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EXPLORING CAUSES OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

ABSTRACT

This dissertation was guided by two research questions: (1) What causes academic entitlement? and, (2) what is the role of subgroups/typologies of academic entitlement? Relying on a mixed-method approach to explore these questions, survey, interview, and experimental methodologies were pursued. Findings are presented in three manuscripts (Chapters two through four).

Chapter two explored the relationship between academic entitlement, learning styles, academic attitudes, and academic performance, and explored how subtypes/subgroups of academic entitlement differ on the same measures. Undergraduate students (N=433) completed an online survey about their behaviours and attitudes towards university. While some support for the hypotheses was generated, effect sizes were generally small and accounted for a small portion of variance in academic entitlement subscales. The academic entitlement subgroup analysis provided some support for the suggestion that there are different groups (or types) of academic entitlement. Student in these groups showed different patterns of learning styles, academic well-being, and levels of academic cynicism. While students in these groups displayed different levels of these variables, academic entitlement group moderated only a few of the relationships between academic attitudes or behaviours and academic entitlement.

Chapter three examined academic entitlement from the student perspective. Eight students participated in an interview where they answered questions about their university experience and discussed various attitudes and behaviours related to academic entitlement. Results from this study showed that three main themes
emerged: Transition to University (Coping); Student Consumerism; and, Effort Fairness, and Deservingness. Overall, two main causes of academic entitlement emerged: Customer Orientation and Coping, the coping group was most apparent among students with the highest academic entitlement scores.

Lastly, Chapter four explored the impact of frustration (a possible cause of academic entitlement) on tolerance for academic dishonesty (an attitude associated with academic entitlement) in an experimental study. Undergraduate students (N=151) were randomly assigned to either the control or experimental group. The control group completed a fair letter search task while the experimental group completed an unfair (impossible) letter search task. For the experimental group, the task was meant to induce frustration. All participants then completed a measure of tolerance for academic dishonesty. A relationship between frustration due to feeling wronged and behaviours associated with academic entitlement was not supported by the findings of this experiment.

Results from these studies provided support for the existence of at least two types of academic entitlement: a customer orientation and coping. These types of academic entitlement will likely require different interventions that relate directly to the causes of academic entitlement.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Academic entitlement is defined as the tendency to possess expectations of unearned academic success, unearned/undeserved academic services, and/or the expectation of unrealistic accommodation (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2010). While definitions of the construct vary slightly from researcher to researcher, they consistently contain a component of expectation for reward separate from achievement, responsibility avoidance, and a consumer orientation/approach to education. The goal of this dissertation is to further our understanding of academic entitlement using a mixed-methods approach.

Academic entitlement is an important topic in educational psychology because it has the potential to alter the university environment in a negative way (for students, professors, and university administration). Morrow (1994) was first to predict the detrimental effects of a growing culture of entitlement and incivility in education. Morrow stated that the culture of entitlement reduces a sense of individual agency and personal responsibility for achievement. Further, this growing sense of entitlement leads to a pervasive attitude that students can never be wrong, like customers at a store. These predictions are captured in the current research on and conceptualization of academic entitlement.

A recent unpublished meta-analysis, conducted by the author, suggested that academic entitlement is related to narcissism, self-efficacy, self-esteem, GPA, and locus of control and that men tend to report higher levels of academic entitlement than women. More specifically, higher levels of academic entitlement are related to higher levels of narcissism, lower self-efficacy and self-esteem, and external locus of control. Academic
entitlement also seems to be related to poorer academic performance (GPA). Ongoing research has demonstrated that students with high levels of academic entitlement experience less academic well-being, higher levels of academic stress, and lower levels of academic performance compared to their peers (Jackson et al, unpublished). Overall, these findings paint a picture of a student who is not enjoying their academic experience and is not performing well but feels entitled to certain grades, accommodations, or services that they did not necessarily earn or deserve.

The term “academic entitlement” first appeared in psychological research in 2002 but did not re-appear until 2008 (Greenberger, Lessard, & Chen, 2008; Achacoso, 2002). The effects of academic entitlement can be seen in today’s university environment (Bowsell 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). Some students hold unrealistic expectations of professors and administration or feel that they are entitled to grades for reasons other than achievement. For example, some students may request special accommodations because of their personal plans or feel entitled to a higher grade because of the effort they put forth. Prior to 2008 student incivility was a popular topic in higher education research. Student incivility ranges from behaviours that are related to academic entitlement or possibly manifestations of academic entitlement (like arguing with professors and demanding accommodations) to behaviours that are outside the realm of academic entitlement (like physical violence). Researchers differ in how they view student incivility in relation to academic entitlement. Some researchers view incivility as a consequence of academic entitlement (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Kopp & Finney, 2013), while other researchers view incivility as a component of academic entitlement (e.g., Wasieleski, Whatley, Briihl, & Warren 2014).
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One of the first studies to examine academic entitlement reported that more “politically savvy” students tended to score higher on a measure of academic entitlement. These students appeared to assume that they had more control over influencing the change of a grade and claimed that they generally got their way in most instances (Achacoso, 2002). This researcher referred to these students as “smart consumers” who were adept at getting the greatest return for their investment (whether that be time/effort or money/tuition). Additionally, this study reported that academic entitlement was negatively related to internal attributions and positively related to external attributions. These early findings set the stage for future academic entitlement research that focused on individual differences, parental factors, academic attitudes and performance, and student consumerism.

Existing research on academic entitlement has concentrated on student consumerism (Frey, 2015; Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011), personality and individual differences (Boswell 2012; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002), parenting factors (Greenberger, Lessard, & Chen, 2008), parenting style (Turner & McCormick, 2018; Greenberger et al., 2008) academic performance (Achacoso, 2002; Greenberger et al., 2008; Kazoun 2013), and learning styles and orientation (Frey 2015; Andrey et al., 2012; Vallade, Martin, & Weber, 2014; Goodboy & Frisby 2014).
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Some recent research on academic entitlement has suggested that there are subgroups\(^1\) of academic entitlement (Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012; Achacoso, 2002). Research has suggested that academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002); that academic entitlement may be the result of a customer orientation to university (Bunce, Baird, & Jones, 2017; Frey, 2015; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011); and that academic entitlement may be the result of an underlying personality trait (general entitlement or narcissism; Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014). Research has provided empirical support for a consumer model of academic entitlement and a coping model of academic entitlement (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011).

**Review of Previous Research**

Existing research on academic entitlement has largely focused on identifying correlates of academic entitlement. Academic entitlement has been studied in relation to several variables: personality, gender, academic performance and attitudes, and parenting style.

\(^1\) The term “subgroups” is used throughout this document to refer to different types (or groups) of academic entitlement that might exist within a larger group (or category) of academically entitled students.
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Personality and individual differences.

Narcissism.

Given the similarities between narcissism and academic entitlement, it is predictable that narcissism is consistently related to academic entitlement. The two constructs share similar characteristics. The defining characteristics of narcissism are inflated self-worth, a need for admiration, and a lack of empathy (American Psychological Association, 2013), and some of the defining characteristics of academic entitlement are expectations of unearned success and/or accommodation (Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2010).

A positive relationship between academic entitlement and narcissism has been consistently found in academic entitlement research (Turnipseed & Cohen, 2015; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). Researchers have generally argued that academic entitlement is related to, but distinct from, narcissism. Turnipseed and Cohen (2015) suggested that narcissistic students may seek academic success through externalizing responsibility (i.e., placing responsibility and blame on the professor or the university rather than themselves). This theme of externalizing responsibility is prevalent throughout the discussion of academic entitlement.

The Big Five.

The relationship between academic entitlement and the Big Five personality domains has been explored in previous research (McLellan & Jackson, 2017; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). Academic entitlement was negatively related to agreeableness and
positively related to extraversion. Chowning and Campbell (2009) also reported that openness and conscientiousness were negatively related to academic entitlement.

**Gender.**

Another consistent finding in academic entitlement research is that men tend to score higher on measures of academic entitlement than women (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Turnipseed & Cohen, 2015; Kazoun, 2013; Boswell, 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Ciani et al., 2008).

Several researchers have relied on gender roles and socialization practices as an explanation for this finding. Wasieleski et al. (2014) suggested that due to the way that men and women are socialized, men tend to have a competitive desire to get ahead and women tend to have a desire to get along with others. This competitive desire is more compatible with academic entitlement than the desire to get along with others. Thus, men display higher levels of academic entitlement because they have been taught to be competitive and that they deserve more. Another researcher suggests that there are systemic structures in place that facilitate gender differences (Boswell, 2012).

A few researchers have relied on I/O psychology work that focused on income entitlement to explain this finding. Due to socialization practices and gender roles, men have internalized social expectations that they should be more successful than women (Turnipseed & Cohen, 2015; Ciani et al., 2008). Women consistently report lower levels of income entitlement than men, they feel that they deserve less for the same work (Desmarais & Curtis, 2001). This finding seems to transfer to the academic world as well; men tend to be more entitled than women.
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Academic Performance

GPA.

GPA (usually self-reported) is consistently expected to be related to academic entitlement but results between studies have been inconsistent. Some studies report a negative relationship between academic entitlement and GPA (Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014; Kazoun, 2013), while others report a positive relationship (Achacoso, 2002), or no relationship at all (Greenberger et al., 2008). One recent study suggested that academic entitlement leads to amotivation which subsequently results in lower grades (Frey, 2015). This indicated an indirect relationship between academic entitlement and GPA. The relationship between academic entitlement and academic performance requires more research and perhaps a different measure of academic performance (not self-reported GPA).

The majority of studies that considered the relationship between GPA and academic entitlement relied on self-reported GPA, which may not be accurate. In the one study that obtained official grades from the university, the students who did not consent to the researcher accessing their official grades tended to have higher levels of academic entitlement than students who did consent to the researcher accessing their official grades (Achacoso, 2002). In a different study, when students were asked to compare their academic performance to their peers, students with higher levels of academic entitlement tended to report lower levels of performance (Jackson et al., unpublished).
Academic attitudes and behaviours.

Goal orientation.

Academic entitlement is also consistently expected to be related to academic goal orientation, specifically performance approach (Frey, 2015; Jackson et al., 2011) or grade orientation (Vallade et al., 2014; Goodboy & Frisby, 2014). Both of these constructs describe students who are focused on grades and performance rather than actually learning or mastering course material. Performance orientation refers to students who are motivated by a desire to maximize their performance (Bong, 2004). Grade orientation refers to students who are motivated by grades (Eison, Pollio, & Milton, 1986).

In the conceptualization of both academic entitlement and performance or goal orientation there are overarching components of responsibility and effort avoidance. Entitled students do not necessarily want to learn they just want their grade or degree. Vallade and colleagues (2011) suggested that grade-focused students do not consider university to be a learning experience. These authors suggested that grade orientation was associated with Machiavellianism, which in the academic context might lead to unrealistic grade expectations and arguing with professors for grades. Goodboy and Frisby (2014) found that learning-oriented students were more likely than grade-oriented students to have a desire to maintain a positive relationship with professors.

Locus of control.

An external locus of control may be a key component of academic entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, 2009) and/or it may serve as a coping mechanism to protect one’s self-esteem (Boswell, 2012). Rotter (1966) defines external locus of control as
beliefs that events are a result of chance and out of the control of the individual. An external locus of control is consistently related to higher levels of academic entitlement (Frey, 2015; Stafford, 2013; Kopp, Zinn, & Finney, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002).

Chowning and Campbell (2009) developed a measure of academic entitlement that included an externalized responsibility subscale. From this, it is clear that these authors consider an external locus of control to be a key component of academic entitlement. There is a consistent theme of holding others responsible for one’s own success across the academic entitlement definitions and research.

Boswell (2012) suggested that an external locus of control serves as a coping mechanism for students with low self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is also related to academic entitlement (discussed next) but it is possible that students with low self-efficacy externalize responsibility as a way of relinquishing control and preventing self-blame. Similarly, Stafford (2013), found that entitled students tend to hold others responsible for their success. They also reported that an internal locus of control and high self-esteem predicted academic success. Thus, an external locus of control may serve as a coping mechanism for low self-esteem.

**Self-efficacy and self-esteem.**

Self-efficacy is consistently negatively related to academic entitlement (Frey, 2015; Boswell, 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). Self-efficacy is defined as the belief that one has the ability and skills necessary to achieve a desired outcome (Bandura, 1977). Academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism to deal with feeling of
inadequacy (i.e., low self-esteem) or for students who have difficulty meeting academic demands (Frey, 2015; Chowning & Campbell, 2009).

Boswell (2012) suggests that an external locus of control may foster low self-efficacy. Academic entitlement may serve as a coping mechanism to deal with the belief that one has no control over the environment or to deal with feeling of inadequacy (inability to meet academic demands and goals.). Other researchers have also suggested that self-efficacy and external locus of control go hand-in-hand (e.g. Frey, 2015).

Self-esteem differs from self-efficacy in that it is an emotional evaluation of one’s worth, rather than a belief about ones’ abilities (Rosenberg, 1965). In current research, self-esteem is consistently negatively associated with academic entitlement; students with lower self-esteem tend to report higher levels of academic entitlement (Stafford, 2013; Greenberger et al., 2009; Chowning & Campbell, 2008). Again, it has been suggested that academic entitlement may be a coping response – a “compensatory protective strategy” that serves to protect ones’ ego (Stafford, 2013; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Greenberger et al., 2009; Chowning & Campbell, 2008).

One study in particular found that students with low and high self-esteem differentially endorse academic entitlement items (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011). Students were separated into two groups based on their self-esteem scores. For the high self-esteem group, the items behaved as expected; all academic entitlement items were negatively associated with self-esteem. For the low self-esteem group only two academic entitlement items were significantly related to self-esteem. Two items regarding self-evaluation and deserving a ‘B’ were significantly related to self-esteem but the other items, regarding professor evaluations, were not. Those in the high self-esteem group
were more likely to endorse items about being demanding towards professors and those referencing poor or unfair treatment from professors (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011). Students with high self-esteem were more likely to respond in a way that placed blame on the professor. These results suggest that academic entitlement may be a coping response to distress caused by a negative experience (i.e., a bad or unexpected grade) for those with high self-esteem. Rather than allow their self-esteem to suffer, these students seem to externalize responsibility and place the blame on professors.

Other academic attitudes and behaviours.

Other academic attitudes and behaviours that are less well-studied in relation to academic entitlement include academic well-being, academic stress, academic cynicism, academic dishonestly, and student research participant behaviour. Recent unpublished research (Jackson et al. 2016) has suggested that academic entitlement is related to higher levels of academic stress (Barton & Hirsch, 2016 also found this), academic cynicism, and tolerance for academic dishonesty, and lower levels of academic well-being. Taylor, Bailey, and Barber (2015) reported that higher levels of academic entitlement were related to counterproductive research study behavior, such as unexcused absence (i.e., study no-shows) and careless survey responding.

Parenting Style and Academic Entitlement.

Parenting style and parental expectation has been linked to academic entitlement. Early academic entitlement research identified parental expectations and parenting style as a likely cause of academic entitlement (Greenberger et al., 2008). This research claimed that students who have parents with high achievement expectations and that place a lot of pressure on the student to succeed were likely to have high levels of
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academic entitlement. Results provided support for the claim; parental achievement expectations and the use of social comparison (i.e., the parent comparing the student’s performance to their peer’s performance) were positively related to academic entitlement. Recent research has demonstrated that perceived parental warmth is negatively related to students’ externalized responsibility and positively to students’ entitled expectation (Turner & McCormick, 2018).

General Psychological Entitlement and Academic Entitlement.

Generally, researchers have considered academic entitlement and psychological entitlement to be distinct but related constructs (Kopp & Finney, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al, 2008). Psychological entitlement is the general belief that one is entitled to more than others (American Psychological Association, 2013). This feeling of entitlement is not domain specific and is considered to be a global trait. Academic entitlement, on the other hand, is expected to be domain specific (i.e., specific to the academic realm). There is something unique about academic entitlement that is not captured in the construct of psychological entitlement.

Some correlates of academic entitlement may actually be causes of academic entitlement. Based on a review of the academic entitlement research, it is possible that the following are causes of academic entitlement:

- personality (e.g., narcissism and general psychological entitlement);
- goal (performance approach) or grade orientation;
- externalization of responsibility (external locus of control);
- poor academic performance or not meeting one’s academic goals;
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- low self-esteem or self-efficacy;
- poor academic well-being or academic stress; and/or,
- parenting style or parental achievement expectations.

The causes of academic entitlement are likely complex, far more complex than a single relationship can explain. In light of this, recent research has begun empirically testing models of academic entitlement. Models of academic entitlement consider the causes of, or underlying reasons for, academic entitlement, like coping (i.e., academic entitlement is viewed as a coping response) or customer orientation (i.e., academic entitlement is considered to be the result of a customer orientation to university education). It is possible that multiple models are valid; for example, Frey (2015) demonstrated empirical support for both of the previously mentioned models: coping and customer orientation. It is likely that there are subgroups of academic entitlement and this possibility is just beginning to be explored empirically, though it has been discussed theoretically for some time.

The possibility of subgroups (or types) of academic entitlement has been explicitly discussed by a few researchers (e.g., Frey, 2015; Andrey et al., 2012) and has been empirically explored to by other researchers (e.g., Wasieleski et al., 2015; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Achacoso, 2002). These researchers have largely taken a theoretically driven approach to the conceptualization of subgroups of academic entitlement.

**Theoretical Subgroups of Academic Entitlement.**

Achacoso (2002) was the first to suggest that students might differ in how they express or experience academic entitlement. For example, students in low, medium, and
high academic entitlement subgroups expressed different subjective experiences of academic entitlement. Those in the high entitlement group were described as being good at getting what they wanted and were more “politically savvy” (i.e., they understand how to work the system to get what they want). Those with the highest levels of academic entitlement viewed themselves as having more control over situations and external factors.

