Undergraduate Honors Theses   Student Works

5-2013

Academic Entitlement and the Association of Attitude toward Learning and Perseverance for Goals, and Identity Processes.

Samantha K. Jones
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/honors

 Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Academic Entitlement and the Association of Attitude toward Learning and Perseverance for

Goals, and Identity Processes

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of Honors

By

Samantha Jones

The Honors College

Teacher Education Honors- in- Discipline Program

East Tennessee State University

Honors-in- Discipline thesis in partial fulfillment for Bachelors of Science in Human Services

April 15, 2013

_____

Karin Bartoszuk, Ph.D. (Thesis Advisor)

_____

Rosalind Gann, Ed.D. (Faculty Reader)

_____

Deborah Harley, Ed.D. (Faculty Reader)

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine associations between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity processes. Participants included 364 undergraduate students, ages 18-29. Results revealed that overall, participants in this study reported low academic entitlement. Nevertheless, students who reported higher academic entitlement reported lower attitude toward learning (mastery approach), and lower perseverance for goals (consistency of interest, perseverance of effort). In addition, students who reported higher academic entitlement were more likely to score higher on diffused, foreclosed, and moratorium identity processes (ideological and interpersonal domains). Lastly, results indicated that participants who reported higher academic entitlement fell into the age category of 18-20. Overall, it appeared that students age 18-20 reported higher academic entitlement, lower attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and were more likely to score higher on diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium. Older students age 21-29 appeared to be more likely to be achieved.

Introduction

Academic entitlement is a new topic of interest explored and examined in the academic literature, and it appears to be increasing on college campuses (Twenge, 2006). One definition of academic entitlement describes students as those who are "deserving of higher grades without putting much effort into the work or perceive themselves as deserving special treatment" (Ciani, Summers, & Easters, 2008, p. 333). Along with these expectations, some students may feel that they are "entitled" to debate and demand a better grade (Ciani et al., 2008). Therefore, academic entitlement may affect both students as well as professors regarding time commitments. Professors may spend more time with entitled students during office hours and during class time; therefore, possibly reducing the time engaged with other students.

Researchers have started to develop more valid measurements assessing academic entitlement (Kopp, Zinn, Finney, & Jurich, 2011; Chowning, & Campbell, 2009), and examine antecedent variables and other related theoretical constructs such as sex (Zusman, Knox, & Lieberman, 2005), personality traits (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011), and stress (Jones, Vess, Cowan, & Bartoszuk, 2012), which might be associated with academic entitlement. Nevertheless, there are still many constructs that remain relatively unexplored that could influence or could be influenced by academic entitlement. Therefore, the intent of this study will be three fold. First, to examine attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity processes and their association with academic entitlement; second, to examine the differences of low, medium, and high academic entitlement on attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity statuses; and third, to examine if differences exist for sex and age, predicting academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity statuses.

Literature Review

Academic Entitlement

One broad definition describes academic entitlement as a concept in which students feel "entitled" to a higher grade, even though they did not put much effort forth. Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, and Reinhardt (2011) suggested that the definition of academic entitlement should encapsulate three different dimensions. These dimensions include: (1) a belief that one deserves a reward that is not justified based on one's actual academic achievement; (2) that academic entitlement diminishes roles of personal responsibility in academic achievement; and (3) high academic entitlement implies high expectations about the instructor(s) that go beyond their obligation of providing educational opportunities as well as effective and quality instruction. It is important to point out that academic entitlement is a fairly recent topic of interest, gaining momentum since the 70s. Lessard, Greenberger, Chen, and Farruggia (2011) described a Nexis Lexis search on academic entitlement. The search revealed that academic entitlement was mentioned 148 times in 1998 and 836 times in 2008 in the print media.

As popular interest in academic entitlement increases, the focus on possible associations with academic entitlement has shifted as well. While past research focused heavily on areas such as entitlement in grade school, or entitlement in the occupational setting (Ciani et al., 2008), research is now beginning to focus on the possible influences academic entitlement may have in the postsecondary setting. When asking why college students were experiencing such feelings of entitlement, research has examined previous studies conducted with children in grade-school. It seems as if these "self-inflating" messages have been received repeatedly by students throughout grade school (Ciani et al., 2008). As result, feelings of academic entitlement are becoming more prevalent among the college student population (Kopp et al., 2011).Transitioning into college

can be an "eye-opener" or "awakening" for many students. It is then that students may realize they are expected to work more independently compared to their high school experience. In addition, students now must be able to understand professors' expectations, and be able to apply previously learned skills (Collier, & Morgan, 2008).

