, 19*, 1082-1086.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 875-901.

Trzesniewski, K. H., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). Rethinking “Generation Me”: A study of cohort effects from 1976-2006. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 58-75.

West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (p. 57-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, R. E. (2008). Targeting, segmenting, and positioning the market for college students to increase customer satisfaction and overall performance. *College Student Journal, 42*, 891-894.

Yu, C., & Muthén, B. (2002, April). *Evaluation of model fit indices for latent variable models with categorical and continuous outcomes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Zinn, T., Magnotti, J., Marchuk, K., Schultz, B., Luther, A., & Varfolomeeva, V. (in press). Performance vs. effort: More about what makes the grade. *Teaching of Psychology*.

Table 1

Fit Indices for the Hypothesized Models

Model	χ^2_{SB}	<i>df</i>	SRMR	RMSEA _{SB}	CFI _{SB}
1) 26-item, five-factor	1228.09*	289	0.051	0.06	0.96
2) 26-item, one-factor	1670.22*	299	0.053	0.07	0.95
3) 26-item, incomplete bifactor	837.99*	277	0.040	0.04	0.98
4) 8-item, one-factor					
Sample A	45.75*	20	0.024	0.04	0.99
Sample B	39.46*	20	0.024	0.03	0.99

Note. All analyses were conducted using Sample A only, except for the 8-item, one-factor model, which was fit to both Sample A and B. χ^2_{SB} = Satorra-Bentler (SB) adjusted chi-square; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA_{SB} = the SB scaled root mean square error of approximation; CFI = the SB scaled comparative fit index. Sample A *N* = 1046; Sample B *N* = 1045.

* *p* < .05.

Table 2

Factor Intercorrelations for 26-item, Five-Factor Solution for Sample A (N = 1046)

	KR	OP	PL	SC	DT
KR	-				
OP	.97	-			
PL	.85	.85	-		
SC	.87	.93	.81	-	
DT	.80	.73	.78	.73	-

Note. KR = Knowledge is a right; OP = Others should provide education; PL = Problems with learning are due to the inadequacies of the teacher; SC = Students should have control over class policies; DT = Certain outcomes are deserved because I pay tuition.

Table 3

Unstandardized (Standardized) Pattern Coefficients and R² Values for 26-item, Incomplete

Bifactor Model for Sample A (N = 1046)

Item	G	OP	PL	SC	DT	R ²
1	.80 (.60)	-	-	-	-	.35
3	.71 (.47)	-	-	-	-	.22
15	.94 (.53)	-	-	-	-	.28
25	.70 (.53)	-	-	-	-	.28
5	.60 (.45)	.31 (.23)	-	-	-	.25
11	.91 (.62)	.01 (.01)	-	-	-	.29
18	.96 (.61)	.16 (.10)	-	-	-	.28
19	.88 (.65)	-.07 (-.05)	-	-	-	.43
20	.41 (.31)	.79 (.59)	-	-	-	.44
22	.62 (.44)	.93 (.67)	-	-	-	.64
2	.74 (.53)	-	.48 (.35)	-	-	.41
10	.69 (.56)	-	.15 (.12)	-	-	.33
12	.76 (.67)	-	.27 (.24)	-	-	.51
14	.61 (.48)	-	.34 (.27)	-	-	.30
16	.77 (.65)	-	.53 (.44)	-	-	.61
24	.55 (.36)	-	-.07 (-.04)	-	-	.13
7	.58 (.36)	-	-	.70 (.44)	-	.33
8	.64 (.56)	-	-	.26 (.23)	-	.36
13	.76 (.53)	-	-	.37 (.25)	-	.34
17	.61 (.42)	-	-	.17 (.12)	-	.19
21	.86 (.55)	-	-	.01 (.01)	-	.31
23	.75 (.46)	-	-	.26 (.22)	-	.26
26	.74 (.45)	-	-	.42 (.26)	-	.27
4	.87 (.55)	-	-	-	.95 (.60)	.66
6	.89 (.64)	-	-	-	.22 (.16)	.44
9	.82 (.66)	-	-	-	.62 (.50)	.69

Note. G = General Entitlement; OP = Others should provide education; PL = Problems with learning are due to the inadequacies of the teacher; SC = Students should have control over class policies; DT = Certain outcomes are deserved because I pay tuition.

Table 4.

Unstandardized (Standardized) Factor Pattern Coefficients for the Eight Item, One-factor Model, Samples A (N = 1046) and B (N = 1045).

Item	Pattern Coefficients		Error Variance		R^2	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
1	.78 (.58)	.52 (.62)	1.21 (.66)	.45 (.62)	.34	.38
3	.69 (.46)	.50 (.47)	1.79 (.79)	.90 (.78)	.21	.22
9	.86 (.69)	.71 (.74)	.82 (.53)	.40 (.45)	.47	.55
11	.92 (.63)	.63 (.61)	1.28 (.60)	.67 (.63)	.40	.37
12	.83 (.73)	.65 (.78)	.59 (.46)	.28 (.40)	.54	.60
13	.80 (.55)	.60 (.57)	1.45 (.69)	.76 (.68)	.31	.32
14	.68 (.53)	.63 (.68)	1.15 (.72)	.45 (.53)	.28	.47
19	.85 (.63)	.75 (.67)	1.12 (.61)	.70 (.55)	.39	.45

Note. A: Sample A. B: Sample B

Table 5.