More recently, Frey (2015) suggested three subgroups of academic entitlement that are consistent with conceptualizations of academic entitlement in the literature. Frey suggested that one subgroup of academic entitlement consists of students who use academic entitlement (knowingly or unknowingly) as a coping mechanism. A second subgroup of students consisted of students who are generally entitled and narcissistic, and the third subgroup consisted of exceptionally gifted students who exhibit what appears to be academic entitlement but is really an expectation or need for accommodation from their professors and university.

Based on a review of the literature it is likely that the following subgroups of academic entitlement exist: (1) coping; (2) generally entitled; and, (3) students as consumers.

1. Coping.

As suggested above, academic entitlement may serve as a coping mechanism for students (1) who are unfamiliar with the norms and rules of university, (2) with lower self-esteem, lower self-efficacy, and an external locus of control (these students may have difficulty meeting academic demands and goals), or (3) (not suggested above but
discussed in detail below) who perceive unfairness and respond with academic entitlement.

1.a. Unfamiliarity with norms and rules of university.

Researchers have suggested that some students have unrealistic academic expectations, and that academic entitlement might result when students’ expectations are not met (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). Students may use academic entitlement as a coping mechanism to deal with unmet expectations. It may be possible to mediate or prevent this reaction by better preparing students for university and providing clear guidelines so that students can adjust their expectations accordingly.

1.b. Difficulty meeting academic demands and goals.

Students who hold themselves to high (possibly unrealistic) academic expectations, or have parents who hold them to unreasonably high academic standards may exhibit academic entitlement to cope with these demands, particularly if the student is not meeting the demands imposed by themselves or their parents (Frey, 2015; Stafford, 2013; Greenberger, 2008). These students likely have an external locus of control and lower levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem compared to their less entitled peers (Boswell, 2013; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011, Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008).

1.c. Equity sensitive.

Research has suggested that entitlement may stem from feelings of injustice and this sense of entitlement has been linked to selfish behaviour (Vallade et al., 2014; Miller,
EXPLORING CAUSES OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

2013; Zitek et al., 2010). For these students, academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism; as a compensatory response to feeling wronged. The theory of equity sensitivity (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987) supports the existence of this subgroup, and assumes that some individuals are more sensitive to perceived injustice than others.

The theory of equity sensitivity assumes three levels of sensitivity to perceived injustice: benevolent, equity sensitive, and entitled (Huseman et al., 1987). At the benevolent end of the spectrum are those who rarely perceive injustice, even if they get less than others, and at the entitled end are those who often perceive injustice even if they get more (or the same) as others in the same situation. Those who would be considered “entitled” on this scale may exhibit academic entitlement as a coping response to consistently feeling wronged or perceiving injustice.

Based on the literature, it seems that what these three sub-groups have in common is that academic entitlement serves as a coping mechanism. Externalizing responsibility, shifting blame to professors and the university system, and making unreasonable demands of professors (like grade haggling or accommodation requests) may be a result of low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, an external locus of control, general difficulties transitioning to university, or perceived injustice.

2. Generally entitled.

A second subgroup of academic entitlement may be students with elevated levels of general psychological entitlement and narcissism. While academic entitlement is expected to be domain specific in most cases (i.e., an individual does not have to be entitled in other domains to exhibit entitlement in an academic domain), this does not
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rule-out the possibility of a subgroup of students that is generally entitled across many domains.

The existence of this group had been suggested in academic entitlement research (Frey, 2015; Wasileski et al., 2014). Frey (2015) suggested that students in this subgroup might view education as a game and use whatever means necessary to achieve their desired outcome. This subgroup of students would likely score high on measures of academic entitlement, psychological entitlement, and narcissism; and be small given the prevalence of narcissistic personality disorder (0.5-1% of the population; American Psychological Association, 2013)

3. Students as consumers.

A third subgroup of entitled students might consist of those who view themselves as consumers of a university. There is potential for this to be a sub-group of academic entitlement or an overarching theme throughout all of the groups. Singleton-Jackson et al. (2011) found that consumerism may be an overarching factor in academic entitlement and many authors have echoed this suggestion. It may be that this type of academic entitlement might be more prevalent when the cost of education is high, and the student is financially responsible for their education.

Bunce, Baird, and Jones (2017) investigated the effect of customer orientation on academic performance and other academic outcomes in a sample of university students from England, where tuition fees were recently introduced. They found that a customer orientation to university education mediated the relationship between learner identity (a measure of one’s commitment to learning), grade goal (desired GPA at graduation), and current academic performance:
• being responsible for paying one’s tuition fees was associated with higher consumer orientation and subsequent lower academic performance;

• higher grade goals were related to higher customer orientation and subsequent lower academic performance; and,

• stronger learner identities were associated with lower customer orientation and subsequent lower academic performance.

**Purpose of This Dissertation**

A review of the academic entitlement research leaves two important questions unanswered: What causes academic entitlement? And, what is the role of subgroups/typologies of academic entitlement? These questions are likely related; that is, causes of academic entitlement are likely related to the different types of academic entitlement. Identifying causes of academic entitlement is a critical step in understanding the phenomenon and in developing interventions to reduce levels of academic entitlement.

The following studies, presented in three manuscripts (Chapters two through four), explored the construct of academic entitlement. Chapter two presents results from survey research that explored the relationship between academic entitlement, learning styles, academic attitudes, and academic performance. The research presented in this chapter also explored how the different subtypes/subgroups of academic entitlement differ on measures of learning styles, academic attitudes, and academic performance, and the role of subtype/subgroup as a moderator. The manuscript presented in Chapter three examined academic entitlement from the student perspective. Finally, Chapter four presents a manuscript that explored the impact of frustration (a possible cause of
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academic entitlement) on tolerance for academic dishonesty (an attitude associated with academic entitlement) in an experimental study.
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CHAPTER 2: Exploring the Construct of Academic Entitlement: What is the role of subgroups of academic entitlement of Academic Entitlement?

A relatively clear picture of the impacts of academic entitlement has begun to emerge. Research findings paint a picture of an academically entitled student who is not satisfied with their university experience; is not performing well in university; holds negative attitudes towards the university; and is likely to experience high levels of stress and burnout, and low levels of self-esteem. Though there has been some recent agreement on the correlates of academic entitlement, the cause of academic entitlement remains unclear. Researchers studying academic entitlement have recently questioned whether subgroups of academic entitlement exist. The existence of subgroups of academic entitlement may help to illuminate some of the causes of academic entitlement.

Existing research on academic entitlement has concentrated on student consumerism (Frey, 2015; Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011), personality and individual differences (Boswell 2012; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002), parenting factors (Greenberger, Lessard, & Chen, 2008), parenting style (Turner & McCormick, 2018; Greenberger et al., 2008) academic performance (Achacoso, 2002; Greenberger et al., 2008; Kazoun 2013), and learning styles and orientation (Frey 2015; Andrey et al., 2012; Vallade, Martin, & Weber, 2014; Goodboy & Frisby 2014). This study explored relationships between academic entitlement and learning styles, a variety of academic attitudes, academic behaviours, and academic outcomes.
Learning Style

Previous research has demonstrated that grade orientation and/or a performance approach academic goal orientation are related to academic entitlement (e.g., Jackson et al., 2011). Yusoff (2011) advanced a typology of learning styles that consists of three styles: (1) strategic learning; (2) deep learning; and, (3) surface learning. Strategic learning implies that students adjust their learning strategy based on a desired goal. These students are motivated to achieve the highest mark possible; they will monitor their progress towards their goals and plan their studying accordingly (Yusoff, 2011). Deep learning implies that students learn for the sake of understanding. A student who engages in deep learning will seek to understand content and think critically about it, they will link new concepts to previous knowledge and experiences to enhance their understanding (Yusoff, 2011). Surface learning implies that students are not engaged with the content and are not learning for the sake of understanding, but rather learning with the goal of memorizing facts. A student who engages in surface learning will be focused on memorizing (rather than understanding) content and what they “learn” will be motivated by course and assessment requirements (Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983; Marton, 1988). Yusoff’s typology of learnings styles has not been examined in academic entitlement research, but similarities between grade orientation, performance approach goal orientation, and surface learning suggest that a relationship between this typology (at least surface learning) and academic entitlement is likely.

Academic Attitudes

Recent research by Jackson and colleagues (2016, unpublished) has found that academic cynicism and tolerance for academic dishonesty were both positively related to
academic entitlement. These researchers have also demonstrated a relationship between increased academic stress, poor academic well-being, and academic entitlement. Overall, this research suggests that students with higher levels of academic entitlement experience more academic distress and less satisfaction than students with lower levels of academic entitlement.

**Academic Behaviours**

It is possible that if students who are rewarded for their entitled behaviour (i.e., those whose entitled behaviour has the desired outcome) they could be more likely to engage in this behaviour in the future. The link between academic behaviour and academic entitlement has not been explored in existing research on academic entitlement. It is reasonable to assume that students who engage in entitled behaviour more often would have higher levels of academic entitlement. Similarly, it is reasonable to suggest that being rewarded for entitled behaviour would predict higher levels of academic entitlement.

**Academic Performance**

Previous research has produced mixed results regarding the relationship between academic performance and academic entitlement. The majority of researchers have predicted a negative relationship between academic entitlement and academic performance, however, only a few have found support for this hypothesis (Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014; Kazoun, 2013; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002).
Subgroups/Subtypes of Academic Entitlement

Some recent research on academic entitlement has suggested that there are subgroups of academic entitlement (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012). Research has suggested that academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002); that academic entitlement may be the result of a cutometer orientation to university (Bunce, Baird, & Jones, 2017; Frey, 2015; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011); and that academic entitlement may be the result of an underlying personality trait (general entitlement or narcissism; Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014). Frey (2015) demonstrated empirical support for a consumer model of academic entitlement and a coping model of academic entitlement, while other researchers have theorized about the existence of subgroups of academic entitlements (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011).

Recent, unpublished research has proposed clusters of academic entitlement that can be best understood as subgroups, “typologies”, of academic entitlement (Jackson, Frey, & McLellan, 2019). Six of the seven academic entitlement domains from the Academic Entitlement Scale (AES; Jackson et al., 2019) were used in the cluster analysis that identified these typologies. In addition to the AES subscales, measures of narcissism and performance avoidance goal orientation were included in the cluster analysis. Five clusters emerged from this research (see Figure 1):

Entitled Narcissistic.

Students in this group tended to score high on all domains of academic entitlement and had significantly higher narcissism scores than students in other groups.
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This group represented a relatively small proportion of students, 8% of the sample. This cluster may represent the “generally entitled” group of students discussed above.

**Entitled Not-Narcissistic.**

Students in this group tended to score high on all domains of academic entitlement but low on narcissism. We suspect that this group represent students who use academic entitlement as a coping mechanism. This group represented 15% of the sample.

**Somewhat Narcissistic.**

This cluster was the largest, representing 29% of the sample. Students in this group tended to report moderate levels of academic entitlement, narcissism, and performance avoidance. They had slightly elevated scores on two academic entitlement domains: Customer Orientation and Reward for Effort. This group of students may view themselves as consumers and expect some reward for the effort they put into their work but overall this group reported only moderate levels of academic entitlement.

**Not Entitled.**

Students in this group tended to have low scores on all academic entitlement domains, narcissism, and performance avoidance. This group represented 27% of the sample.

**Reward my Effort.**

Students in this group tended to report high performance avoidance scores and low to average academic entitlement and narcissism scores. These students seemed to be concerned with avoiding the appearance of incompetence and poor grades. Students in
this group may be those who experience high levels of academic pressure from their parents or themselves. This group was quite large and represented 23% of the sample.

[Figure 1] This figure illustrates the average score within each cluster across four domains: Academic Demands, Performance Avoidance, Customer Orientation & Reward for Effort (“Customer Reward”) and narcissism.

The Current Study

A review of the literature illuminated the need to further explore the construct of academic entitlement, specifically how subgroups of entitled students (identified in the cluster analysis discussed above) differ from one another on key variables. Exploring academic entitlement subgroups may highlight some of the causes of academic
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etitlement; an important component of understanding the concept of academic entitlement is understanding it’s cause(s). Understanding causes of academic entitlement may allow for the development of targeted interventions to prevent or lessen academic entitlement. What works for one subgroup might not work for another subgroup of entitled students. For example, if academic entitlement is a coping mechanism for low self-efficacy, then those students specifically should receive training in study skills and tips to succeed in university. Another group, say the group struggling to transition to university, might benefit from a workshop or welcome session to help build and strengthen their new identity as a university student. All students should receive this information, but it may serve to decrease academic entitlement in those students who are likely to use it as a coping mechanism when they feel unable to meet their goals. By furthering our understanding of the construct of academic entitlement, researchers and educators will be better prepared to cope with and address attitudes of academic entitlement in future and current students.

Research questions.

1. Does academic entitlement relate, as expected, to measures of learning style (deep, surface, or strategic learning), academic attitudes (dishonesty, cynicism, satisfaction), academic performance, and student and faculty behaviours?

2. How do the subgroups of academic entitlement\(^2\) differ on measures of learning style, academic attitudes, academic performance, and entitled academic behaviours?

\(^2\) The five clusters refer to the cluster analysis results, the typologies, discussed above
Hypotheses.

1. Learning Style: Given the similarities between performance orientation and surface learning, it was expected that higher levels of surface learning would predict higher levels of academic entitlement.

2. Academic Attitudes:
   a. It was expected that higher levels of academic cynicism would predict higher levels of academic entitlement.
   b. It was expected a greater tolerance for academic dishonesty would predict higher levels of academic entitlement.
   c. It was also expected that students who report higher levels of academic entitlement would report lower levels of academic satisfaction.

3. Academic Performance:
   a. It was expected that academic entitlement would predict GPA; specifically, students with higher levels of academic entitlement would report lower GPAs.
   b. It was expected that academic entitlement would predict perceived performance compared to peers and self-reported typical academic performance; specifically, students with higher levels of academic entitlement
would report lower levels of performance compared to their peers.

4. Entitled Behaviour:
   
a. It was expected that students reporting more frequent engagement in behaviours associated with academic entitlement (e.g., How often have you blamed the professor for a poor grade?) would report higher levels of academic entitlement.

   b. It was expected that students reporting more frequent experiences where faculty members reward entitled behaviour (e.g., How often have professors bent the rules for you.) would report higher levels of academic entitlement.

5. Academic Entitlement Subgroup Analysis: It was expected that subgroups of academic entitlement would exhibit different relationships between academic attitudes/behaviours and academic entitlement. Moderation analysis was conducted to explore this hypothesis (see Figure 2).
**Figure 2**  Hypothesis 5: Subgroup of academic entitlement will moderate the relationship between academic attitudes and behaviours and academic entitlement.

**Method**

**Participants.**

Undergraduate students (N= 433) were recruited from the University of Windsor. The majority were women (73.3%) and the average age of participants was 20.0 years old. Participants were evenly distributed by year of study. See Table 1 for a full summary of participant demographic characteristics.
Table 1  
*Sample Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (% of Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>255(73.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>84(24.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify as a man or women</td>
<td>7(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>81(23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76(22.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72(20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>117(33.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Humanities, and Social Science</td>
<td>93(32.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>43(15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>43(15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Kinetics</td>
<td>30(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>33(11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>25(8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>12(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>262(79.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-Canadian or Caribbean-Canadian</td>
<td>17(5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>14(4.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (% of Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>8(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>20(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>2(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ethnicity</td>
<td>8(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures.

*Academic Entitlement Scale (AES, Jackson et al., 2013).*

The academic entitlement questionnaire is a 30-item self-report 7-dimension measure of academic entitlement. The measure consists of seven subscales: general academic entitlement, reward for effort, accommodation, responsibility avoidance, customer orientation, customer service expectation, and grade haggling. Participants responded to items using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), where higher scores indicated higher levels of entitlement. Previous versions of this questionnaire have been evaluated and modified to produce the current version. Cronbach’s alpha values for previous version of this questionnaire suggest good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.75$ to 0.95) (Frey et al., 2013). The subscales were negatively correlated, as expected, with academic self-esteem and positively correlated with performance goal orientation (Jackson & McLellan, 2015). The subscales were also moderately correlated with a measure of narcissism (Frey et al., 2013). These correlations have provided evidence of construct validity for the measure.
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*Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI-16; Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006).*

The NPI-16 is a short measure of narcissism. The scale consists of 16 paired statements utilizing a forced-choice format; participants choose the response that is most like them. Of the pairs of responses, one is considered the narcissistic option (scored as 1) and the other the non-narcissistic option (scored as 0). An example pair is, “I know that I’m good because everyone keeps telling me so” and “When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed”. Higher scores on the measure represent higher levels of narcissism. The measure has demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.72$) and was highly correlated with the long-form of the measure ($r = 0.90$). Additionally, the NPI-16 predicted self-judgements as expected (Ames et al., 2006).

*Learning Approach Inventory (Yusoff, 2011).*

The Learning Approach Inventory was utilized to assess learning style (deep learning, surface learning, strategic learning). The nine-item measure relies on a five-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*least like you*) to 5 (*most like you*). An example item from each subscale follows: “I am motivated to learn by an interest in the subject matter” (deep learning), “I’m motivated to learn by a fear of failure” (surface learning), and “My learning focus is depending on what is required by the course” (strategic learning). A previous confirmatory factor analysis suggested good fit for the three subscales ($\chi^2_{(20)} = 26.07, p = 0.163, TLI = 0.985, CFI = 0.992, RMSEA = 0.04; Yusoff, 2011).
Academic Goal Orientation (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Bong, 2004).