Recent literature suggests that both professors and students may be susceptible to a more negative classroom environment. It is possible that a student may become argumentative over a grade, or may feel surprised when they receive a lower grade than they had expected. In fact, it would seem that disconnects concerning grades between students and faculty have been occurring more often. Tippin, Lafreniere, and Page (2012) suggest that such disconnects are seen in terms of expectations, perception, and reasoning behind evaluation of academics. This study suggested that some students have misconceptions regarding the evaluation process. Such discrepancies and misconceptions create "a situation with ample opportunity for misunderstanding and conflict between faculty and students" (Tippin et al., 2012, p. 52). These negative relationships may lead faculty members to begin to re-evaluate courses and the coursework they require. Baer and Cheryomukhin (2011) stated that these increased feelings of academic entitlement have given students degrees of power that in fact, have not been positive. This "power" refers to student evaluations of faculty and classes. These evaluations allow students to voice their opinions, and provide faculty with constructive feedback on the course, course material, and non-descriptive negative feedback (e.g., too hard, too much work). According to Tippin et al. (2012), this increase of academic entitlement has caused faculty to modify courses (decrease in number of outside reading assignments and out-of-class work) in hopes that students will provide more positive course evaluations.

When examining the post-secondary setting, Chowing and Campell (2009) describe academic entitlement as two sub-categories. These categories are labeled as externalized responsibility and externalized expectations. Externalized responsibility focuses on the students' responsibility of their academic success while externalized expectations focus on entitled expectations of their professors and course policies. Furthermore, academic entitlement can be seen as the expectation that "positive academic outcomes" (such as high grades) should be received regardless of performance. These types of students may exude that responsibility for shortcomings rely with professors or other external factors (such as environment), instead of accepting fault (Kopp et al., 2011).

It is not only important to understand the definitions of academic entitlement, but also to understand what differences due to sex and age may be present. It appears that men experience feelings of entitlement more often than women (Ciani et al., 2008). This is an interesting variable to consider since women are becoming a more prominent population in the postsecondary setting. In addition to sex, it is also important to examine age differences. As noted above, students experience feelings of entitlement throughout grade-school. This leaves the possibility that first- year freshmen may be susceptible to reporting higher levels of entitlement as they come from an environment that might place more value on self-esteem enhancement (Kopp et al., 2011).

As academic entitlement has been discussed, it is evident that the possibility of influencing a student's perception of their capabilities does in fact exist. Academic entitlement may influence levels of motivation as well as expectations that the student may have. As noted above, students who experience high levels of academic entitlement might feel "deserving of higher grades without putting much effort into the work or perceive themselves as deserving

special treatment" (Ciani et al., 2008, p. 333). It might be of importance to explore the potential

of academic entitlement influencing other aspects, such as attitudes toward learning, and

perseverance for goals. Students who score high on academic entitlement might score low on

attitude toward learning and perseverance for goals because when one feels academically

entitled, one might feel that a good grade is deserved. In addition, if failure occurs, the student

may feel that the fault then lies with the professor. Therefore, it is possible that these individuals

are not focused on truly learning the material, since the end result is thought to be positive

regardless.

Attitude Toward Learning and Perseverance for Goals

Achievement motivation in individuals has often been characterized as someone who

"aspires to accomplish difficult tasks; maintains high standards; and is willing to work towards

distant goals; responds positively to competition; willing to put forth effort to attain excellence"

(Jackson, as cited in Smith, Sansone, & White, 2007, p. 101). It is easy to see how achievement

motivation is an important construct not only in the college environment but throughout a

person's professional and personal life. Therefore, it has been examined at the college level and

for particular classes at the college level. It is important to think about how a student's entire

course load may potentially influence one's level of achievement motivation. As suggested by

Finney, Pieper, & Barron (2004), achievement motivation should examine all classes taken by

the student during a semester. This concept is identified as attitudes towards learning, and also

examines the four sub-concepts (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery

avoidance, mastery approach) in hopes to capture one's level of achievement motivation.

Attitude toward learning is an important aspect regarding the college experience.