Correlations, Factor Correlations, and Descriptive Statistics between Relevant Variables (N = 1560)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. AEQ	.81	.47**	.17**	.52**	.54**	-.04	-.22**	.38**	-.29**
2. PES	.39**	.87	-.03	.30**	.33**	.09**	-.10**	.20**	-.14**
3. RSE	.14**	-.03	.88	.36**	.34**	-.31**	-.13**	.22**	-.18**
4. LOCC	.40**	.24**	.29**	.73	.85**	-.01	-.15**	.27**	-.21**
5. LOCP	.43**	.27**	.28**	.63**	.76	.04	-.19**	.30**	-.22**
6. LOCI	-.02	.06*	-.22**	-.01	.03	.54	.25**	-.14**	.21**
7. MAP	-.18**	-.08**	-.11**	-.11**	-.14**	.16**	.74	-.61**	.23**
8. WAV	.30**	.16**	.18**	.20**	.23**	-.09**	-.46**	.77	-.22**
9. EFF	-.24**	-.12**	-.15**	-.16**	-.18**	.14**	.18**	-.17**	.83
Mean	22.11	26.74	18.41	25.46	25.19	35.20	17.67	10.52	18.37
Standard Deviation	6.75	9.70	4.86	5.57	5.68	4.48	2.65	4.33	3.49

Note. Correlations between scores are listed on the bottom half of the table, and correlations between latent factors are listed on the top half. Alpha values are listed on the diagonal. AEQ = Academic Entitlement Questionnaire LOCC = Locus of Control – Chance; LOCP = Locus of Control – Powerful Others; LOCI = Locus of Control – Internal; SE = Self-Esteem; PES = Psychological Entitlement; MAP = Mastery Approach Goal Orientation; PAP = Performance Approach Goal Orientation; MAV = Mastery Avoidance Goal Orientation; PAV = Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation; WAV = Work Avoidance Goal Orientation; EFF = Effort; IMP = Importance.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Appendix

Original Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (AEQ) Facets and Items (26 items)

- A. “[K]nowledge is a right that should be delivered with a minimum of exertion and discomfort on the part of the ‘consumer’” (Dubovsky, 1986).**
- 1. If I don’t do well on a test, the professor should make tests easier or curve grades.*
 - 3. Professors should only lecture on material covered in the textbook and assigned readings.*
 - 15. Professors should not expect me to complete work or study for tests over school breaks (e.g., Thanksgiving, Spring Break).
 - 25. I focus on learning what is necessary to satisfy the requirements, but no more.
- B. “[O]thers will provide all of the education that is necessary” (Dubovsky, 1986).**
- 5. Professors must be entertaining for me to learn.
 - 11. If I am struggling in a class, the professor should approach me and offer to help.*
 - 18. If a professor does not cover material in class, I should not be expected to learn it.
 - 19. It is the professor’s responsibility to make it easy for me to succeed.*
 - 20. Professors should provide their lecture notes online.
 - 22. Professors should provide study guides.
- C. “[P]roblems in learning are due to the inadequacies of the teacher, the course, or the system, rather than to the student’s own shortcomings” (Dubovsky, 1986).**
- 2. The professor is responsible for how well I do in class.
 - 10. My grades are more affected by how much a professor likes me than the amount or quality of work I do.
 - 12. If I cannot learn the material for a class from lecture alone, then it is the professor’s fault when I fail the test.*
 - 14. I am a product of my environment. Therefore, if I do poorly in class, it is not my fault.*
 - 16. Because it is the professor’s job to help me learn, if I do not do well, it is the professor’s fault.
 - 24. I’ve done poorly on exams because they weren’t geared to my test-taking style.
- D. Students should have control over class policies.**
- 7. If I have a family vacation scheduled, I should be able to make up work that I miss.
 - 8. I should be able to turn in assignments late without a penalty.
 - 13. I should be given the opportunity to make up a test, regardless of the reason for the absence.*
 - 17. I should have input into how my classes are taught.
 - 21. Because students are the ones who take classes, they know best what good teaching is.
 - 23. I’m paying for my classes, so I should be able to skip class without a grade penalty.
 - 26. If I have more than one test on the same day, I should have the opportunity to move one of them.
- E. Certain outcomes are deserved because the student pays tuition.**
- 4. Because I pay tuition, I expect to pass the class and get credit.
 - 6. Because my tuition pays professors’ salaries, professors should accommodate my wishes.
 - 9. Because I pay tuition, I deserve passing grades.*

Note. Retained items in the final, 8-item model are denoted with an asterick (*)