This scale consists of four subscales intended to measure four learning orientations: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery approach, and master avoidance. Participants responded to questions using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). This subscale has demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = 0.73-0.88$; Bong, 2004; Jackson, Singleton-Jackson, & Frey, 2011) and was used to recover the academic entitlement clusters.

Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty Scale (Frey, Jackson, McLellan, & Rauti, 2016).

This 10-item academic dishonesty measure asked students to read a scenario and rate how dishonest a behaviour was using a 100-point scale where higher scores indicate a higher tolerance for dishonest behaviour. Two example scenarios from this measure are: “You have not studied for a difficult exam for a required course. During the exam, you ask to be excused and you pull the fire alarm so the exam will be moved to a different day” and “You are taking an exam and realize you can see the student’s answers in front of you and you know this person is an excellent student. You decide to copy this student’s answers.” The measure has demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.91$) and a previously conducted confirmatory factor analysis suggested good fit for the single-dimension measure ($\chi^2(5) = 17.04$, $p <.004$, RMSEA=0.09, CFI=0.99, SRMR=0.02). Preliminary research has demonstrated that the dishonesty measure was related, as expected, to narcissism and learning orientation, with higher narcissism scores being related to a higher tolerance for dishonest behaviour and mastery learning orientation being related to a lower tolerance for dishonest behaviour (Frey, et al., 2016).
Academic Cynicism Questionnaire (McLellan, Rauti, & Jackson, 2016).

A 16-item bi-factor measure of academic cynicism was utilized to assess cynicism in two domains: (1) toward professors and (2) toward the university/administration. Example items from this measure include, “Universities are just businesses trying to make money” and “This university’s administrators are not concerned with students’ education”. Preliminary assessment has demonstrated that the measure has good internal consistency; Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.87 to 0.92. The measure was correlated, as expected, with academic well-being and academic stress (McLellan et al., 2016).

Academic Satisfaction Scale (Schmitt, et al., 2008).

The academic satisfaction scale consists of 11 items; five assess satisfaction and six assess fit. Participants respond to items using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where higher scores indicate a greater level of academic satisfaction or fit. An example item from the satisfaction scale, “All in all, I am satisfied with the education I can get in this school” and from the fit scale, “All things considered, my current major suits me.” The satisfaction subscale has demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.81$), as has the fit subscale ($\alpha = 0.75$; Schmitt, et al., 2008). Both subscales are related to absenteeism and dropout in the expected direction. Higher satisfaction scores were related to lower levels of absenteeism and dropout. Higher fit scores predicted lower dropout rates (Schmitt, et al., 2008).

Academic Performance (GPA and performance compared to others).

Academic performance was measured in two ways. First, participants were asked to report their current GPA, out of 100%. Second, given the shortcomings of self-reported
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GPA, students were also asked to compare their performance to their peers. Two questions were used for this comparison: (1) “When you compare your grades to those of your friends and classmates, are your grades typically…” response choices range from 1 (much higher than others) to 5 (much lower than others); and (2) “With respect to your performance in a typical class, would you say that you typically perform…” response chooses range from 1 (in the top 10%) to 6 (in the bottom 10%).

Demographics inventory.

Participants were asked to fill out a demographics inventory. The inventory included questions about gender, age, ethnicity, year of study, and program of study.

Procedure.

Participants completed all measures online, and the questionnaire took approximately 45 to 60 minutes to complete. The university mass-mail system was used to send a recruitment invitation email to all University of Windsor Undergraduate students.

Upon receiving the recruitment email participants were able to access the online consent form using the link provided in the email. After reading the consent form and indicating that they agreed to participate, participants were directed to the survey. Students were also asked to indicate whether or not they consent to being contacted for an interview about the same topic. If they consented to being contacted about participating in an interview, they were prompted to provide their email address. After completing the survey, all participants were eligible to enter a draw for the chance to win
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one of two $200 prizes if they chose to provide their information (name, email address or phone number).

Results

Data cleaning and preparation.

Before examining main hypotheses, data were cleaned and coded, descriptive statistics were generated for the entire sample on all measures (see Table 2), and statistical assumptions were checked. Data were screened for missing data and incomplete cases: 27 cases were deemed incomplete (missing > 50%) and were removed; 48 cases were removed due to concerns about the quality of data (these cases allocated less than three second per question and were deemed to have completed to survey too quickly to provide meaningful responses).

Table 2
Measure Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Effort</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Haggling</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entitled Behaviours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviours</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviours</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Dishonesty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Cynicism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards University</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narcissism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Approach</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Avoidance</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Approach</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Avoidance</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRELATIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General AE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Effort</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Hagling</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Behaviours</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviours</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism (University)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism (Profs)</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance compared to peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Performance</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
Normality of the dependent variables (Academic Entitlement Scales).

Because the dependent variables for all hypotheses were the academic entitlement subscales, normality will be discussed once, here, rather than repeated multiple times throughout the following section.

All tests of normality were significant ($p<0.01$), indicating that the assumption of normality was violated for all academic entitlement subscales. However, inspection of skewness and kurtosis values (Table 4) and histograms revealed that for the majority of subscales the departure from normality was minor. Skewness values were within the standard cut-off of +/-2. Two kurtosis values were outside the standard cut-off of +/-3: Accommodation subscale (kurtosis=3.53) and the Responsibility Avoidance subscale (kurtosis=5.54). These two subscales had low means and students tended to score below the mid-way point of the scale (Accommodation: $M=1.97$, Median= 1.75; Responsibility Avoidance: $M=1.65$, Median=1.50). Analyses proceeded as planned, noting the minor departure from normality that was not expected to significantly impact results. Where more serious departures from normality were noted, the assumption of homoscedasticity was not violated.
### Table 4

*Academic Entitlement Subscale Skewness and Kurtosis Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Academic Entitlement</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Effort</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Avoidance</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Haggling</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main findings.

Hypothesis one: Learning style.

Multiple regression analysis (MRA) was used to test this hypothesis: a series of MRAs were run, each using one subscale of the academic entitlement measure as the dependent variable and learning styles as the independent variables in all cases.

Prior to analyses the remaining assumptions were checked: (1) the absence of collinearity and (2) homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was examined based on inspection of variance inflation factors and tolerance values. Homoscedasticity was examined through inspection of scatterplots of residual by predicted academic entitlement subscale values. Because the assumption of normality was violated for some variables, it was important to ensure that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not also violated; violations of both assumptions result in unreliable standard errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were no analyses where both the assumptions of normality and the assumption of homoscedasticity were violated. Data were also screened for outliers: Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: $\chi^2(2) = 11.34$) was used to identify outliers on academic entitlement subscales and standardized residuals (cut-off: $z>|3|$) were examined to identify outliers on learning style variables. Lastly, data were screened for influential observations using Cooks Distance (cut-off: $>1$; Cook & Weisberg, 1982).

Results did not support this hypothesis; surface learning was not a significant predictor of any academic entitlement subscales. Strategic learning predicted higher General Entitlement, Reward for Effort and Customer Orientation. Deep learning predicted lower scores on Customer Service Expectations, Responsibility Avoidance, and Accommodation subscales (see Table 5 through Table 11).
### Table 5
*Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting General Entitlement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>[1.14, 3.00]</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.05]</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>0.092**</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.15]</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.04]</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001  
*significant at p<.05

R$^2$=.026
Adjusted R$^2$=.018

### Table 6
*Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting Reward for Effort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>[0.95, 3.12]</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.10]</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>0.088*</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.16]</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.04]</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001  
*significant at p<.05

R$^2$=.029
Adjusted R$^2$=.022
Table 7
*Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting Accommodation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.64, 2.96]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.05]</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.06]</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.056*</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.02]</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>R²=.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Model Fit**     |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05**

Table 8
*Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting Responsibility Avoidance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.77, 2.78]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.42]</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.01]</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.045**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>[-0.07, -0.02]</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>R²=.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Model Fit**     |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |
|                   |       |            |     |                             |     |     |           |

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05**
### Table 9
Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting Customer Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>[2.24, 4.24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.03]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>0.101*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.17]</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.03]</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$**$significant at $p<.001$

*$*$significant at $p<.05$

R$^2$=.023

Adjusted R$^2$=.015

### Table 10
Regression Results: Learning Styles Predicting Customer Service Expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>[1.95, 3.46]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.05]</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.05]</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>-0.047*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>[-0.09, -0.01]</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$**$significant at $p<.001$

*$*$significant at $p<.05$

R$^2$=.014

Adjusted R$^2$=.007
**Hypothesis two: Academic attitudes.**

Multiple regression analysis was used to test these hypotheses: a series of MRAs were run, each using one subscale of the academic entitlement measure as the dependent variable and academic attitudes as the independent variables in all cases.

Prior to analyses the remaining assumptions were checked: (1) the absence of collinearity and (2) homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was examined based on inspection of variance inflation factors and tolerance values. Homoscedasticity was examined through inspection of a scatterplot of residual by predicted academic entitlement subscale values. Because the assumption of normality was violated for some variables, it was important to ensure that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not also violated; violations of both assumptions result in unreliable standard errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were no analyses where both the assumptions of normality and the assumption of homoscedasticity were violated. Data were also screened for outliers:
EXPLORING CAUSES OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: $\chi^2(4) = 15.09$) was used to identify outliers on academic entitlement subscales and standardized residuals (cut-off: $z>|3|$) were examined to identify outliers on academic attitude variables. Lastly, data were screened for influential observations using Cooks Distance (cut-off: $>1$; Cook & Weisberg, 1982)

Results provided partial support for all hypotheses (see Table 12 through Table 18). Consistent with hypothesis 2a, academic cynicism towards the university predicted lower scores on Reward for Effort and Customer Service Expectation subscales. Academic cynicism towards the professors predicted higher General Entitlement, Reward for Effort, Accommodation, Customer Orientation, Customer Service Expectation, and Grade Haggling subscales.

Results also provided partial support for hypothesis 2b. Tolerance for academic dishonesty predicted higher General Entitlement, Reward for Effort, Accommodation, Responsibility Avoidance, and Grade Haggling subscale scores.

Lastly, results provided some support for hypothesis 2c: academic satisfaction predicted higher scores on the Reward for Effort subscale. Academic fit predicted lower scores on Reward for Effort and Accommodation subscales.
Table 12
Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting General Entitlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.85, 3.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.40]</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>[-0.35, 0.10]</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.31]</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.03]</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>R²=.040 Adjusted R²=.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Table 13
Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Reward for Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( sr )</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.70, 3.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.361*</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>[0.12, 0.61]</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.289*</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>[-0.54, -0.04]</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>-0.157*</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>[-0.31, 0.0]</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.428**</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.60]</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.03]</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ** \)significant at \( p<.001 \)
\( * \)significant at \( p<.05 \)

\( R^2=.098 \)
Adjusted \( R^2=.087 \)
Table 14
Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.70, 3.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.12]</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.202*</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>[-0.35, -0.06]</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>[0.06, 0.26]</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

R²=.116
Adjusted R²=.105
Table 15

Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Responsibility Avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.48, 2.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.08]</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>[-0.24, 0.01]</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.01]</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.03]</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>R²=.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²=.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
### Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Customer Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.13, 4.72]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>[-0.36, 0.11]</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>[-0.28, 0.20]</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.24]</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.210*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>[0.04, 0.38]</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R²=.093**  
Adjusted  
**R²=.081**

**significant at p<.001**  
*significant at p<.05
Table 17

Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Customer Service Expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>[0.92, 2.82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.23]</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>[-0.33, 0.03]</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>[-0.23, -0.01]</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>[0.22, 0.47]</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.01]</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>R²=.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted
R²=.102

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
### Regression Results: Academic Attitudes Predicting Grade Haggling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.39, 2.06]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.18]</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>[-0.21, 0.10]</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards the University</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.04]</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism towards Professors</td>
<td>0.274**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>[0.17, 0.38]</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.02]</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R² = .122**

Adjusted

**R² = .110**

**significant at p<.001**

*significant at p<.05

**Hypothesis three: Academic performance.**

Correlation analysis was used to assess the relationship between GPA and academic entitlement. GPA was not significantly correlated with academic entitlement (see Table 3).

Multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 3b: a series of MRAs were run, each using one subscale of the academic entitlement measure as the dependent variable and the two measures of academic performance as the independent variables in all cases.
Prior to analyses the remaining assumptions were checked: (1) the absence of collinearity and (2) homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was examined based on inspection of variance inflation factors and tolerance values. Homoscedasticity was examined through inspection of a scatterplot of residual by predicted academic entitlement subscale values. Because the assumption of normality was violated for some variables, it was important to ensure that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not also violated; violations of both assumptions result in unreliable standard errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were no analyses where both the assumptions of normality and the assumption of homoscedasticity were violated. Data were also screened for outliers: Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: $\chi^2(1) = 9.21$) was used to identify outliers on academic entitlement subscales and standardized residuals (cut-off: $z > |3|$) were examined to identify outliers on academic attitude variables. Lastly, data were screened for influential observations using Cooks Distance (cut-off: $>1$; Cook & Weisberg, 1982).

Results provided partial support for this hypothesis. Specifically, typical academic performance in a class was related to Reward for Effort, Accommodation, Responsibility Avoidance, and Grade Haggling; in all cases, higher academic entitlement was related to lower typical academic performance in a class. Perceived performance relative to peers’ performance was not related to any academic entitlement subscales. See Table 19 through Table 25.
Table 19

Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Predicting General Entitlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.669</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td></td>
<td>[3.23, 4.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>[-0.35, 0.03]</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>[-0.30, 0.09]</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R²=0.037
Adjusted R²=0.032

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

Table 20

Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Reward for Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.18, 3.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>[-0.30, 0.14]</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>0.292*</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>[0.06, 0.52]</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R²=0.026
Adjusted R²=0.020

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
## Table 21
\textit{Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Accommodation}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>[1.41, 2.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>[-0.20, 0.09]</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>0.172*</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.32]</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R\(^2\)=.019
Adjusted
R\(^2\)=.013

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

## Table 22
\textit{Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Predicting Responsibility Avoidance}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.16, 1.66]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.05]</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>0.166*</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>[0.04, 0.29]</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R\(^2\)=.024
Adjusted
R\(^2\)=.018

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Table 23
Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Predicting Customer Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.717</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>[3.28, 4.16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.34]</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

R²=.004
Adjusted R²=.002

Table 24
Regression Results: Perceived Academic Performance Predicting Customer Service Expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.54, 2.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived performance compared to peers</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>[-0.22, 0.10]</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical performance in a class</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.33]</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

R²=.013
Adjusted R²=.007
**Hypothesis Four: Entitled behaviour.**

Multiple regression analysis was used to test these hypotheses: a series of MRAs were run, each using one subscale of the academic entitlement measure as the dependent variable and the two entitled behaviour measures as the independent variables in all cases.

Prior to analyses the remaining assumptions were checked: (1) the absence of collinearity and (2) homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was examined based on inspection of tolerance values. Homoscedasticity was examined through inspection of a scatterplot of residual by predicted academic entitlement subscale values. Because the assumption of normality was violated for some variables, it was important to ensure that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not also violated violations of both assumptions result in unreliable standard errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were no analyses
where both the assumptions of normality and the assumption of homoscedasticity were violated. Data were also screened for outliers: Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: $\chi^2(1) = 9.21$) was used to identify outliers on academic entitlement subscales and standardized residuals (cut-off: $z>|3|$) were examined to identify outliers on academic attitude variables. Lastly, data were screened for influential observations using Cooks Distance (cut-off: $>1$; Cook & Weisberg, 1982).

Results provided support for hypothesis 4a: higher frequency of entitled behaviour predicted higher General Entitlement, Reward for Effort, Accommodation, Customer Orientation, Customer Service Expectation, and Grade Haggling subscale scores. Results did not provide support for hypothesis 4b: frequency of faculty responding to entitled behaviour with the expected result did not predict academic entitlement scores on any subscale. See Table 26 through Table 32.

Table 26

*Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting General Entitlement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.937</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>[1.39, 2.49]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.033*</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.06]</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.03]</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>R$^2$.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjusted R$^2$.029**

**significant at p<.001**

*significant at p<.05*
### Table 27
Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Reward for Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.17, 2.48]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.058**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.09]</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>R²=.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.03]</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001  
*significant at p<.05

### Table 28
Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.65, 1.50]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.040**</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.06]</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>R²=.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001  
*significant at p<.05
Table 29
Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Responsibility Avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>[0.75, 1.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.03]</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>R²=.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.20]</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

R²=.029
Adjusted

Table 30
Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Customer Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.64, 2.84]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.060**</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.09]</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>R²=.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.04]</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

R²=.072
### Table 31
*Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Customer Service Expectation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>[0.64, 1.54]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.042**</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

**R²=.057
Adjusted

### Table 32
*Regression Results: Frequency of Entitled Behaviour Predicting Grade Haggling*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.48, 1.33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behaviour</td>
<td>0.042**</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Behaviour</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

**R²=.063
Adjusted

**R²=.058
Academic entitlement subgroups.

In order to test this hypotheses, subgroups of academic entitlement had to be retrieved from the data. Using scoring coefficients identified in a previous cluster analysis, five academic entitlement subgroups were retrieved from the data. See Table 33 for demographic characteristics by group and Figure 3 for academic entitlement domain scores by group.