Research has suggested that students will be highly motivated and more cognitively engaged

when interest in the material is high (Rozendall, Minnaert, & Boekaerts, 2003). These students

can be seen as individuals who are driven to complete difficult tasks while also maintaining high

standards and working towards distant goals. In addition, they are more likely to react in a

positive manner when faced with competition and are more willing to put forth effort in order to

maintain excellence (Smith et al., 2007). When discussing attitude toward learning, it is

important to discuss the before mentioned sub-concepts as well. These sub-concepts include

performance and mastery goals. Those who engage in performance goals are more likely to try to

maintain a positive image of their ability. While a performance goal approach was initially

viewed as maladaptive, research has indicated that multiple goal orientation, or a mix of both

performance and mastery goals can promote positive outcomes for students. Mastery goals focus

on the development of competence through mastery, and performance goals focus on

demonstrating competence (Elliot, & McGregor, 2001). In contrast, Mastery goals allow

individuals to not only master new challenges, but also seek out opportunities in which their

competence can increase (Mattern, 2005).. According to Mattern (2005), those who engage in

mastery goals tend to seek out more challenges, have higher reported use of effective learning

strategies, have a greater positive attitude towards school, and have higher self-efficacy. Elliot

and McGregor (2001) proposed that the two types of goals (performance and mastery) needed

further examination. Both performance and mastery goals were placed into approach and

avoidance sub-constructs. Smith et al. (2007) give definitions for each type of goal.

Performance- approach goals are defined the need to demonstrate competence when compared to

others. These students strive to make better grades than others, as well as display competence in

comparison to others.   Performance- avoidance goals are defined as wanting to avoid seeming

incompetent in comparison to others. These students strive to avoid seeming incompetent in

comparison to their fellow classmates. This has often produced negative effects for an individual's learning and motivation. Mastery- avoidance goals are those that want to have absolute and interpersonal success, but fear and avoid failure (Elliot, & McGregor, 2001). Students with a mastery-avoidance goal orientation would "strive to avoid misunderstanding the course material or not to forget what he or she has learned" (Finney et al., 2004, p.367). Mastery-approach goals are those in which individuals, aim to have absolute and interpersonal mastery while producing success. This type of individual seeks to be able to understand and master information in a successful way. As different types of goals have now been discussed, it is also important to examine how one's perseverance toward theses goals may also influence an individual. Perseverance for goals has been defined as the ability to "work strenuously toward challenges, maintaining effort and interest over the years despite failure, adversity, and plateaus in progress" (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly 2007, p. 1087-88). To clarify this broad concept, sub-concepts have been used to describe these phenomena in more depth. These sub-concepts include consistency of interests and perseverance of effort. Consistency of interests is described as the level of interest (for a goal) over time, while perseverance of effort is defined as the level of focused effort one may have towards a goal (Duckworth et al., 2007). In an ideal world, students would have a yearning to learn, set goals, and be motivated to complete them. However, it seems that one area of concern is how individuals can be equally intelligent, yet some can accomplish more than others. Previous theories have predicted that people will perform an "act" when the performance of such is likely to produce an outcome that is important or desired by the individual (Tuckman, 1996). By measuring one's level of consistency of interests, as well as perseverance of effort, one's perseverance for goals may be seen. It is also important to take into consideration what other influences may be present as well. Achievement

motivation has been linked to the perseverance for goals, examining how one's motivation may possibly influence the level of interest and focus of an individual's goals.

Examining the concepts of perseverance for goals and attitude toward learning creates the hypothesis that a connection to academic entitlement may exist. It is possible that students with high academic entitlement may have a more performance- avoidance goal orientation, as one may feel that regardless of how much time or effort is put into a project/examination, that a good grade is deserved; therefore avoiding failure.

Another important aspect is to examine how sex and age may play a role in academic entitlement. Templaar, Schim van der Loeff, Gijselaers, & Nijhuis (2011), conducted a study in which achievement motivation was examined within a group of business students. Tempelaar et al. (2011) suggested that male students in business statistics, as well as financing and accounting expressed greater levels of motivation than their female counterparts. This is quite an interesting finding because while males showed greater levels of motivation, overall females had higher scores than males with the exception of two math-related assignments in the course.

Contradicting Temelaar et al.'s (2011) findings, there has been previous research that has indicated that females score higher on motivation scales than males. In an article written by Zusman et al. (2005), results revealed many significant differences between men and women. These included areas of class attendance, seating preference, note taking, organized study time, book purchase, reading the assigned textbook(s), and taking advantage of extra credit opportunities. In terms of achievement motivation, results of the study concluded that "college females outshine college males in their behavioral dedication to perform well in academia" (p. 623). This study further suggests that women might be geared towards performance and are compliant due to socialization. For males, these gender roles are viewed as "oppositions to

authority," and doing-well in a class may be interpreted as a "compliant…feminine trait" (p. 623). As other research has suggested, age can play a significant factor in achievement motivation and its different levels. Freilino's & Hummel's (1985) findings suggested that female students around 30 years of age reported more life experiences and higher motivation towards achievement.