Table 33

*Demographic Characteristics by Academic Entitlement Subgroup*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Somewhat Narcissistic</th>
<th>Not Entitled</th>
<th>Entitled not Narcissistic</th>
<th>Reward my Effort</th>
<th>Entitled Narcissistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>23(29.9)</td>
<td>29(29.6)</td>
<td>8(20.0)</td>
<td>15(13.8)</td>
<td>9(45.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>53(68.8)</td>
<td>67(68.4)</td>
<td>30(75.0)</td>
<td>92(78.6)</td>
<td>11(55.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify as a man or women</td>
<td>1(1.2)</td>
<td>2(2.0)</td>
<td>2(5.0)</td>
<td>2(1.7)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20(26.0)</td>
<td>14(14.3)</td>
<td>14(35.0)</td>
<td>28(25.7)</td>
<td>5(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10(13.0)</td>
<td>24(24.5)</td>
<td>8(20.0)</td>
<td>30(27.5)</td>
<td>3(15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13(16.9)</td>
<td>25(25.5)</td>
<td>7(17.5)</td>
<td>23(21.1)</td>
<td>4(20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>34(44.2)</td>
<td>35(35.7)</td>
<td>11(27.5)</td>
<td>28(25.7)</td>
<td>8(40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Humanities, and Social Science</td>
<td>26(36.1)</td>
<td>15(20.5)</td>
<td>9(32.1)</td>
<td>35(38.5)</td>
<td>7(41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9(12.5)</td>
<td>14(19.2)</td>
<td>3(10.7)</td>
<td>15(16.5)</td>
<td>2(11.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exploring Causes of Academic Entitlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Somewhat Narcissistic</th>
<th>Not Entitled</th>
<th>Entitled not Narcissistic</th>
<th>Reward my Effort</th>
<th>Entitled Narcissistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14(19.4)</td>
<td>16(21.9)</td>
<td>2(7.1)</td>
<td>9(9.9)</td>
<td>2(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Kinetics</td>
<td>7(9.7)</td>
<td>9(12.3)</td>
<td>2(7.1)</td>
<td>11(12.1)</td>
<td>1(5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>6(8.3)</td>
<td>8(11.0)</td>
<td>6(21.4)</td>
<td>13(14.3)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6(8.3)</td>
<td>4(5.5)</td>
<td>4(14.3)</td>
<td>5(5.5)</td>
<td>5(29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>4(5.6)</td>
<td>4(5.5)</td>
<td>2(7.1)</td>
<td>3(3.3)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Median)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA [M(SD)]</td>
<td>75.16(15.35)</td>
<td>70.47(22.75)</td>
<td>69.91(21.70)</td>
<td>71.97(20.91)</td>
<td>72.54(9.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>84(22.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>109(29.2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>44(11.8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>117(31.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>18(4.8)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 Academic Entitlement Domains Scores by Subgroup.

Hypothesis Five. Academic entitlement subgroup analysis.

Moderation analysis was used to test these hypotheses: using the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2017) in SPSS a series of moderation analyses were run. Due to the number of analyses being run, a composite Academic Entitlement score was computed by taking the average of all subscale scores (rather than considering each subscale on its own). Seven moderation analyses were run, each using the composite Academic Entitlement score as the dependent variable. The independent variables were nine academic attitude/behaviour variables. The moderator, academic entitlement group, was dummy-coded so that the reference category was the Not Entitled group.
Prior to analyses assumptions were checked: (1) the absence of collinearity and (2) homoscedasticity. Multicollinearity was examined based on inspection of variance inflation factors and tolerance values. Homoscedasticity was examined through inspection of a scatterplot of residual by predicted academic entitlement scores. Because the assumption of normality was violated for some variables, it was important to ensure that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not also violated violations of both assumptions result in unreliable standard errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). There were no analyses where both the assumptions of normality and the assumption of homoscedasticity were violated. Data were also screened for outliers: Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: $\chi^2(8) = 27.87$) was used to identify outliers on the academic entitlement variable and standardized residuals (cut-off: $z>|3|$) were examined to identify outliers on academic attitude and behaviour variables. Lastly, data were screened for influential points using Cooks Distance (cut-off: >1; Cook & Weisberg, 1982).

Learning style.

Moderation analysis was conducted to examine whether the relationship between learning styles (Strategic learning, Surface learning, and Deep learning) and academic entitlement varies by academic entitlement group. Results revealed that academic entitlement group moderated the relationship between Deep learning and academic entitlement, but not between Strategic or Surface learning and academic entitlement (Table 34 through Table 36). The relationship between Deep learning and academic entitlement was positive for the Not Entitled Group (i.e., higher levels of Deep learning predicted higher levels of entitlement), but negative for the Entitled Narcissistic group (i.e., higher levels of Deep learning predicted lower levels of entitlement). While these
relationships were statistically significant, it should be noted that the magnitude of the coefficients in quite small.

Levels of each learning strategy varied by group (Figure 4):

1. Levels of Surface learning for the Entitled not Narcissistic group and the Entitled Narcissistic group significantly differed from the Not Narcissistic group;

2. Levels of Strategic learning for the Entitled not Narcissistic group, the Reward my Effort group, and the Entitled Narcissistic group significantly differed from the Not Narcissistic group; and,

3. Levels of Deep learning were significantly different from the Not Narcissistic group for all groups.
Table 34
_Moderation Results: Surface Learning Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>[1.69, 2.33]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.89]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.329*</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>[0.70, 1.96]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.86]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>1.762**</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>[0.83, 2.69]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning * Entitled</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.09]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Narcissistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning * Reward my</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning * Entitled</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Learning * Entitled</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.09]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Narcissistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=0.688

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Table 35
*Moderation Results: Strategic Learning Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>[1.34, 2.18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.04]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>[-0.02, 1.22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.759**</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>[0.97, 2.54]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.635*</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>[0.01, 1.27]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>1.973**</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.08]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.08]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.09]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Learning * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.683

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
# Table 36

*Moderation Results: Deep Learning Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>[0.94, 1.75]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.58**</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>[0.97, 2.19]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>2.871**</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>[2.00, 3.79]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>1.432**</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>[0.86, 2.00]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>3.014**</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>[2.08, 3.95]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.066**</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>[-0.12, -0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.078**</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>[-0.15, -0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.045*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.111**</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>[-0.19, -0.03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional Effects (By AE Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE Group</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.077*</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>[-0.15, -0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.692

**significant at p < .001**  
*significant at p < .05**
Moderation analysis was conducted to examine whether the relationship between academic well-being (academic satisfaction and academic fit) and academic entitlement varies by academic entitlement group. Results revealed that the relationship between both academic satisfaction and academic fit is moderated by academic entitlement group (Table 37 and Table 38). For academic satisfaction, the only significant relationship between academic satisfaction and academic entitlement was for the Entitled Narcissistic group. For this group, satisfaction was negatively related to academic entitlement. For the other subgroups, the relationship between satisfaction and academic entitlement was non-significant. For academic fit, similar results were found: academic fit negatively predicted academic entitlement for the Entitled Narcissistic group only, for all other subgroups this relationship was not significant.

Levels of both academic satisfaction and academic fit for each group differed significantly from the Not Entitled group. Students in the Entitled Narcissistic group
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reported the lowest levels of both satisfaction and fit, followed by students in the
Somewhat Narcissistic group and Entitled not Narcissistic group (Figure 5).

Table 37

**Moderation Results: Academic Satisfaction Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>[1.33, 2.13]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.038**</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>[0.44, 1.63]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>2.422**</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>[1.74, 3.11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>1.105**</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>[0.56, 1.65]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>3.737**</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>[2.81, 4.66]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>[-0.22, 0.08]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>[-0.29, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.08]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Satisfaction * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.554**</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>[-0.80, -0.31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional Effects (By AE Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE Group</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.480**</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>[-0.78, -0.32]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 0.703 \]

**significant at p<.001**

*significant at p<.05
### Table 38

**Moderation Results: Academic Fit Predicting Academic Entitlement**

*moderated by Academic Entitlement Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>[1.47, 2.38]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.050*</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>[0.37, 1.73]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>2.417**</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>[1.56, 3.27]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.971**</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>[0.38, 1.56]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>2.885**</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>[2.04, 3.73]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>[-0.25, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>[-0.35, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Fit * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.340*</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>[-0.57, -0.11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional Effects (By AE Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE Group</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>[-0.25, 0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>[-0.36, 0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Narcissian</td>
<td>-0.384**</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>[-0.58, -0.18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R² = 0.699

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Moderation analysis was conducted to examine whether the relationship between academic cynicism and academic entitlement varies by academic entitlement group. Results revealed that academic entitlement group moderated the relationship between cynicism towards the university and academic entitlement, but not the relationship between cynicism towards professors and academic entitlement (Table 39 and Table 40). Cynicism towards the university was positively related to academic entitlement for students in the Entitled Narcissistic group only, this relationship was not significant for other academic entitlement subgroups.
Academic cynicism towards professors and towards the university varied by group:

1. Cynicism towards professors differed significantly by academic entitlement group; each group had significantly different levels of cynicism compared to the Not Entitled group.

2. Cynicism towards the university also differed significantly by academic entitlement group. Levels of cynicism for those in the Entitled not Narcissistic group, Reward my Effort group, and Entitled Narcissistic group were significantly different from the Not Entitled group. Levels of cynicism towards the university did not differ (significantly) between the Somewhat narcissistic and Not Entitled groups.

3. In general, students in the Entitled Narcissistic group reported the highest levels of cynicism and students in the Not Entitled group reported the lowest levels of cynicism (Figure 6).
### Table 39

*Moderation Results: Academic Cynicism (towards professors) Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>[1.46, 1.98]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism (university)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.663**</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>[0.26, 1.06]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>1.864**</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>[1.30, 2.42]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.755**</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>[0.41, 1.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>1.934**</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>[1.15, 2.72]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.19]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.684

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Table 40
Moderation Results: Academic Cynicism (towards the university) Predicting Academic Entitlement moderated by Academic Entitlement Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>[1.58, 2.13]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism (university)</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.04]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>2.117**</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>[1.55, 2.68]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.626**</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>[0.25, 1.00]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Group)Entitled Narcissists</td>
<td>0.823*</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>[-0.01, 1.65]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.108*</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Reward my Effort</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Cynicism * Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.212*</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.40]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Effects (By AE Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Entitled</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.04]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Not Narcissistic</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward my Effort</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>0.183*</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.35]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.691

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
Discussion

This study was intended to explore the construct of academic entitlement in terms of how it relates to variables where consistent relationships have been reported in previous academic entitlement research, and to explore how subgroups of academic entitlement vary on measure of learning style, academic attitudes, and academic performance. While some significant relationships were found, results should be interpreted with caution as $R^2$ values are low and in many cases findings account for approximately 5% of the overall variance in the model (or less). When academic entitlement subgroup was added to the analysis (to test hypothesis five), $R^2$ values increased and accounted for substantially more variance in the models compared to when academic entitlement subgroup was not included in the analysis (hypotheses one through four). Results provided partial support for hypotheses two through five.
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**Learning Styles**

Results did not support hypothesis one; surface learning was not a significant predictor of any academic entitlement subscales. However, strategic learning predicted higher General Academic Entitlement, Reward for Effort and Customer Orientation, and deep learning predicted lower scores on Customer Service Expectations, Responsibility Avoidance, and Accommodation. This findings suggests that deep learning is related to lower scores on multiple academic entitlement domains and is supported by previous research that found a relationship between performance approach learning goals (Frey, 2015; Jackson, Singleton-Jackson, & Frey, 2011) or grade-focused learning orientation (Vallade et al., 2014; Goodboy & Frisby, 2014). Deep learning is associated with a desire to understand course material, while both performance approach and grade-focused learning goals/orientation are associated with a desire to get good grade or appear competent, rather than with a desire to understand or learn course material.

**Academic Attitudes**

Results provided partial support for hypothesis 2. Contrary to hypothesis 2a, higher levels of academic cynicism towards the university predicted lower levels of two academic entitlement subscales: Reward for Effort and Customer Service Expectation. Consistent with hypothesis 2a, higher levels of academic cynicism towards professors predicted higher levels of all academic entitlement subscales except Responsibility Avoidance. It is unexpected that the relationship between academic entitlement and the two cynicism domains is in opposite directions. It is possible that cynicism towards professors and cynicism towards the university in general manifest in different ways, and they appear to have different impacts on academic entitlement.
Cynicism towards professors may be a result of a student’s bad experience with a professor or because of someone else’s bad experience that they have heard second-hand. Students who report higher levels of cynicism towards professors were more likely to endorse academic entitlement across all domains except Responsibility Avoidance. These students appear to take some responsibility for their learning and success but also expect a great deal in return, in terms of professors granting special accommodations, expectations of customer service like treatment, and some ability to manipulate or control their grades. Cynicism towards the university might be indicative of students who expect the worst the university and are possibly withdrawn (or amotivated), therefore they don’t bother “fighting back” or using academic entitlement as a coping response. Students who are cynical of professors may be more likely to engage in academic entitlement as coping, or protective, response.

Tolerance for academic dishonesty (hypothesis 2b) was positively related to all but two academic entitlement domains: customer orientation and customer service expectation. It is interesting that the two domains related to a customer approach to education are not related to tolerance for academic dishonest while the other academic entitlement domains are. It is possible that students who view themselves as customers of the university and expect customer service-like treatment from professors hold themselves to a higher standard of integrity.

Lastly, results provided some support for hypothesis 2c: academic satisfaction predicted higher levels of Reward for Effort, and academic fit predicted lower levels of Reward for Effort and Accommodation. These results suggest that students who feel like they “fit” in their current major (i.e., their current major is a good choice for them) report
lower levels of academic entitlement, specifically related to wanting reward for their
effort and special accommodations from professors.

*Academic Performance*

Results provided partial support for hypothesis three. Specifically, typical
academic performance in a class was related to Reward for Effort, Accommodation,
Responsibility Avoidance, and Grade Haggling. In all cases, higher academic entitlement
was related to lower typical academic performance in a class. Perceived performance
relative to peer’s was not related to any academic entitlement subscales, nor was self-reported GPA.

Overall, these analyses reveal that the various domains of academic entitlement
exhibit varying relationships with the construct of interest. Relationships were consistent
across domains of academic entitlement (i.e., all in the same direction) but there was not
one relationship that was statistically significant across all domains of academic
entitlement. One thing that was common across all findings is that academic entitlement
items are more strongly endorsed by students who are seemingly having a bad, or
challenging, academic experience. Students with high levels of academic entitlement
tended to report not fitting with their program or major, poor perceived academic
performance (compared to their peers), and cynicism towards professors.

*Entitled Behaviours*

Results provided support for hypothesis 4a: frequency of entitled behaviour
predicted General Academic Entitlement, Reward for Effort, Accommodation, Customer
Orientation, Customer Service Expectation, and Grade Haggling. In all cases, more
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frequent engagement in entitled behaviour was related to higher scores on academic entitlement domains. This finding makes logical sense; students who more frequently engage in academic entitlement behaviours should report higher scores on measures of academic entitlement.

Surprisingly, results did not provide support for hypothesis 4b: frequency of faculty responding to entitled behaviour with the expected result did not predict academic entitlement scores on any subscale. Regression results did not support this hypothesis, but the correlation between academic entitlement and faculty behaviour was significant and in the expected direction. It was expected that students who more frequently encountered a professor who indulged their academic entitlement, for example by moving a test date if the student is not prepared, would report higher levels of academic entitlement. When a behaviour is rewarded it is more likely to occur in the future, but this is far too simple an explanation to account for the cause of academic entitlement. It is likely that students are more likely to engage in behaviour in the future if they receive the outcome they desire, but it is more likely that this situation reinforces an already existing attitude (i.e., academic entitlement existed before that interaction with the professor).

Subgroups of Academic Entitlement

Five Academic Entitlement subgroups were retrieved from the data. Moderation results suggested that these groups differed significantly on measures of learning orientation, academic well-being, and academic cynicism. Similar patterns in levels of surface learning and strategic learning were observed for academic entitlement groups. Students in the Not entitled group displayed the lowest levels of these learning styles, followed by students in the Somewhat narcissistic group and then the Entitled
EXPLORING CAUSES OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

Narcissistic group. Note that students in the Entitled not Narcissistic group and the Reward my Effort group displayed the highest levels of both surface and strategic learning. The pattern for deep learning was different: Students in the Somewhat Narcissistic group demonstrated the highest levels of deep learning, followed by Reward my Effort and Not Entitled. Students in the Entitled not Narcissistic and Entitled Narcissist group reported the lowest levels of Deep Learning.

Notice that on all three learning styles the Reward my Effort group scored high compared to students in the other academic entitlement subgroups (consistently having the second highest score of all subgroups). This pattern is what would be expected; students who expect reward for their effort (i.e., the ‘Reward my Effort’ group) may engage in many different study behaviours, or report engaging in many different study behaviours, to make their effort “visible”. It is possible that the expectation of reward for effort is a characteristic of student consumerism; students expect to get some (value) for the effort they put forth. Students in the Entitled not Narcissistic group scored highest on measures of surface and strategic learning and second lowest on deep learning. This pattern implies that these students are not engaged in study behaviours that lead to a deep and thorough understanding of constructs (i.e., deep learning), rather their study behaviours are motivated by course assessments and individual goals.

Academic satisfaction and academic fit were used as measures of student well-being. Students in the Entitled Narcissistic group reported the lowest levels of both academic satisfaction and academic fit and students in the Not Entitled group reported the highest levels, compared to students in all other groups. Students in the ‘Entitled Narcissistic’ group also reported the highest levels of cynicism (towards the university
and towards professors), followed by ‘Entitled not Narcissistic’, ‘Somewhat Narcissistic’, then ‘Reward my Effort’, and lastly, with the lowest levels of cynicism the ‘Not Entitled’ group. Overall, students in the Not Entitled group reported highest levels of academic well-being and the lowest levels of cynicism, while the Entitled Narcissistic group reported the opposite. In the context of past research that reported higher levels of entitlement were associated with higher levels of academic stress and lower levels of self-esteem, these findings add to the research that characterizes the entitled students as one who is having a negative or challenging academic/university experience.