It is clear that there is a possibility that linkages between age and sex in regards to attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and academic entitlement may exist. In addition, it is possible that a connection to identity processes might also be of importance to examine. This connection is important as many emerging adults are still examining their possibilities regarding their future in terms of work, values, and relationships. Identity processes focus on exploration and commitment in broad ideological and interpersonal domains (diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement), perhaps one's identity may play a influential role in how entitled and motivated one may feel. However, there is little research that explores these ideas; and therefore need further examination.

Identity:

Identity processes have been examined over many decades. Erik Erikson developed a concept that includes eight psychosocial stages that individuals experience throughout the lifespan. The fifth stage, identity v. identity diffusion (confusion) is one that strengthens the overall ego processes, and broadens the range of developmental tasks (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). When Erikson proposed this theory, the identity v. identity diffusion (confusion) stage occurred during late adolescence. However, today's research has suggested that many young adults still are in this stage, due to a prolonged transition period (emerging adulthood) (Arnett, 2006). Identity processes as described by Erikson focus on the ability to decipher a choice of

occupation, and begin the formation of an ideology. Erikson conceptualized one's identity as a "multidimensional construct tapping into cognitive, moral, cultural, and social aspects and encompassing different levels of analysis" (as cited in Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, Beyers, & Missotten, 2011, p. 78). This included both personal and social dimensions. Erikson stated that one's identity is never finalized, suggesting that as time passes, one's beliefs, values, and views may change, evolve, and transform.

Furthering these ideas of Erikson, James Marcia operationalized Erikson's concepts of identity focusing on exploration and commitment (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). Exploration refers to a period of "re-thinking," sorting, and "trying out" different roles and "life plans." This is a time during which late adolescents are able to actively choose "meaningful alternatives."

Commitment is identified as the degree of "personal investment" one may express in a course of action or belief (Kroger& Marcia, 2011, p. 33-4). Such ideas of exploration and commitment were used to develop the different identity processes. These identity processes include: identity diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement.

The first identity process conceptualized by Marcia is identity diffusion. Those who identify with identity diffusion go through little exploration and make very few commitments. These individuals lack self-views and engage in "limited" examination of themselves (Berzonsky, 1995). When discussing identity statuses, it is important to examine other contributing factors that influence one's identity.

Identity foreclosure occurs when there are commitments, taken from significant others or significant individuals in their life, yet have little to no exploration. These identities are adapted from others instead of formulating one's own identity and exploring such. However, these

commitments that have been made are firm, but have not gone through "extensive self-examination" (Berzonsky, 1995, p. 738).

Moratorium occurs when one has high exploration, yet has low commitments. Individuals who fall into this process may have a hard time making a commitment, yet is stuck in a period of exploration, where alternatives are examined. These individuals are not actively seeking out any form of identity, lack any strong personal beliefs, and as mentioned before are seemingly stuck in self-reflection phase.

Lastly, there is identity achievement. Identity achievement is composed of high exploration and high commitment. An achieved identity is characterized as having a stable view of the self as a result of an extensive amount of exploration and examination (Berzonsky, 1995). However, one must first be able to determine how well this new sense of identity fits within one's own contexts. These "goodness-of-fit evaluations" then will cycle back in order to be influential to one's motivations and wants to engage further in identity work, allowing themselves to take into considerations other possible alternatives (Luyckx et al., 2011, p. 79). It is possible that the commitment that the individual has chosen to make will be unsatisfactory, however, it is then that one can resume in the exploration process, unlike other's such as identity foreclosure, that has little to no exploration involved. These commitment formations and evaluations first take place during adolescence and may change and transform as the individual enters into early adulthood, which will be discussed further on.

Read, Adams, and Dobson (1984), developed a measure that included both ideological and interpersonal domains. The ideological domain examines "occupational, religious, political life-style values, goals, and standards," while the interpersonal domain focuses on areas such as "friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreational choices" (p.14). Read et al. (1984) also

emphasize the importance of time and its influence on one's identity status. As time passes, the authors suggest that diffused and foreclosed youth are more likely to move onto a status of moratorium or achievement of identity later on in emerging adulthood. It is also important to note that it is possible for an individual who was once in an achieved status to move back to status such as moratorium.