A summary of patterns of learning style, academic well-being, and academic cynicism by academic entitlement group provides somewhat of a profile for each group (see Table 41). The Entitled Narcissistic group displayed low levels of academic fit and satisfaction, but high levels of cynicism compared to the other groups. These students also reported low levels of deep learning. These findings suggest that students in this group are not engaged with their learning, expect the worst of professors and the university, and would report generally low academic well-being.
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Table 41
Summary of Findings by Group (Group Profiles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE Group</th>
<th>Learning Style</th>
<th>Academic Well-being (satisfaction and fit)</th>
<th>Academic Cynicism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entitled Narcissistic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled not Narcissistic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Narcissistic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Entitled Reward my Effort</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward my Effort</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Entitled not Narcissistic group also displayed high levels of cynicism but mid-range levels of academic fit and satisfaction. This group also reported high levels of surface learning and low levels of deep learning. These findings suggest that this group of students is cynical about their university experience but is not engaged with course material and is not necessarily dissatisfied with their academic experience (but not satisfied either).

The Somewhat narcissistic group displayed interesting patterns, in that students in this group reported the highest levels of deep learning, low levels of strategic and surface learning, and only moderate levels of cynicism and well-being. These students may be students who legitimately work hard and engage in deep learning, and expect some level of reward (i.e., grade) in return. This expectation is likely legitimate, and these students may have reasonable expectations of reward based on the effort they devote to studying and mastering material.
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The Not Entitled group displayed patterns that would be expected. Students in this group reported high levels of academic fit and satisfaction, and low levels of cynicism. They also reported low levels of both strategic and surface learning but moderate levels of deep learning. These students appear to be somewhat engaged in, and interested in, mastering course material and are having a generally pleasant academic/university experience.

Lastly, the Reward my Effort group displayed high levels of all three learning strategies, this may be related to an overarching customer orientation or to the desire to make their effort “visible”. These students reported high levels of fit and satisfaction compared to the other groups and low levels of cynicism.

While groups displayed different levels of the various learning strategies, academic well-being variables, and academic cynicism, academic entitlement group moderated only some of the relationships between these variables and academic entitlement. Academic entitlement group moderated the relationships between Deep learning, academic satisfaction, academic fit, and academic cynicism towards the university with academic entitlement. In general, the Entitled Narcissistic group demonstrated the relationships that were proposed: for this group, deep learning was negatively related to academic entitlement, academic fit and academic satisfaction were both negatively related to academic entitlement, and academic cynicism was positively related to academic entitlement. For all other groups, the relationships between these constructs and academic entitlement were not statistically significant (with one exception: deep learning was positively related to academic entitlement for the Not Entitled group).

The Entitled Narcissistic group is thought to be the most “extreme” or exaggerated form
of academic entitlement; thus, it is not surprising that the expected relationships between academic entitlement and related variables are observed for this group and not necessarily for the other groups. It is also possible that using a composite academic entitlement score masked some group differences that may have been apparent had academic entitlement domain/subscale scores been used as dependent variables.

**Conclusion**

This study aimed to explore the construct of academic entitlement by examining how it related to learning style, academic attitudes, academic behaviours, and academic performance. While some support for the hypotheses was generated, effect sizes were generally small and accounted for a small portion of variance in academic entitlement subscales (hypotheses one through four). The measure of academic entitlement used in this research consisted of seven domains, across the domains of academic entitlement, relationships were consistent (i.e., all in the same direction). Another commonality across all findings was that academic entitlement was endorsed by students who reported a negative or challenging academic experience. Students with high levels of academic entitlement tended to report not fitting with their program or major, poor perceived academic performance, and cynicism towards professors. Previous research has suggested that academic entitlement is related to a negative university experience (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Jackson et al., unpublished; Frey, 2015; Boswell, 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009) and that academic entitlement may be a coping response, at least for some students (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). Results from the current study suggest that future research should consider exploring academic entitlement from a
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coping perspective, as it is likely that at least some students use academic entitlement to cope with unmet expectations, unexpected grades, and/or other negative experiences they may encounter in university.

This study also aimed to explore subgroups of academic entitlement. The subgroup analysis (hypothesis five) provided some support for the suggestion that there are different groups (or types) of academic entitlement. Five groups of academic entitlement were retrieved from the current data. Student in these groups showed different patterns of learning styles, academic well-being, and levels of academic cynicism. While students in these groups displayed different levels of these variables, academic entitlement group moderated only a few of the relationships between academic attitudes or behaviours and academic entitlement. In general, the expected relationships were found for the Entitled Narcissistic group and not the other groups. It is possible that using a composite academic entitlement score masked some group differences that may have been apparent had academic entitlement domain/subscale scores been used as dependent variables. Future research on academic entitlement should continue to explore how different types of academic entitlement might be related to causes of academic entitlement, and how different types of academic entitlement could potentially manifest in different ways.

**Limitations**

This study has a few limitations worth discussion. First, results regarding learning styles should be interpreted with caution as two of these scales (X and X learning) had low internal consistency values. Further, generalizability of the results of this study may be limited by the sample, which consisted primarily of women and social science majors.
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Future research should explore the same relationships in a more diverse sample of university and college students.
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CHAPTER 3: What are students saying about Academic Entitlement? A look at Academic Entitlement from the student perspective

A growing body of literature suggests that our understanding of academic entitlement as a construct/phenomenon is improving. However, a review of this literature reveals that, aside from a couple of studies, student voices are largely absent from the research on academic entitlement. The current body of literature suggests that academic entitlement is best defined as the tendency to possess expectations of unearned academic success, unearned/undeserved academic services, and/or the expectation of unrealistic accommodation (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2010).

Existing research on academic entitlement is dominated by quantitative studies that primarily focus on developing a measure of academic entitlement or examine correlates of academic entitlement. Much of this research has explored the relationship between academic entitlement and student consumerism (Frey, 2015; Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011). In general, researchers conclude that academic entitlement is related to an underlying consumer attitude; student consumerism may be an underlying cause of academic entitlement or a manifestation of academic entitlement. Personality and individual differences are also commonly related to academic entitlement (Boswell 2012; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002) as are parenting factors (Greenberger, Lessard, & Chen, 2008), and parenting style (Turner & McCormick, 2018; Greenberger et al., 2008). Researchers have consistently reported that academic entitlement is distinct but related to general psychological entitlement, positively related to narcissism, and could be
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associated with, or caused by, high parental expectations (i.e., high expectation related to academic performance placed on the student).

Many researchers have explored the relationship between academic entitlement and academic performance; however, findings have been inconsistent with some researchers reporting that lower grades are related to higher levels of academic entitlement and other studies suggesting that there is no relationship between the two variables (Achacoso, 2002; Greenberger et al., 2008; Kazoun 2013). Lastly, the relationship between learning styles or academic goals orientation and academic entitlement has been explored (Frey 2015; Andrey et al., 2012; Vallade, Martin, & Weber, 2014; Goodboy & Frisby 2014). Academic entitlement is consistently related to a grade-oriented learning style and a performance goal orientation.

Fewer researchers have suggested that there are subgroups of academic entitlement and even fewer have empirically explored subgroups of academic entitlement (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012; Achacoso, 2002). Subgroups of academic entitlement may illuminate causes of academic entitlement. Researchers that have explored the existence of subgroups of academic entitlement have largely defined groups based on causes of academic entitlement. Research has suggested that academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism, in response to students being unprepared, not meeting performance expectation, or perceiving unfairness (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). Academic entitlement may also be the result of a customer orientation to university, students who enter university with the perception that they are customers may be more likely to exhibit academic entitlement (Bunce, Baird, & Jones,
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2017; Frey, 2015; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2011). It has also been suggested that academic entitlement may be the result of an underlying personality trait (general entitlement or narcissism; Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014). Frey (2015) demonstrated empirical support for both a consumer model of academic entitlement and a coping model of academic entitlement, while other researchers have only theorized about the existence of subgroups of academic entitlements (Wasieleski et al., 2014; Andrey et al., 2012; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011).

A review of the literature reveals that student voices are largely absent from this body of research. Few studies have engaged students in interviews or focus groups when exploring the construct of academic entitlement. Achacoso (2002) conducted follow-up interviews with a subset of participants to explore how these students with various levels of academic entitlement discussed their university experiences. She generally noted that students with higher levels of entitlement tended to perceive higher levels of control over the university environment, were more “politically savvy” and tended to report that they got what they wanted in most situations.

Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, and Reinhardt, J. (2010) are the only researchers to take a truly qualitative approach to exploring academic entitlement. First-year undergraduate students were engaged in focus groups to discuss their views on higher education. Students were asked “consumer type” questions about the worth of their education and about their university experience. Six themes that represent facets of academic entitlement emerged:

1. Product value of education – This domain captures an expectation for something (usually a job/career) for students’ financial investment
(tuition). 63% of students responded with a careers goal as their reason for attending university

2. Social promotion – This refers to a belief that students should be rewarded for reasons other than academic performance.

3. Role of professors – Students demonstrated a general attitude that professors work for them. Participants also indicated that they knew a lot about the duties, responsibility, and schedule of their professors. Students expressed entitled attitudes towards class time and expectations of certain behaviours from professors, this attitude was attributed to the overarching customer service approach that students seem to have toward university education.

4. Teaching assistants - Student did not seem to feel as strongly about their expectations of TAs compared to professors.

5. Administrators – Again, students did not seem to feel as strongly about their expectations of university administration. The authors note that these were first year students and as such may not have had much experience with university administration at this point.

6. Shoppers as scholars – Participants were directly asked if they viewed themselves as customers of the university. Overall student responses are what you would expect to hear from a customer. Students indicated that paying tuition makes them customers and being essential to the universities very existence makes them customers (important customers).
This study was the first, and only, to explore academic entitlement attitudes empirically based on what students are saying about university education and their opinions of, and experiences with, higher education. The results suggested that students view themselves as consumers; university education is a product and they are the consumers of this product. This study laid the groundwork for future conceptualization of academic entitlement as student consumerism.

Though there has been some recent agreement on the correlates of academic entitlement, the causes of academic entitlement are less clear and student voices are noticeably lacking from the literature. This study aimed to provide a voice to students by asking them about academic entitlement and their experiences in university. The purpose of this study was to explore some of the possible causes of academic entitlement using qualitative methodology.

**Research Question**

What do students themselves say about their academic entitlement (i.e. how do they interpret, discuss, and justify attitudes and behaviours consistent with the definition of academic entitlement)?

**Method**

**Participants.**

Participants (N=8) were recruited from a sample of undergraduates who participated in survey research on the same topic. After completing the survey, participants were asked to provide their name and contact information if they wished to participate in an interview where they would be asked about their experiences in
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university (N=132). Interview participants had varying levels of academic entitlement, tended to be in their first or fourth year of study, and were predominantly women (see Table 42 for participant profiles).
### Table 42

*Participant Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>GPA (self-reported)</th>
<th>General Reward for Effort</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Responsibility Avoidance</th>
<th>Customer Orientation</th>
<th>Customer Service Expectation</th>
<th>Grade Haggling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication Media Information</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Visual Arts</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Academic Entitlement Subscale scores are calculated as means and range from 1.00 (low academic entitlement) to 7.00 (high academic entitlement).

Subscale $M(SD)$:
- General: 3.04(1.57)
- Accommodation: 1.84(0.84)
- Customer Orientation: 4.06(1.70)
- Grade Haggling: 1.81(0.81)
- Reward for Effort: 3.22(1.85)
- Responsibility Avoidance: 1.34(0.27)
- Customer Service Expectation: 2.09 (0.66)
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Procedure.

Interviews ranged in length from 45 to 90 minutes and were all conducted in the same location (an office in the psychology department). The purpose of the interviews was to gather a more comprehensive understanding of the experience of entitlement from the perspective of the student. When participants arrived for the interview they were greeted by the researcher, offered water, and asked to read over a consent form. Once the participant had read over the consent form, the researcher reviewed the consent form with them and confirmed that they wished to continue with the interview. At this point, the recording device was turned on; all interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Participants were first asked what program they were enrolled in and what year of study they were in. The first interview questions were designed to make the participant feel comfortable and were intended to engage the participant in conversation about their university experience. To help establish rapport, the researcher then asked the participants to talk about their university experience so far, in general (e.g., what courses they had liked and why, if they had joined any school clubs, etc.). Participants were also asked why they decided to come to university.

The next questions asked the student to think about the expectations that they had before coming to university; for some participants this required them to think back only a couple of months, but for other participants (those not in their first year) it required them to think back a couple of years. It was noted that this will likely impact a participant’s response. Someone who was remembering an expectation from many years ago may have been more likely to remember an expectation that was not met or had strong emotions attached to it. Whereas, participants who were only recalling expectations from a few
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months ago may have more easily recalled expectations regardless of whether they were met or unmet. Participants were asked to discuss their expectations coming to university and then asked to think about whether those expectations changed over time, and what caused them to change.

Participants were asked about an unfair experience that they had encountered in university. They were asked to think about why the situation was unfair, how they responded to it, and whether the end result was fair. Participants were asked to reflect on, and discuss, why they responded in the way they did.

Following the unfair experience discussion, it was originally intended that the researcher would discuss participants responses and reactions to questions on the AES (which all participants completed for the study described in Chapter two). The plan was to focus on domains where the participant scored high (i.e., demonstrated academic entitlement), however, after the first two interviews it was apparent that student feedback and reactions to domains that they scored low on would also be important. Participants were asked to review a subset of AES items, one or two from each domain, and discuss their reactions to the item. The majority of participants did not remember how they responded to the items when they first saw them in the survey. Participants reviewed the AES domains in the same order that questions are asked on the questionnaire, starting with General Academic Entitlement and ending with Grade Haggling.

Finally, students were asked to talk about something positive that they had experienced during their time in university. The purpose of this question was to lighten the mood in case of any distress that may have been caused by talking about an unfair
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experience in university, and to ensure that the student left the interview feeling good about their university experience.

Data analysis: Thematic Analysis.

Data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously. As the interviews were completed they were transcribed, and transcripts were analyzed. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013) was used to guide the data analysis process. The researcher had a few pre-determined coding schemes: customer orientation, academic entitlement as a coping response, a theme related to effort deserving reward, and potentially a theme related to general entitlement or narcissism. Pre-determined and new themes were coded as they emerged. The coding process was iterative, and transcripts were analyzed multiple times as new themes emerged.

As each interview was transcribed, the researcher noted any themes that were apparent and any notes about that interview that were relevant to analysis (e.g., whether the participant was engaged or if there were distractions outside the closed door). This process was followed for all eight interviews/transcripts. Once all interviews had been completed and transcribed, the researcher read through all transcripts and compiled a comprehensive list of emerging themes. The themes were then re-categorized (e.g., some themes were combined) and all transcripts were re-coded using the new list of themes. The list of themes was once again reviewed and condensed, and one final round of coding was completed on all transcripts.

In the Results and Discussion section below, the following terms are used: all, many, some, few. These terms are used consistently. ‘All’ is used when the theme was present in all transcripts. ‘Many’ or ‘Nearly all’ was used when the theme was present in
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more than 75% but not all of the transcripts. ‘Some’ was used when 25-50% of the transcripts exhibited the theme. And ‘few’ was used when less than 25% of transcripts exhibited a theme.

Results and Discussion

General observations.

Students were relatively open about their university experiences; both positive and negative. There were some students who exhibited more obvious signs of academic entitlement as it has been defined for this study. These students tended to think that the university and/or professors should change the way they do things to better suit the students’ needs or preferences. They tended to talk as if they had a level of control over their university experience, either because they paid tuition or because they were a unique individual with unique learning needs. A few students were resistant to discussing academic entitlement domains that they had strongly endorsed when they completed the AES questionnaire previously, while others were happy to discuss, and often justify, why they endorsed specific academic entitlement domains. There were no obvious similarities or differences between the students who were resistant to discussing academic entitlement domains that they endorsed and students who openly discussed these domains.

How do students talk about their university experiences? Main themes.

Two of the four pre-determined themes clearly emerged: “Student Consumerism” and “Effort, Fairness, and Deservingness”. A third pre-determined theme, “Coping”, was apparent in a few emerging themes: “Transition to University”; “Unmet Expectations”;
“Cynicism”; and, “Externalizing Responsibility (Blaming Professors)”. The fourth pre-determined theme, “General Entitlement” manifest in students’ opinions that they are unique and deserve a unique learning experience, this theme, in some cases appeared to be related to a customer orientation (i.e., wanting a personalized experience because the student has as a consumer-mentality). See Table 43 for a summary of main themes and subthemes.

Table 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition to University (Coping)</th>
<th>Student Consumerism</th>
<th>Effort, Fairness, and Deservingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Unmet Expectations</td>
<td>Expectation of Customer Service-Like Treatment</td>
<td>(no subthemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>Expectation of Accommodation and/or a Personalized Learning Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Responsibility</td>
<td>Feelings of Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aging Professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Theme: Transition to university (Coping)*

Nearly all students discussed the transition from high school to university. This could be due to the fact that many of those interviewed were first year students, however, even third- and fourth-year students mentioned this transition period. There was agreement among most participants that the first year, or the first two years, of university is about learning how to be a student and learning how to navigate the university environment.
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ID-105: “It just first year, so there’s not a lot of pressure, I’m just figuring out how to learn, it’s different from high school. I have to learn to study differently, it doesn’t work the same.”

ID-107: “It’s definitely gotten easier throughout the years, to know how teachers or professors will be with the way they teach or anything they do.”

Predictably, students spoke about both positive and negative aspects of their transition. Overall, students who were generally positive about their transition talked about being prepared for first year because they attended a tour or open house prior to arriving on campus for their first day of classes. Some of these students also talked about feeling a “good fit” with their selected program/major and effectively using resources provided by the university (e.g., Skills to Enhance Personal success (STEPS) workshops, writing support, etc.). Many of these students talked about peer support as an important component of a successful transition into university.