Identity researchers have included age as well as sex. Research including sex (Freilino, & Hummel, 1984), suggest that women over 30 were more likely to have an achieved identity status than female students under the age of 30. Identity processes has been linked to academic entitlement as well. Bartoszuk, Vess, & Jones (2012) found participants who reported a diffused identity style exhibited higher levels of academic entitlement. While there is some research that has explored how one's identity can be influential, there is a dearth of literature that explores how identity processes, academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, and perseverance for goals may be related.

Academic Entitlement, Attitude toward Learning, Perseverance for Goals, and Identity

Associations between both achievement motivation and academic entitlement in students in a postsecondary setting have been made (Tippin et al., 2012), but associations between attitude toward learning and academic entitlement have yet to explored in depth. Even more interesting questions concerning associations between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning arise when discussing the perseverance for goals. It appears that motivation is not only contingent upon interest of the goal or task, but what type of perseverance for goals an individual has as well. Is it possible that the same could be seen for students in regard to attitude towards learning? This is interesting when looking at academically entitled students. As stated above, it is possible that a student who reaches a high level of academic entitlement will be more

performance- avoidant. These entitled, performance-avoidant individuals may also score lower on perseverance of effort or consistency of interests. In contrast, if a student has a low level of academic entitlement, it is then possible she or he may score higher on attitude toward learning (mastery-approach) and consistency of interests. This is possible if the person is focused on mastery, as she or he may look for alternate explanations as to why failure occurs and look to how improvements can be made in the future. Striving to be a master of the material, this individual would perhaps be consistent in interests.

The concept of identity processes and their levels of explorations and commitments bring intriguing questions to the surface when looked at as an influence or association with academic entitlement. Speaking in terms of academic entitlement, it is possible that someone who is low in academic entitlement may also identify as being achieved in identity. This type of individual engages in both high exploration and high commitment. Therefore, it is possible that when a student prepares thoroughly for an assignment, and receives a low grade, this individual will explore for ways in which improvements can be made. These types of scenarios can be carried out for academic entitlement in terms of identity, attitude toward learning, and perseverance for goals. However, the answers still yet remain unclear.

Purpose of the Study

As academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity have been explored on a theoretical basis, the intent of this exploratory study is to examine these associations. This study will explore how academic entitlement is related to attitude towards learning (including: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach), perseverance for goals (including: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort), and identity processes in the ideological and interpersonal domains. In addition, sex and age

differences may influence levels of academic entitlement, attitude toward learning (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach), perseverance for goals (consistency of interests, perseverance of effort), and identity (ideological and interpersonal domains) will also be explored. Levels of academic entitlement experienced by an individual may also give insight to levels of attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity processes. Attitude toward learning, and perseverance for can be seen as the driving force within an individual to excel in academics. Lastly, one's identity process could possibly be the root as to why and the level at which academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, and perseverance for goals is occurring. In addition, differences due to sex and age and academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, perseverance of goals, and identity will be included.

Therefore, the purpose of this exploratory study is to focus on the associations between academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity processes. In addition, associations between levels (low, medium, high) of academic entitlement and attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity will be also be explored. Lastly, the differences between sex and age for academic entitlement, attitude toward learning, perseverance for goals, and identity will be examined. The research questions are as follows:

1. What are the correlations between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach), perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort), and identity processes (subscales: ideological diffusion, ideological foreclosure, ideological moratorium, ideological achievement, interpersonal diffusion, interpersonal foreclosure, interpersonal moratorium, interpersonal achievement)?

2. Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement and their reported attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach)?

3. Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement and their reported perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort)?

4. Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement, and their reported identity processes (ideological/interpersonal domains)?

5. Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding academic entitlement?

6. Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach)?

7. Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort)?

8. Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding identity processes (ideological/interpersonal domains)?

Methods

Procedure:

After IRB approval was granted, web-based surveys were administered through SONA, a web –based research participation program at a southeastern university. Students were asked to volunteer and fill out an anonymous web-based survey. The survey took about 25 minutes to complete. After all data was collected, the surveys were downloaded into SPSS a statistical software package.

Participants:

The study included 364 students (105 males and 259 females). The participants' mean age was 19.94 (sd=2.11). The majority of students were White (85%).

Measures:

Academic Entitlement: Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (AEQ) (Kopp et al., 2011). Includes 8-items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* (e.g. If I cannot learn the material for a class from the lecture alone, then it is the professor's fault when I fail the test) (α=.83). This measure was used both as a categorical and continuous variable. The categories were low levels of academic entitlement (n=287) medium level of academic entitlement (n=48), and high levels of academic entitlement (n=28).