ID-105: “We had workshops for transitions from high school to university and we have those tours when we get out of high school, so I thought the transition was pretty easy.”

ID-101: “Nothing really surprised me. I had been here before and my classes had done tours here.”

ID-101: “Maybe its because I chose a program that fits my strengths. I think my high school prepared me to university. I had a lot of good teachers with high expectations and high workloads”

ID-107: “Because I knew enough people, I think that made it easier.”

Students who talked about difficult aspects of their transition talked about being unprepared, feeling uncertain, and having unmet expectations (realistic or not). These students also tended to be change resistant and felt overwhelmed with their university experience.
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ID-104: “It was been difficult for me to get involved with a lot of things because I’m just trying to figure about what’s going on. I’m trying to stabilize myself and adjust to university. There have been some pros and cons. It’s a lot better than high school but there have been some difficulties.”

ID-108: “When I met with the professor from the...department and I expected all other departments to be like that and they are very different.”

ID-108: You come in and you think oh I’m just an English major and so I’ll only take English classes. And then first year I took Spanish and was in that every day with my English classes. You go in thinking okay I’m ready, I’m prepared for my major and then it’s like just kidding you need to know a bunch of other stuff too. Which isn’t a bad thing it makes you more diverse. It’s daunting.

ID 107: “I didn’t know what to expect at all. I didn’t really ask anybody just wanted to see how it goes.”

ID-106: “It’s always hard for me to get into a grove with people who don’t already know my work needs and accommodations.”

ID-104: “I was really confused. I had to think hard about what my passion is.”

ID-102: “That program wasn’t a good fit for me, it didn’t go well.”

Current academic entitlement research has discussed the possibility of unmet expectations resulting in academic entitlement. For students whose transition to university is not easy, perhaps in cases where they do not understand the rules and norms of university, academic entitlement may serve as a coping mechanism. Rather than coping with stress due to uncertainty or unmet expectations, academic entitlement may be used to cope with a lack of understanding of how the university environment functions. Additionally, when students transition to university they may see a decline in grades from high school, academic entitlement may be used as a coping strategy to compensate for a
lack of ability or lack of skills to succeed in university (similar to the way self-efficacy is related to academic entitlement).

Subtheme: Responses to unmet expectations

Students had varying responses to their unmet expectations early on in university. Many students adjusted their expectations after learning what was expected from them.

   ID-108: “Yeah, [my expectations] definitely changed. As I saw that different professors do things, some of them, very differently... When you get here it’s like oh my god some of them just do some things so differently and once you realize that you have to figure out where your expectations have to fall because they aren’t all going to be like the first teacher that I met.”

   ID-107: “I kind of know what to expect now and I know what [professors] expect of me. There’s some [professors] that are more personable, everyone is going to be different, but now what I know what to expect I don’t find it so difficult to understand the ways that they’re teaching and the ways they like to mark or grade exams. It’s definitely gotten easier throughout the years to know how teachers or profs will be with the way they teach or anything they do.”

   ID-106: “I think just because of the experience that I have had... you kind of become accustomed to certain routines that come with university, like you become more used to the fact that there will be more demands from you so your expectations become more realistic as to how you handle things and having to deal with questions every year, with experience comes awareness or you understand more this is how it’s going to go on it’s not that different from other courses.”

A few students expected professors or the university to adjust to their expectations. When students had unrealistic expectations but did not identify the need to adjust their expectations, they tended to voice feelings of frustration, defeat, and stress. Some students talked about being overwhelmed by the difficulty of first year courses and finding this unreasonable.
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ID-102: “Coursework is manageable, but I do feel that teachers don’t take into account that you have a lot of other classes and that you do have to sleep sometimes. I’m a pretty good student but keeping up with being the most amazing student that they want you to be, to have time to read everything you’re supposed to read and do all the assignments and get them checked by people before you hand them in and have time to be, it’s not a possibility. You either have to give up your social life or something, you can’t do it all! ... I think trying to finish a 4-year degree in 4 years isn’t something a lot of people can do, and I don’t know a lot of people that will be graduating in 4 years.”

ID-102: “There are other things I have to do in life that aren’t school”

ID-104: “It’s an introductory class and he has high expectations.... this class is so much more difficult and unnecessarily difficult.

Subtheme: Cynicism

Many students expressed an expectation that professors would not care about them. There was a consistent expectation that professors should be mentors and should invest in their students’ learning, but, largely, students expected that professors would not fill these roles and would not care about their well-being or learning.

ID-105: “I expected professors to not really know my name and just talk in front of the class and then leave.”

ID-104: “I think it’s just been really difficult because your ability to learn quickly impacts your overall average and its unfair when some classes are just like purposely there to try and fail you because that professor has no shame and thinks their class is so hard you can’t pass. I think that totally ruins the university experience.”

ID-102: “In my experience, university feels more out of touch than in touch with students.”

ID-102: “People are here for different reasons. Half are here because they want to be here and learn, and the other half are here because its what their parents want them to do. And I think that teachers assume that we all don’t want to be here.”
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ID-101: “[University is] a much more impersonal experience than high school, but I expected that.”

ID-106: “First year classes put a lot of information on students and I don’t think that’s fair, I don’t think so much information in an intro course is fair because that might limit someone’s ability to perform to their standards. You’re pretty much setting people up for failure when you do it that way, so I think in first year there should be some sort of limit on things that can be put in course work because I think it is a lot and its very particular.”

ID-102: “I understand there are teachers that weed kids out but they are paying you to come here, they are paying you, why would you kick them out of the school that is your salary you are throwing out of the school. And regardless of that these kids whether they are coming here for the right reasons isn’t your judgement call…”

Subtheme: Externalizing responsibility

Some student’s explicitly blamed professors for an outcome that was perceived to be unfair (usually a course or assignment grade).

ID-107: “Professors do have a big impact on how students do in class.”

ID-106: “The prof was pretty mean the whole time. Not understanding what so ever over the fact that I have a learning disability and need to be taught a certain way and our class only had like maybe 10 kids in it so I was like sitting there and he would explain things a certain way and none of us would understand how he was getting to where he was and I had to tell him that and he was like well its simple you just go like this and explained it the same way and he wouldn’t even elaborate – he would just say this is what I just did and he wouldn’t show me how he got to what he got and I was looking at everything and saying I’ve seen this 8 times and I don’t understand.”

ID-104: I do have one class where I’m having difficulty.... I do have this one professor, I have to admit has passionate, but it’s a terribly organized course. His expectations are so high for something that is a first-year class. Its an introductory class and he has this high expectation. This class is so much more difficult and unnecessarily difficult.”
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*ID-102: “that program wasn’t a good fit for me, it didn’t go well. The professor who ran it wasn’t a good fit.”*

**Theme: Student Consumerism**

This theme emerged in nearly all transcripts and encompassed a few emerging themes (categorized as subthemes). Previous academic entitlement research has identified an underlying consumer attitude or customer orientation among students. Gokcen (2014) defined student consumerism by equating the relationship between student and university to the relationship between customer and service/product provider. While not all researchers conclude that student consumer attitudes are detrimental (e.g., this dynamic gives students a voice and a say in their educational experience), in terms of the development of academic entitlement student customer orientation or student consumerism may serve to enhance feelings of entitlement.

Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, and Reinhardt (2010) conducted focus groups with 52 first-year undergraduate students. Students were asked “consumer type” questions about the worth of their education and about their university experience. Six themes emerged, these themes represented facets of academic entitlement: Product value of education; Social promotion; Role of Professors; Teaching Assistants; Administrators; and, Shoppers as Scholars. Some of these themes overlap with themes that emerged from this analysis. The subthemes that emerged include, Value for Money; Expectation of Customer Service-Like Treatment Under the Guide of Respect; Expectations of Accommodation and/or a Personalized Learning Experience; Feelings of Control.
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Subtheme: Value for Money

A few students specifically mentioned getting the best value for their money. Many students talked about, or alluded to, conserving energy and not expecting to work too hard to get their degree. “Learning how to play the system” to achieve a desired outcome has been discussed in previous academic entitlement research (see Frey, 2015; Achacoso, 2002).

ID-103: “My first couple of years I was more motivated and more enthused. Now what’s the point I’m never going to use this I don’t care about this, so I’ll just slink by and get a 60 or 70, return on investment.”

ID-104: “I expected it to be a lot harder. Once you figure out how to get good grades you don’t engage in the subject.”

Subtheme: Expectation of Customer Service-Like Treatment Under the Guise of Respect

Some students exhibited expectations of customer service-like treatment, particularly when talking about an expectation of “respect” from professors. This attitude was often accompanied by the idea that professors do not respect students or could be more respectful of students.

ID-107: “If you’re paying a lot, all this money. It’s not that you deserve to be entertained but I hope my profs can respect the fact that we’re here paying this much, and you should put together something that’s engaging. I don’t need to be entertained, I don’t need you up there juggling or anything, but I think with, like I respect that you’re teaching but respect the fact that I’m paying a lot of money to be here.”

ID-102: “I think that we’re customers and we deserve to be treated with respect just like professors deserve to be treated with respect.”
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Subtheme: Expectations of Accommodation and/or a Personalized Learning Experience

Many students expressed a desire for a personalized university experience. They wanted professors to manage their schedules and coordinate with other classes so that assignments and tests were staggered in order to reduce stress. There was a general expectation among many that it was the job of the professors and the university to make the learning experience pleasant and pain free. Nearly all students expressed a desire to have more input in how their classes were taught.

ID-108: “I think the university could do more to help students get the grades they want.”

ID-106: “I think that you shouldn’t be failing to begin with, you should at least get a 50% if you complete [an assignment].”

ID-107: “Generally speaking, I think students should have some form of input with how classes are taught but I mean they’re not the professionals and aren’t going to school to be a teacher necessarily, so they [students] don’t know.”

ID-104: “I think in first year we should have some input in how our classes are taught because first year is crucial to building an understanding and learning.”

ID-102: “You’re paying for the customer service as well. Like if you’re going to the store to buy a shirt. This is a store, we come here, and you take away something. The same way the customer’s always right, we’re the customer so we should get a say in how we’re taught, right.”

ID-102: “You’re with these teachers all the time and I think a part of their job is to inspire you to love the career you’re going to have.”

Subtheme: Feeling of Control

Some students talked about feeling in control and like they could “manage” their professors to achieve a desired outcome. This finding replicates previous research that
found that students behaved like “smart consumers”; students with higher levels of academic entitlement were more “politically savvy” (Achacoso, 2002).

\[\text{ID-108: “...but professor wise, I realized I had to manage that a little bit...”}\]

\[\text{ID-106: “It’s always hard for me to get into a groove with people who don’t already know my work needs and accommodations.”}\]

\[\text{ID-106: “I do think we should be given a lot more say in how our classes are being taught because at the end of the day we are the ones paying for tuition and if a class is taught poorly or is structured not the greatest that can really affect how we end up.”}\]

**Subtheme: Aging/old profs**

Some students wanted to see a new generation of teacher; “new faces” “new ideas”. There was a common perception that old/aging professors were stubborn and out of touch with the current generation of students, and ultimately getting in the way of student success.

\[\text{ID-108: “...and he was an aging professor...He was an older prof so very like stuck, you couldn’t even bring a laptop into his classroom, very stuck in the older ways of teaching.”}\]

\[\text{ID-107: “I know there are a lot of eager younger people wanting to come up, or more experienced people, or people more dedicated to their jobs...maybe some people here are not as engaged as they used to be. So, with a whole bunch of younger people coming up, and they don’t necessarily have to be younger, but newer faces and maybe newer ideas need to be brought up or I think we need to... I don’t know I think there are some professors I can’t get engaged with because they seem not engaged themselves. So, on top of adequate teachers maybe looking at the job prospects and saying it’s time to bring in some new faces.”}\]

\[\text{ID-102: “you can’t teach an old dog new tricks, but you can force them to attend yearly training”}\]
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It is possible that this perceived notion of control, or perception that students should have more control, and comments related to aging professors are related to cynicism (i.e., a general distrust of professors), or to externalizing responsibility and blame; in either case, some students admitted that they expected the worst of professors or felt like professors were not on their side. Other students, however, talked about positive and uplifting experiences that they have had with professors.

**Theme: Effort, Fairness, and Deservingness**

A common theme in academic entitlement research is the idea that effort should be rewarded (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009). This theme was apparent in these transcripts as well and students tended to justify their expectation of reward for effort by saying that it was “fair” to reward effort and/or that they “deserved” to be rewarded (usually with a grade) because of the effort that they put out.

*ID-108: “For putting effort into an assignment I think that should count for something. I think that a lot of students don’t put a lot of effort into coming to class as much as they should. So, attending the lectures should somewhat have an effect on your grade.”*

*ID-108: “I think grades are important so you should get what you deserve.”*

*ID-107: “The idea that effort should be rewarded isn’t necessarily wrong. I can kind of agree –there are profs that give extra credit for showing up to class, there’s your praise and easy marks. I have a class on Thursday nights that I show up to and do the activity quickly to get marks. Some professors do that, and I think its great. It’s a reward for coming to class.”*

*ID-106: “I get kind of [angry] when I’m sitting there and putting in so much work and nobody else is doing anything. I just don’t think that’s fair.”*
Differences between Students with Low and High Academic Entitlement Scores

Interviews from two students with low scores on the academic entitlement subscales (ID 103 and 108) were compared to interviews from three students with higher scores on the academic entitlement subscales (ID 102, 105, and 106). There were few differences between students with low levels of academic entitlement compared to students with higher levels of academic entitlement. Students with higher scores on the academic entitlement subscale gave significantly longer interviews than those with lower academic entitlement scores. Students with higher academic entitlement scores were also more likely to talk about a difficult transition from high school to university. While some differences were noted, one similarity did stand out between students with low and high scores on academic entitlement: both groups exhibited a customer orientation.

Two students with lower academic entitlement scores (< 3.00) gave substantially short interviews than students with higher level of academic entitlement (these interviews were approximately 30-40 minutes in length). Both of these students were upper-year students (one 3rd year, one 4th year). These students had similar scores on the academic entitlement subscales, but their interviews shared few similarities. One student appeared to have low levels of academic entitlement because they were withdrawn and disengaged with their university experience. They talked about “just getting by with a 60 or 70” instead of putting in extra effort to achieve better grades, and learning to “play the system” in order to put in the least amount of effort possible but still get a good “return on investment”. The second student with low levels of academic entitlement appeared to be goal driven and discussed taking responsibility for their learning and achievement and putting in the hard work to achieve their future career goals. Both of these students have
low scores on the academic entitlement subscales but the underlying reason for these scores is likely different: one student is withdrawn and the other is fully invested in their education. Among students with higher academic entitlement scores, more similarities than differences were observed.

Three students with higher scores on the academic entitlement subscales (>3.50) gave interviews that exceeded 60 minutes in length. Using the same interview guide and similar prompts, these students had more to say about their university experience than students with lower academic entitlement scores. Despite two of these students being upper-year students (4th year), they talked in-depth about difficult transitions from high school to university and had high expectations of professors (i.e., thought that professors would make accommodations for them). They were more likely to blame professors for bad grades and more likely to expect a “personalized learning experience” than students with lower levels of academic entitlement. Transcripts from all three of these students had hints of cynicism throughout. These students said things like, … “first year classes put a lot of information on students, and I don’t think that’s fair. You’re setting people up for failure…” and “I think that teacher assume that we all don’t want to be here.” All three of these students appeared the be relying on academic entitlement as a coping response; either to unmet expectations or as a result of the cynical views they held.

Interestingly, students with both low and high scores on the academic entitlement subscales exhibited a customer orientation throughout the interviews. The student with lower academic entitlement appeared to be most focused on return for investment. This student wanted to ensure that they got the grade they were striving for, while at the same time expending the least amount of effort possible. This student also seemed to think that
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their degree would not benefit them in the future: “I’m not super enthused by what I’m doing…. I’m never going to use this, I don’t care.” Students with higher levels of academic entitlement expressed their customer orientation in different ways. These students were more concerned with being able to control or predict professors’ expectations. These students also viewed their university education as a transaction: “This is a store, we come here and we take something away.” Both groups exhibited a customer orientation towards their university experience and both groups seemed to view their education as a transaction. However, those with the highest academic entitlement scores were more likely to report acting like what Achacoso (2002) called “smart consumers”: they placed more emphasis on being able to control professors and predict or alter professor’s expectations.

Conclusion

This qualitative study brought student voices to the research and explored common themes that emerged when students were engaged in a conversation about their university experience and academic entitlement. Results from this study showed that three main themes emerged: Transition to University (Coping); Student Consumerism; and, Effort Fairness, and Deservingness (see Table 43). Previous research would suggest that the expectation of reward for effort (main theme #3) would be related to student consumerism, however nearly all students exhibited this attitude at some point during the interview and it was not obviously connected to a customer attitude. Students tended to believe that effort should be considered in grades. Students also thought that it was unfair to reward someone with a grade if they did not put forth any effort, and that it was unfair to not reward someone with a grade if they did put effort into completing an assignment.
The expectation of reward for effort was related to perceptions of fairness, rather than student consumerism, in this study.

These findings are supported by current academic entitlement research that suggests the cause of academic entitlement is an underlying consumer attitude and/or that academic entitlement is a coping response. Academic entitlement researchers have long suspected that a customer orientation or underlying consumer attitude was related to academic entitlement (Bunce, Baird, & Jones, 2017; Frey 2015; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010; Achacoso, 2002). These students view themselves as customers of the university, under this model academic entitlement is a result of the customer attitude (or student consumerism). This type of academic entitlement clearly emerged in this study. Students talked about getting the best value for their money and expressed expectations that university would not be too hard. Students also expected customer-service-like treatment from professors and expected “respect” in return for the money they pay to attend university. They also expected professors to provide them with a flexible and personalized learning experience. Lastly, some students expressed perceptions of having control over professors and knowing how to “manage” professors to ensure a desired outcome (usually a grade).