Attitude Toward Learning and Performance in College this Semester (modified from the Achievement Goal Questionnaire) (Finney et al., 2004). Includes 12- items on a 6- point Likert scale ranging from *not at all true of me* to *very true of me*. Included in this scale were four subscales: *Performance Approach*: three items (e.g. My goal this semester is to get better grades than most of the other students) (α=.95). *Performance Avoidance*: Three items (e.g. The fear of performing poorly is what motivates me) (α=.79). *Mastery Avoidance*: Three items (e.g. I am

definitely concerned that I may not learn all that I can this semester) (α=.90). *Mastery Approach*: Three items (e.g. The most important thing for me this semester is to understand the content in my courses as thoroughly as possible) (α=.90).

     Perseverance and Passion for Long-Term Goals (GRIT) (Duckworth et al., 2007). Includes 12- items on a 6- point Likert scale ranging from *not at all like me* to *very much like me*. Included in this scale were two subscales: *Consistency of Interests:* Six items (e.g. I have often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one [reverse coded]) (α=.88). *Perseverance of Effort*: Six items (e.g. I finish whatever I begin) (α=.84).

     The Revised Version of the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams, 1998). Includes 64 items on a 6- point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*. Included in this scale were eight subscales: *Ideological Diffusion*: Eight items (e.g. I guess I just kind of enjoy life in general, and I don't see myself living by any particular viewpoint to life) (α=.68). *Ideological Foreclosure*: Eight items (e.g. My own views on a desirable lifestyle were taught to me by my parents and I don't see any need to question what they taught me) (α=.86). *Ideological Moratorium:* Eight items (e.g. I am looking for an acceptable "lifestyle" view, but I haven't really found one yet) (α=.73). *Ideological Achievement:* Eight items (e.g. After considerable thought I've developed my own individual viewpoint of what is for me an ideal "lifestyle" and don't believe anyone will be likely to change my perspective) (α=.71). *Interpersonal Diffusion*: Eight items (e.g. I don't think about dating much. I just kind of take it as it comes) (α=.73). *Interpersonal Foreclosure*: Eight items (e.g. My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose my friends) (α=.87). *Interpersonal Moratorium*: Eight items (e.g. There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friend for me) (α=.72). *Interpersonal Achievement*:

Eight items (e.g. Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now) (α=.74).

Results

Academic Entitlement

This exploratory study is critical to the current concept of academic entitlement. Before each research question is examined in detail, a description of the outcomes regarding academic entitlement suggests that students may not be as academically entitled as one might have expected. The mean score for academic entitlement was 2.36 (sd=.84) which indicates that most students moderately to slightly disagreed with these items. When a categorical variable was created using low academic entitlement, medium academic entitlement, or high academic entitlement, distributions were as follows: low academic entitlement (n=287), medium academic entitlement (n=48), high academic entitlement (n=28). This again indicates that the vast majority of students report low levels of academic entitlement.

Research Question 1

What are the correlations between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach), perseverance for goals (consistency of interest, perseverance of effort), and identity processes (ideological diffusion, ideological foreclosure, ideological moratorium, ideological achievement, interpersonal diffusion, interpersonal foreclosure, interpersonal moratorium, interpersonal achievement)?

A bivariate correlation was computed using Pearson's correlation coefficients for all 15 scales used in the study (see Table 1 for all correlations). Academic Entitlement was positively (statistically significant) related to the following scales: Attitude toward Learning (performance avoidance, mastery avoidance), Identity (ideological and interpersonal-diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium); r ranged from .134 to .366. Students who scored higher on academic

entitlement also reported higher scores on performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, identity diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium in both the ideological and interpersonal domains.

Academic entitlement was negatively (statistically significant) related to the following scales: Attitude toward learning (mastery approach), Perseverance for Goals (consistency of interests, perseverance of effort); *r* ranged from -.187 to -.238. Students who scored higher on academic entitlement also reported lower scores on mastery approach, consistency of interests, and perseverance of effort.

Research Question 2

Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement and their reported attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach)?

A one-way ANOVA was utilized to evaluate the relationship between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach). The independent variable (academic entitlement) included three levels: low, medium, and high. The dependent variable was attitude toward learning (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach). The ANOVA for academic entitlement and attitude toward learning (mastery approach) was statistically significant, F (2/360)=7.66, *p*=.001. Follow-up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance was assumed) revealed that students who scored low on academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in the medium range on attitude toward learning (mastery approach). The results of these tests including mean and standard deviations are reported in Table 2.