A coping-type of academic entitlement also clearly emerged from this research and was most apparent among students who scored highest on the academic entitlement subscales. Previous academic entitlement research has pointed to the existence of a coping type of academic entitlement; based on a review of the literature, three coping groups were proposed above. First, a group of students that have unrealistic academic expectations that might engage in academic entitlement when their expectations are not
met (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). Findings from this study support the existence of this group. Nearly all students talked about having unmet expectations when they arrived at university. While some students talked about adapting their expectations once arriving at university and adjusting to the rules and culture (and learning what was expected of them as students), many students talked about expecting professors to adapt the expectations they had of students and expecting professors to accommodate students with a personalized learning experience.

A second coping type, or group, of academic entitlement may be students who have difficulty meeting academic demands and goals. Research has suggested that if students are not meeting the demands imposed by either themselves or their parents, they may exhibit academic entitlement as a coping response (Frey, 2015; Stafford, 2013; Greenberger, 2008). These students likely have an external locus of control and lower levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem compared to their less entitled peers (Boswell, 2013; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011, Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). While this group did not clearly emerge in this study, this study does provide some support for the existence of this group. Some students exhibited an external locus of control, primarily related to blaming professors for outcomes that students deemed unfair (usually a grade on an assignment or in a course).

A third coping type of academic entitlement may be students that are sensitive to perceived inequity and exhibit academic entitlement to cope with, or correct, the perceived inequity. Research has suggested that entitlement may be linked to selfish behaviour and may result from feelings of injustice (Vallade et al., 2014; Miller, 2013;
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Zitek et al., 2010). Students who exhibit this type of entitlement may use academic entitlement as a coping mechanism or response to feeling wronged. Equity theory (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987) supports the existence of this subgroup, and assumes that some individuals are more sensitive to perceived injustice than others. While this group or type of academic entitlement did not clearly emerge, it is interesting to note that the expectation of reward for effort was related to perceptions of fairness, rather than student consumerism.

Overall, two main causes of academic entitlement emerged: Customer Orientation and Coping. Though a small sample size may limit the generalizability of these findings, future research should continue to involve students in conversations about academic entitlement. Speaking directly with students will help to illuminate some of the causes of academic entitlement. The underlying causes of academic entitlement may point to potential routes of intervention or ways to reduce academic entitlement.
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CHAPTER 4: Do Academic Entitlement and Frustration about an Unfair Task Predict Students’ Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty: An Experimental Study

Academic entitlement has been linked to a plethora of maladaptive academic attitudes and behaviours, like disruptive classroom behaviour (Zhu & Anagondahalli, 2017), academic dishonesty (Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff, 2018; Elias, 2017; Boswell, 2012), and bargaining with professors for grades (Greenberger et al., 2008). It is also associated with maladaptive goal orientation and learning styles (Andrey et al., 2012; Frey 2015; Goodboy & Frisby 2014; Vallade, Martin, & Weber, 2014); and with poor academic outcomes (Frey, 2015; Wasieleski et al., 2014; Kazoun, 2013). Some researchers have speculated that entitlement may function as a coping mechanism to deal with feelings of frustration, unfairness, or a perceived personal wrong (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Miller, 2013; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). It has been argued that entitlement explains differing reaction to unfairness; entitlement in general, is a trait on the “equity sensitivity spectrum”, where the spectrum ranges from benevolent to entitled (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987).

Equity theory stipulates that fairness is perceived differently by different people, but what is common among all people is that when one’s input-output ratio is not equivalent to someone else’s (in the same situation), and unfairness is perceived, dissonance will result. Dissonance will make a person uncomfortable and they may attempt to resolve the dissonance. An entitled person will more sensitive to the perceived unfairness or inequality than a benevolent person and at an extreme, the entitled person will never perceive fairness, and the benevolent person will never perceive unfairness, regardless of the situation (Huseman et al., 1987).
Early research on academic entitlement identified frustration as a component, or precursor, of academic entitlement. This research claimed that academic entitlement is a compensatory response to feeling wronged or perceiving an unfair situation (Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). This research speculated that academic entitlement functions primarily as a coping response to mitigate frustration that results from unmet academic (likely unrealistic) expectations or unexpected outcomes. More recent research has echoed the notion that frustration may evoke academic entitlement and associated behaviour. For example, Barton and Hirsch (2016) claimed that students who enter university with unrealistic expectations may experience cognitive dissonance and frustration when confronted with an academic setting that does not meet their expectations. Students who lack the self-regulation skills necessary to adapt and succeed in the unexpected environment may respond with academic entitlement.

Equity theory also made its debut in academic entitlement research relatively early on but, in general, has not been a common area of study in the field of academic entitlement. Miller (2013) equated academic entitlement with a preference for academic equity. He used an equity framework to argue that students’ preference for academic equity was related to academic entitlement; further, he argued that students’ preference for academic equity would predict perceptions of grade fairness better than traditional measures of academic entitlement. Results demonstrated support for the notion that preference for academic equity and academic entitlement are similar constructs, and that preference for academic equity predicted grade fairness better than traditional measures of academic entitlement. Miller stressed that both measures assess similar constructs. In
conclusion, he argued that academic entitlement is best explained by a measure of preference for academic equity.

Models of academic entitlement.

It is likely that frustration is not the only cause of academic entitlement and behaviours associated with it. A common theme in recent research on academic entitlement has been the idea that subgroups of academic entitlement exist. Subgroups of academic entitlement are generally based on suspected causes of academic entitlement, and researchers have largely identified a coping-type or consumer-type of academic entitlement (e.g., Achacoso, 2002; Chowning and Campbell, 2009; Frey, 2015; Warren, 2013; Vallade et al., 2014).

While earlier research investigated correlates of academic entitlement in an attempt to understand the phenomenon, model testing remains a relatively new technique in academic entitlement research. Model testing has provided further support for the hypothesis that frustration is linked to academic entitlement and associated behaviours, like academic dishonesty. Two models of academic entitlement have been empirically tested in recent research: (1) Consumer (Frey, 2015; Warren, 2013), and (2) coping (Frey, 2015; Vallade et al., 2014). The models are explained in detail below:

Consumer model.

The consumer model does not provide support for the frustration/equity hypothesis, but is interesting and well documented nonetheless. Much of the existing academic entitlement research has suggested that a customer mindset or attitude is associated with academic entitlement. Researchers have commented on the rise of student
consumerism and the increasing number of students who view their educational exchanges as financial interactions. In the most extreme cases academic entitlement is defined as student consumerism (Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012).

Early academic entitlement research identified customer attitudes and expectations as an important component or characteristic of academic entitlement. Achacoso (2002) reported that students with higher levels of academic entitlement had a consumer attitude and appeared to behave like “smart consumers”. These students attempted to maximize their performance (e.g., achieve high grades) while minimizing their effort. They tended to be grade-focused rather than learning-focused.

Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, Reinhardt (2010) identified six domains of academic entitlement, two of which could be considered consumer-oriented. The first, “Product Value of Education”, captures an expectation of something (usually a job/career) for students’ financial investment (e.g., tuition); 63% of students responded with a career goal as their reason for attending university, while only 9% mentioned learning or knowledge as their motivation for attending university. The second domain, “Shoppers as Scholars”, reflects students’ responses to being directly asked if they viewed themselves as customers of the university. Overall student responses were what you would expect to hear from a customer. Students indicated that paying tuition make them customers and that being essential to the existence of the university made them customers. This finding has been echoed in recent research; some researchers have included customer orientation in their measurement or definition of academic entitlement (Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Jeffres, Barclay, & Stolte, 2014; Hartman, 2012; Kopp et al., 2011; Jackson, Singleton-
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Jackson, & Frey, 2011; Lippmann, Bulanda, & Wagenaar, 2009; Chowning & Campbell, 2009).

This model is most likely related to locus of control and to learning orientation (Stafford, 2013; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). Students who view themselves as consumers are likely to externalize responsibility by holding the university or professor accountable for their success, and to be focused on achieving the best grade (or the best product) for their money.

**Coping model.**

A second model of academic entitlement that has been tested in recent research is a coping model. The coping model is directly related to the frustration/equity hypothesis. In this model academic entitlement is thought to be a coping strategy to deal with the demands of university. Achacoso (2002) and Chowning and Campbell (2009) were the first to suggest that academic entitlement may be a coping response. They hypothesized that academic entitlement may be a response to mitigate frustration created by unmet expectations and/or academic difficulties. More recent research has also discussed the coping theory of academic entitlement (Frey, 2015; Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Stafford, 2013).

Academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism to help students deal with unmet expectations (Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002), with the demands of university coursework (Stafford, 2013; Greenberger, 2008), or with perceived injustice (Miller, 2013; Zitek, 2010). For example, researchers have suggested that academic entitlement might result from frustration when students’ expectations are not met and that some students have unrealistic expectations (Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002).
Unrealistic expectations that students bring with them to university have been linked to grade inflation and high parental expectations (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008). While other researchers have not specifically mentioned unrealistic expectations, they have indicated a link between academic entitlement and student expectations. A common suggestion for preventing or lessening academic entitlement is to provide students with clear guidelines and expectations as early as possible, in order to prevent unrealistic expectations (Frey, 2015; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002). A review of the literature suggests that the “coping” subgroup of academic entitlement may exist due to three different causes or underlying reasons.

1. Unfamiliarity with norms and rules of university.

These students may be experiencing difficulty with the transition to university. Researchers have suggested that some students have unrealistic academic expectations, and that academic entitlement might result from frustration when students’ expectations are not met (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Lippmann et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002).

1.b. Difficulty meeting academic demands and goals.

It has been suggested that high academic demands and expectations, either from parents or students themselves, may contribute to academic entitlement in students who have difficulty meeting these demands (Frey, 2015; Stafford, 2013; Greenberger, 2008). These students likely have an external locus of control and lower levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem compared to their less entitled peers (Boswell, 2013; Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011, Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008).
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entitlement may act as a coping mechanism to deal with academic demands that exceed one’s abilities or with grades that do not align with one’s self-image.

1.c. Equity sensitive.

Another group of students might perceive injustice or unfairness and respond in an entitled way. Research suggests that entitlement may stem from feelings of injustice and this sense of entitlement has been linked to selfish behaviour. Academic entitlement may function as a coping mechanism; in this case it may function as a compensatory response to feeling wronged. The theory of equity sensitivity (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987) assumes that some individuals are more sensitive to perceived injustice than others.

According to this theory there are three types of people: Benevolents, Equity Sensitive, and Entitleds (Huseman et al., 1987). “Benevolents” are people who infrequently perceive injustice even if they get less than others. “Equity Sensitive” individuals follow the pattern suggested by equity theory. That is, when they think that they have received less than others for the same amount of effort or resources they perceive injustice (i.e., when their input-output ratio is different than someone else’s). The third group, “Entitleds”, consistently perceives unfairness even when they have received the same as others.

It is possible that “Entitleds” might consistently perceive inequity and respond in an entitled way in an academic setting. Academic entitlement has been linked to procedural and distributive justice and to perceptions of unfairness (Vallade et al., 2014; Miller, 2013). Miller (2013) viewed academic entitlement from a social comparison perspective and equity theory framework and suggested that entitled students are
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centricted with whether or not what they are getting is the same as what other students are getting.

Zitek et al. (2010), through a series of experiments, demonstrated how feeling wronged can lead to a sense of entitlement, which in turn can lead to selfish behaviour. They acknowledged that feeling wronged is not the only contributor to feelings of entitlement and selfish behaviour and propose four alternative explanations: social modeling, equity with the world, frustration-aggression, and social exclusion. These explanations may help to understand academic entitlement and uncivil student behaviours. For example, the frustration-aggression hypothesis is likely related to the equity theory hypothesis and suggests that when someone is wronged they may become frustrated and exhibit aggressive behaviour to compensate. This echoes other authors’ suggestion that academic entitlement results from frustration encountered due to unmet expectations; if students feel like they are being treated unfairly, academic entitlement may be a compensatory response.

Based on the literature, it seems that what these three sub-groups have in common is that academic entitlement serves as a coping mechanism. Externalizing responsibility, shifting blame to professors and the university system, and making unreasonable demands of professors (like grade haggling or accommodation requests) may be a result of low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, an external locus of control (though this may be related to low self-efficacy), general difficulties transitioning to university, or perceived injustice. Regardless of the cause, frustration appears to be linked to academic entitlement. The current study will explore this relationship.
Purpose.

Academic entitlement is related to maladaptive behaviors, such as academic dishonesty, academic incivility, and bargaining with professors for grades (Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff, 2018; Elias, 2017; Boswell, 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). It has been suggested that student incivility (like academic dishonesty) and academic entitlement might result from frustration or from students feeling wronged or treated unfairly (Achacoso, 2002; Aveling et al., 2012; Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Greenberger et al., 2008; Lippmann et al., 2008; Miller, 2013; Vallade et al., 2014).

The current experiment aimed to empirically validate the suggestion that behaviours associated with academic entitlement, like academic dishonesty, may result from feelings of frustration in unfair situations. As such, this experiment aimed to explore the role that academic entitlement plays in the relationship between frustration and tolerance for academic dishonesty.

Hypotheses.

1. Academic entitlement should predict tolerance for dishonesty. Higher levels of academic entitlement should be related to lower tolerance for academic dishonesty.

2. Tolerance for academic dishonesty should be significantly different between conditions (fair/unfair). Students in the unfair condition should report higher levels of tolerance for dishonesty than students in the fair condition.

3. Frustration should predict tolerance for dishonesty. Higher levels of frustration should be related to a higher tolerance for academic dishonesty.
4. Academic entitlement should moderate the relationship between condition and tolerance for dishonesty (see Figure 7).

*Figure 7* Model: Academic entitlement moderates the relationship between condition and tolerance for academic dishonesty.

**Method**

**Participants.**

Participants (N=151) were recruited from the Psychology Participant Pool at the University of Windsor. The average age of participants was 20.81 years old (SD=3.05), the majority were women (88.7%), in second year or above, and from the faculty of Arts Humanities and Social Science (72.0%). There were no significant differences on any demographic variables between participants in the fair condition (n=78) and participants in the unfair condition (n=73; see Table 44 for full sample characteristics).
Table 44

*Sample Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (% of sample)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>17(11.3)</td>
<td>10(12.8)</td>
<td>7(9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>134(88.7)</td>
<td>68(87.2)</td>
<td>66(90.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18(11.9)</td>
<td>8(10.3)</td>
<td>10(13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45(29.8)</td>
<td>23(29.5)</td>
<td>22(30.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47(31.1)</td>
<td>27(34.6)</td>
<td>20(27.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>41(27.2)</td>
<td>20(25.6)</td>
<td>21(28.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Humanities, and Social Science</td>
<td>108(72.0)</td>
<td>51(66.2)</td>
<td>58(78.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16(10.7)</td>
<td>7(9.1)</td>
<td>9(12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3(2.0)</td>
<td>2(2.6)</td>
<td>1(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Kinetics</td>
<td>10(6.7)</td>
<td>6(7.8)</td>
<td>4(5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5(3.3)</td>
<td>5(6.5)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4(2.7)</td>
<td>3(3.9)</td>
<td>1(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>4(2.7)</td>
<td>3(3.9)</td>
<td>1(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Procedure.

Participants accessed the study via the Participant Pool website; once participants signed up for the study they were randomly assigned\(^3\) to either the fair or unfair condition were emailed the appropriate study URL. Upon clicking on the study URL, participants reviewed the consent form and were required to click “I agree to participate” before they were able to begin the online survey and experiment (See Appendix A for consent form).

After consenting to participate in the study, participants first completed the academic entitlement scale (AES), followed by a three-minute distractor task where they were asked to write about what they did last weekend or what they will do this weekend. Following the distractor task, participants completed a letter-search task. They were presented with instructions and asked to complete five trials of the letter search task. After completing the letter search task participants answered three follow-up questions: one measuring how fair participants thought the letter search task was, one measuring participants’ current frustration level, and one measuring how well they think they performed on the letter search task. Participants also completed the Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty Questionnaire and a brief demographic questionnaire. At the end of the study, participants were fully debriefed; they were informed of the true purpose of the study, which, for the unfair condition, included an explanation as to why the task was unfair. Participants were asked to confirm their consent to participate in the studying following the debrief and then were directed to a separate survey where their personal

---

\(^3\) The researcher used a random number generator to assign participants to a condition: odd numbers meant the participant was assigned to the fair condition and even numbers meant the participant was assigned to the unfair condition.
EXPLORING CAUSES OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

information was collected (name and email address) so that Participant Pool credit could be assigned.

**Letter Search Task.**

Participants were presented with letter search matrices of increasing size and difficulty (5x5 to 20x20) and were instructed to search for a letter within the matrix (see example below). All participants completed five trials, each time searching for a different letter. Each trial matrix was displayed for 30 seconds.

**Example Instructions:**

Thank you for participating in our study. We ask that you try your best on the following letter search task. You will be presented with 5 trials, each lasting 30 seconds. A letter-filled-matrix will be displayed, and you will be asked to locate a specific letter within the matrix. Once you’ve found the letter, click on it and you will proceed to the next trial. Once 30 seconds has elapsed you will automatically move on to the next trial.
Example Letter Search Matrix:

TRIAL X

Find the letter V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>w</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions.

Fair Condition (Control).

The letter that participants were searching for was present in all five letter-search trials. Each trial/letter-search matrix was displayed for 30 seconds.

Unfair Condition (Experimental).