Table1: Bivariate Correlations for Academic Entitlement, Achievement Goals,

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Ac. Entitlement	.--														
2. Attitude/Perf. App.	.018	.--													
3. Attitude/Perf. Avoi.	.134*	.521**	.--												
4. Attitude/Mast. Avoi.	.118*	.087	.223**	.--											
5. Attitude/Mast. App.	-.235**	.319**	.267**	.290**	.--										
6. Persv./Consist. of Interests	-.187**	-.038	-.109*	-.244**	.099	.--									
7. Persev./Persev. of Effort	-.238**	.325**	.228**	-.043	.456**	.194**	.--								
8. Identity/Ideo. Diffusion	.324**	-.050	.038	.106*	-.138**	-.246**	-.167**	.--							
9. Identity/Ideo. Foreclosure	.366**	.036	.118*	.111*	-.030	-.075	-.140**	.338**	.--						
10. Identity/Ideo. Moratorium	.286**	-.021	.075	.182**	-.099	-.338**	-.190**	.727**	.336**	.--					
11. Identity/Ideo. Achievement	-.072	.027	.032	-.072	.159**	.009	.214**	-.045	.069	-.005	.--				
12. Identity/Inter. Diffusion	.269**	-.057	.004	.188**	-.093	-.227**	-.266**	.566**	.470**	.565**	.012	.--			
13. Identity/Inter. Foreclosure	.359**	.060	.046	.127*	-.037	-.075	-.185**	.290**	.840**	.321**	.033	.439**	.--		
14. Identity/Inter. Moratorium	.222**	.037	.024	.137**	-.053	-.277**	-.117*	.531**	.367**	.675**	.192**	.532**	.341**	.--	
15. Identity/Inter. Achievement	-.003	.204**	.157**	-.067	.132*	.010	.210**	.086	.174**	.088	.585**	-.140**	.144**	.184**	.--

**p < .01; *p< .05

Research Question 3

Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement and their reported perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort)?

A one-way ANOVA was utilized to evaluate the relationship between academic entitlement and perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort). The independent variable (academic entitlement) included three levels: low, medium, and high. The dependent variable was perseverance for goals (consistency of interests, perseverance of effort). The ANOVA for academic entitlement and perseverance for goals (consistency of interests) was statistically significant: F (2/360)=3.86, p=.022. Follow-up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) reveal that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in the medium range of perseverance for goals (consistency of interests). The results of these tests including mean and standard deviation can be found in Table 2. The ANOVA for academic entitlement and perseverance for goals (perseverance of effort) was significant F (2/360)=3.93, p=.021. Follow-up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) reveal that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in the medium range on perseverance for goals (perseverance of effort). The results of these tests including mean and standard deviation can be found in Table 2.

Table 2: Academic Entitlement (Low, Medium, High) and all Other Scales

Variables			
	Academic Entitlement		
	Low (n=287) m (sd)	Medium (n=48) m (sd)	High (n=28) m (sd)
Measure			
Attitude Toward Learning			
Attitude/Perf. App.	4.62 (1.46)	4.34 (1.27)	4.68 (1.27)
Attitude/Perf. Avoi.	4.36 (1.33)	4.47 (1.08)	4.88 (1.01)
Attitude/Mast. Avoi.	3.94 (1.48)	4.01 (1.09)	4.59 (1.18)
Attitude /Mast. App.	**4.96 (1.04)**[ac]	**4.33 (1.26)**[bc]	**4.71 (1.06)**[abc]
Perseverance for Goals			
Persev./Consist. of Interests	**3.80 (1.22)**[ac]	**3.31 (0.99)**[bc]	**3.55 (1.20)**[abc]
Persev./Persev. of Effort	**4.68 (0.98)**[ac]	**4.30 (1.02)**[bc]	**4.36 (0.87)**[abc]
Identity			
Identity/Ideo. Diffusion	**2.52 (0.80)**[a]	**3.00 (0.74)**[bc]	**2.92 (0.86)**[bc]
Identity/Ideo. Foreclosure	**2.37 (1.00)**[a]	**2.87 (0.91)**[bc]	**3.08 (0.93)**[bc]
Identity/Ideo. Moratorium	**2.65 (0.85)**[a]	**2.98 (0.72)**[bc]	**3.03 (0.77)**[bc]
Identity/Ideo. Achievement	3.92 (0.91)	3.76 (0.66)	3.62 (0.84)
Identity/Inter. Diffusion	**2.58 (0.82)**[a]	**2.92 (0.70)**[bc]	**3.01 (0.97)**[bc]
Identity/Inter. Foreclosure	**2.30 (0.95)**[a]	**2.75 (0.95)**[bc]	**3.06 (0.97)**[bc]
Identity/Inter. Moratorium	**2.81 (0.84)**[ac]	**2.98 (0.60)**[abc]	**3.17 (0.71)**[bc]
Identity/Inter. Achievement	3.79 (0.92)	3.77 (0.63)	3.66 (0.78)