The letter that participants were searching for was only present in two of the five letter-search trials. Each trial/letter-search matrix was displayed for 30 seconds. Because the letter was not actually present in all of the matrices for these trials, these participants were unable to get a perfect score on the letter-search task. This condition was intended to induce frustration.
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Measures.

*Academic Entitlement Scale (AES, Jackson et al., 2011).*

The academic entitlement questionnaire is a 30-item self-report 7-dimension measure of academic entitlement. The measure consists of seven subscales: general academic entitlement, reward for effort, accommodation, responsibility avoidance, customer orientation, customer service expectation, and grade haggling. Participants responded to items using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), where higher scores indicated higher levels of entitlement.

*Tolerance of Academic Dishonesty Scale (TADS, Frey, Jackson, McLellan, & Rauti, 2016).*

The 10-item academic dishonesty measure assessed participants tolerance for various dishonest academic behaviours. Participants were presented with 10 vignettes, each describing one dishonest behaviour and asked to rate how dishonest each scenario/vignette is using a 100-point scale (ranging from dishonest to honest); higher scores indicated greater tolerance for dishonest academic behaviour.

*Task Fairness.*

Participants were asked a single question: On a scale from 1 (*extremely unfair*) to 10 (*extremely fair*) please rate how fair you think the letter search task was.

*Current Frustration Level.*

Participants were asked a single question: On a scale from 1 (*not at all frustrated*) to 10 (*extremely frustrated*) please rate how frustrated you currently feel.
Perceived Performance on Letter Search Task.

Participants were asked a single question: On a scale from 1(*not well*) to 10 (*extremely well*) please indicate how well you think you performed on the letter search task.

Results

Before examining main hypotheses, descriptive statistics were generated for the entire sample and for each condition (see Table 45); validation checks were run to ensure the manipulation worked as intended (i.e., the unfair condition evoked frustration); and, statistical assumptions were checked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>Fair Condition</td>
<td>Unfair Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Entitlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Effort</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Haggling</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maxmum</td>
<td>$M(SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>Fair Condition</td>
<td>Unfair Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Experiment Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Validation of manipulation.

Validation checks were run to ensure that the manipulation worked as intended; that is, to ensure that participants in the unfair condition reported higher levels of frustration and greater perceived task unfairness than those in the fair condition. T-tests confirmed that participants in the unfair condition were significantly more frustrated than those in the fair condition. Participants in the unfair condition perceived the task to be significantly less fair than those in the fair condition. Lastly, participants in the fair condition reported better performance on the letter search task than those in the unfair condition (see Table 46).

Table 46
\textit{t-test Results: Manipulation Validation}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>\textit{M}</th>
<th>\textit{SD}</th>
<th>\textit{t-test}(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-15.57(146)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>5.18(139.50)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.49(137.90)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main findings.

\textit{Hypothesis One and two.}

It was expected that academic entitlement would predict tolerance for academic dishonesty, and that condition would predict tolerance for academic dishonesty. To test
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dthese hypotheses multiple regression analysis was used; the independent variables were
the seven academic entitlement subscales and condition, and the dependent variable was
tolerance for academic dishonesty. Prior to running the analysis all assumptions where checked.

Based on inspection of a histogram, tolerance for academic dishonesty scores
appeared non-normal but skewness and kurtosis values were within acceptable ranges.
The data were positively skewed; as expected, participants tended to have a low tolerance
for academic dishonesty overall. Mahalanobis Distance (cut-off: \( \chi^2(7) = 18.48 \)) was used to
identify outliers on academic entitlement variables and standardized residuals (cut-off:
\( z > 2.5 \)) were examined to identify outliers on tolerance for academic dishonesty: seven
and five outliers were found, respectively. Removal of outliers did not impact regression
results, so these cases were retained. The data were also screened for influential point
using Cooks Distance (cut-off: >1; Cook & Weisberg, 1982), and no issues were found.
Lastly, no issues with multicollinearity were observed, based on inspection of tolerance
values.

Regression results provided little support for the hypotheses; the customer service
expectation subscale of the AES was positively related to tolerance for academic
dishonesty scores. Students who reported a greater tolerance for academic dishonestly
tended to score higher on the measure of customer service expectations. There were no
other significant relationship between academic entitlement domains or condition and
tolerance for academic dishonesty (see Table 47).
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Table 47  
Regression Results: Hypothesis one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(intercept)</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General AE</td>
<td>-13.43</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Effort</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Avoidance</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>-13.66</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>39.28*</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Haggling</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-29.77</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=0.26  
Adjusted  
R²=0.22

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty  
**significant at p<.001  
*significant at p<.05

Hypothesis three.

It was expected that frustration would predict tolerance for academic dishonesty.

To test this hypothesis a bivariate correlation was used. Results did not support this hypothesis. Frustration was not related to tolerance for academic dishonesty (r²=.146, p>.05).
Hypothesis four.

It was expected that academic entitlement would moderate the relationship between condition and tolerance for dishonesty. To test this hypothesis a moderation analysis was conducted using the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2019).

Two academic entitlement domains moderated the relationship between condition and tolerance for academic dishonesty: Reward for Effort and Customer Service Expectation (see Table 48 through Table 54). Reward for Effort moderated the relationship between condition and academic entitlement. The effect of condition on tolerance for academic entitlement was larger for students with higher scores on this domain than for students with low and moderate scores on the Reward for Effort domain for students who scored higher on the reward for effort domain. For students with higher scores, being in the unfair condition was related to a lower tolerance for academic dishonesty.

Customer Service Expectation also moderated the relationship between condition and academic entitlement. The effect of condition on tolerance for dishonest was larger for students with higher scores in this domain than for students with low and moderate scores on the Customer Service Expectation domain. For students with higher scores, being in the unfair condition was related to a lower tolerance for academic dishonesty.
### Table 48
**Moderation Analysis: General Academic Entitlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>64.74</td>
<td>[-72.16, 183.71]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Academic Entitlement</td>
<td>53.22*</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>[11.53, 94.92]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>86.76</td>
<td>[-141.64, 201.28]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-25.61</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>[-80.95, 29.63]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .070$

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty
**significant at p<.001**
*significant at p<.05

### Table 49
**Moderation Analysis: Reward for Effort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td>[-122.98, 112.88]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>63.09**</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>[30.56, 95.63]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>106.08</td>
<td>80.52</td>
<td>[-53.04, 265.20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-43.14*</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>[-87.43, 1.16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .11$

#### Conditional Effects by Reward for Effort Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward for Effort Score</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (2.00)</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>[-62.29, 101.90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (3.25)</td>
<td>-34.11</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>[-89.78, 21.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (4.92)</td>
<td>-106.15*</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>[-194.49, -17.82]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty
**significant at p<.001**
*significant at p<.05
Table 50
*Moderation Analysis: Accommodation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>[-64.92, 113.94]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>79.65**</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>[44.91, 114.40]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>[-140.63, 133.54]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-14.42</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>[-69.84, 41.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.18

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty
**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

Table 51
*Moderation Analysis: Responsibility Avoidance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>[-62.68, 113.44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Avoidance</td>
<td>89.43**</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>[50.91, 127.96]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>[-120.80, 130.74]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-15.58</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>[-74.08, 42.92]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.19

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty
**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
## Table 52
**Moderation Analysis: Customer Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>105.81</td>
<td>62.49</td>
<td>[-17.69, 229.31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>[-3.01, 58.11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>90.20</td>
<td>[-161.17, 195.36]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-16.00</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>[-60.24, 28.25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R^2 = .04**

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

## Table 53
**Moderation Analysis: Customer Service Expectation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-4.74</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>[-90.97, 81.50]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Expectation</td>
<td>95.62**</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>[60.93, 130.32]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>57.87</td>
<td>60.49</td>
<td>[-61.63, 177.39]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-45.16*</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>[-92.88, 2.57]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R^2 = .22**

**Conditional Effects by Customer Service Expectation Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (1.00)</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>[-67.32, 85.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2.00)</td>
<td>-32.45</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>[-85.75, 20.86]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (3.25)</td>
<td>-88.89*</td>
<td>35.58</td>
<td>[-159.21, -18.57]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty

**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05
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Table 54
Moderation Analysis: Grade Haggling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI for B [lower, upper]</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>[-32.83, 123.15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Haggling</td>
<td>77.29**</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>[45.15, 109.42]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-16.54</td>
<td>57.48</td>
<td>[-130.13, 97.06]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AE*Condition)</td>
<td>-6.06</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>[-55.75, 43.64]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DV: Tolerance for Academic Dishonesty
**significant at p<.001
*significant at p<.05

Discussion

This experiment aimed to empirically validate the hypothesis that frustration, resulting from feeling wronged or perceiving unfairness, would predict attitudes associated with academic entitlement, specifically tolerance for academic dishonesty. The hypothesis is supported by equity theory and by early academic entitlement research.

Equity theory suggests that when unfairness is perceived, an individual will experience dissonance, and that they may attempt to resolve that dissonance (Huseman et al., 1987). One way to resolve the dissonance may be through academic entitlement or associated behaviours, like academic dishonesty or grade haggling. Miller (2013) equated academic entitlement with a student’s preference for equity. Students that were more entitled were likely to have a higher preference for equity.

Early research in academic entitlement suggested that academic entitlement may function as a coping response to mitigate feelings of frustration from unmet academic
expectations or unexpected outcomes (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). This research identified frustration as a component, or precursor, of academic entitlement.

Based on this research, it was expected that academic entitlement would predict tolerance for dishonesty; that tolerance for dishonesty would be significantly different between participants in the fair and unfair conditions; and, that frustration would predict tolerance for dishonesty. Lastly, it was expected that academic entitlement would moderate the relationship between condition and tolerance for academic dishonesty.

Results confirmed that the unfair condition resulted in greater frustration, greater perceived unfairness, and worse perceived performance than the fair condition; the manipulation worked as it intended. Despite this, results provided little support for the hypotheses tested. While two domains of academic entitlement moderated the relationship between condition and tolerance for academic dishonesty, the relationships were not in the expected direction; students with higher levels of Reward for Effort and/or Customer Service Expectation reported a stronger response to frustration and tended to report lower tolerance for academic dishonesty.

It is possible that the task meant to induce frustration – a letter search task - was not “academic” enough to induce a frustration that would be alleviated (an input-output ratio imbalance that could be corrected) by being more tolerant for academically dishonest behaviour. It is possible that if the task were more academic there would be impact on tolerance for academic entitlement as expected.

It appears that students responded to frustration induced by the unfair task by being harsher on academic dishonesty and a lower tolerance for academic dishonesty than
participants in the fair condition. Though not statistically significant, there was a small
difference in average tolerance for academic dishonesty scores between participants in
the fair and unfair condition. Contrary to what was expected, participants in the fair
condition reported a higher tolerance for academic dishonesty than participants in the
unfair condition.

A third possible explanation is that only a subgroup of students who exhibit
academic entitlement do so because of perceived inequity and/or frustration. Academic
entitlement research has explored the possibility of subgroup of academic entitlement
(e.g., Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Stafford, 2013). This research has identified a coping
model, or subgroup, of academic entitlement and it is likely that somewhere in that group
are the students who use academic entitlement as a coping strategy to right perceived
injustice and alleviate frustration. It is possible that this coping group was not present in
the current sample.

Further research exploring the frustration/equity hypothesis is warranted and
should consider examining a different entitled behaviour; perhaps ability to follow
instructions under different conditions (frustrating vs. not frustrating) or rating a “grader”
who has graded a short paper or quiz under different conditions (fairly vs. unfairly).
Recent research has demonstrated a relationship between psychological entitlement and
not following instructions (Zitek & Jordan, 2019). It is likely that same relationship
would be found between academic entitlement and not following instructions in an
academic setting, on an assignment for example. Zitek and Jordan showed that entitled
individuals were less likely to follow instructions than non-entitled individuals regardless
of cost to self. So, even when following instructions came at little or no cost to oneself,
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entitled individuals more likely than non-entitled individuals to blatantly not follow instructions. The researchers concluded that entitled individuals ignored instructions because they viewed the instructions as unfair demands on them.

Further research on academic dishonesty is also warranted to attempt to uncover the reasons why students cheat. In a recent study academic entitlement was the second largest predictor of self-reported cheating behaviour ($\beta = 0.117$), followed by being a student athlete or belonging to a fraternity or sorority. Age was also a predictor of cheating behaviour; younger students were more likely than older students to report cheating on an exam, assignment, or quiz (Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff, 2018).

Conclusion

A relationship between frustration due to feeling wronged and behaviours associated with academic entitlement was not supported by the findings of this experiment. However, it is likely that this relationship does exist and would be uncovered in future studies utilizing different behaviours (i.e., not tolerance for academic dishonesty). It is possible that student’s tolerance for dishonesty is different from how they would actually respond in a given situation; students may be less likely to admit a tolerance for academic dishonesty than actual cheating.
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CHAPTER 5: Discussion and Conclusion

This three-study project explored the construct of academic entitlement with two primary questions in mind: What causes academic entitlement?; and, what is the role of subgroups/typologies of academic entitlement? Chapter two presented a study that explored the construct of academic entitlement, including subgroups of academic entitlement, in an attempt to further our understanding of the causes of academic entitlement. The researcher attempted to replicate relationships that have been reported in previous academic entitlement research. Some support for hypotheses was generated but effect sizes were generally small. In general, academic entitlement was related to a negative or challenging academic experience. Chapter two also explored how subgroups of academic entitlement differ on various academic attitudes and behaviours. These groups differed on levels of Deep Learning, Academic Fit, and Academic Cynicism. Academic entitlement group moderated a few of the relationships between academic attitudes and behaviour and academic entitlement.

Chapter three brought student voices to the research and explored common themes that emerged when students were engaged in a conversation about their university experience and academic entitlement. Three main themes emerged: Transition to University (Coping); Student Consumerism; and, Effort Fairness, and Deservingness. These themes may be related to the causes of academic entitlement.

In Chapter four an experimental study that explored the impact of frustration (a possible cause of academic entitlement) on tolerance for academic dishonesty (an attitude associated with academic entitlement) was presented. Framed by equity theory (Huseman et al., 1987) it was expected that academic entitlement would predict tolerance for
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academic dishonesty; that tolerance for dishonesty would significantly differ between participants in the fair and unfair conditions; and, that frustration would predict tolerance for academic dishonesty. Finally, it was expected that academic entitlement would moderate the relationship between condition and tolerance for academic dishonesty.

While results from this study did not find a relationship between frustration due to feeling wronged and tolerance for academic dishonesty (a behaviour associated with academic entitlement), it is likely that this relationship does exist and would be uncovered in future studies utilizing different behaviours (i.e., not tolerance for academic dishonesty).

Together, these studies provided support for two types (or groups) of academic entitlement that can be explained by different causes. Chapter two and three provides support for both a Customer Oriented or Student Consumerism type of academic entitlement and a Coping type of academic entitlement. Chapter four was intended to provide support for a coping type of academic entitlement. Findings from these studies are supported by current academic entitlement research that suggests the cause of academic entitlement is an underlying consumer attitude and/or that academic entitlement is a coping response. Academic entitlement researchers have long suspected that a customer orientation or underlying consumer attitude was related to academic entitlement (Bunce, Baird, & Jones, 2017; Frey 2015; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010; Achacoso, 2002). This type of academic entitlement clearly emerged in Chapter three, students talked about getting the best value for their (tuition) money and expected customer service-like treatment from professors. Students also talked about feeling as though they had control over professors, either by learning how to get what they wanted from them or learning to “manage” professors.
A coping-type of academic entitlement also clearly emerged from this research. Previous academic entitlement research has pointed to the existence of a coping type of academic entitlement and three coping groups were hypothesized: a coping response elicited by unmet academic expectations; a coping response elicited by failure to meet academic expectations; and, a coping response elicited by perceptions of inequity or feeling wronged (Barton & Hirsch, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Aveling et al., 2012; Greenberger et al., 2008; Achacoso, 2002). The first two coping groups clearly emerged in research presented in Chapter three. While the third coping group or type of academic entitlement was not supported by Chapter four (as it was expected to be), it is interesting to note that in Chapter three the expectation of reward for effort was related to perceptions of fairness, rather than student consumerism. The connection between Equity Theory and academic entitlement warrants continued exploration.

Implications for Reducing Academic Entitlement

Some researchers have suggested that system wide change is necessary to reduce academic entitlement (e.g., Kopp & Finney, 2013), while others have suggested that targeted intervention may be necessary (e.g., Frey, 2015). For example, one “system-wide” approach has been suggested: Kopp and Finney (2013) suggested that interventions aimed at increasing student gratitude may reduce entitlement. This proposed intervention is supported by findings from Chapters two and three. Results from both chapters revealed that students were largely cynical towards professors and that this cynicism was related to academic entitlement. Given this relationship, there is potential for increased student gratitude to result in lower levels of academic entitlement. However, it is likely that this intervention would be more effective with the consumer
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type of academic entitlement than the coping type. Students who turn to academic entitlement as a coping response may benefit more from interventions that enhance coping skills. These students would also likely benefit from interventions that aim to provide students with clear guidelines to help ensure their expectation are realistic; this type of intervention has commonly been suggested by academic entitlement researchers (Frey, 2015; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Achacoso, 2002).

Conclusion

Academic entitlement is a complex construct that likely has multiple causes, leading to different causes or types of academic entitlement. The manuscripts presented in Chapter two, Chapter three, and Chapter four provide support for the existence of at least two types of academic entitlement: a customer orientation type of academic entitlement and a coping type of academic entitlement. These types of academic entitlement will likely require different interventions that relate directly to the causes of academic entitlement. Future research should continue to include student voices in the exploration of causes of and types of academic entitlement with a focus on student consumerism and student coping.
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