Bold indicates statistical significance, superscript indicates statistical significance at least at the $p< .05$ level.

Research Question 4

Are there differences between students who score low, medium, or high on academic entitlement, and their reported identity (ideological subscales: ideological diffusion, ideological foreclosure, ideological moratorium, ideological achievement) (interpersonal subscales: interpersonal diffusion, interpersonal foreclosure, interpersonal moratorium, interpersonal achievement)?

A one-way ANOVA was utilized to evaluate the relationship between academic entitlement and identity (ideological diffusion, ideological foreclosure, ideological moratorium,

ideological achievement). The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (ideological diffusion) was statistically significant F (2/360)=9.28, p=.000. Follow up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) revealed that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in both the medium and high range on ideological identity processes (ideological diffusion). The results of these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (ideological foreclosure) was significant F (2/360)=10.91, p=.000. Follow up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) reveal that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in both the medium and high range on ideological identity processes (ideological foreclosure). The results of these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (ideological moratorium) was significant F (2/360)=5.35, p=.005. Follow-up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) reveal that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students who scored in both the medium and high range on ideological identity processes (ideological moratorium). The results of these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. Possible differences between students who score low, medium, or high levels of academic entitlement, and their reported identity (interpersonal subscales: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, achievement) were then examined.

A one-way ANOVA was utilized to evaluate the relationship between academic entitlement and identity (interpersonal diffusion, interpersonal foreclosure, interpersonal moratorium, interpersonal achievement). The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (interpersonal diffusion) was significant F (2/360)=6.39, p=.002. Follow-up post hoc tests

(LSD, equal variance assumed) reveal that students who score low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students in both the low and high range on interpersonal identity processes (interpersonal diffusion). Results of these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (interpersonal foreclosure) was significant F (2/360)=11.55, p=.000. Follow- up post hoc tests (LSD, equal variance assumed) revealed that students who scored low on academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students in both the medium and high range on interpersonal identity processes (interpersonal foreclosure). Results of these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. The ANOVA for academic entitlement and identity (interpersonal moratorium) was significant F (2/360)=3.11, p=.046. Follow- up post hoc tests (Dunnett's C, equal variance was not assumed) revealed that students who scored low in academic entitlement were statistically significantly different from students in the high range on interpersonal identity processes (interpersonal moratorium). Results from these tests including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2.

Research Question 5

Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding academic entitlement?

A general linear model (GLM) was used to examine this question. The independent variables included sex (male/female), age (18-20, 21-29), and the interaction effect (sex x age). The dependent variable was academic entitlement. The results indicated a significant effect for age F (2/360)=4.30, p=.039. A non-significant main effect for sex, and a non-significant interaction between sex and age was obtained (see Table 3).

Research Question 6

Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding attitude toward learning (subscales: performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach)?

A multivariate general linear model (GLM) was used to examine research question 6. The independent variables included sex (male/female), age (18-20, 21-29), and the interaction effect (sex x age). The dependent variable was attitude toward learning (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach). There were no statistically significant main or interaction effects. A between- subject effect revealed a statistically significant interaction effect for sex x age (performance avoidance, and mastery avoidance). However, when followed-up with a univariate post hoc test, the significant results disappeared. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations.

Table 3: Correlations between Sex, Age, Sex x Age, and all Other Scales

Variables	Sex		Age		Sex x Age			
	Male (n=105) m (sd)	Female (n=259) m (sd)	18-20 (n=251) m (sd)	21-29 (n=113) m (sd)	Male (18-20) (n=74) m (sd)	Male (21-29) (n=31) m(sd)	Female (18-20) (n=177) m (sd)	Female (21-29) (n=82) m (sd)
Ac. Entitlement	2.46(0.87)	2.32(0.82)	**2.44(0.82)**	**2.19(0.84)**	2.50(0.84)	2.35(0.95)	2.41(0.82)	2.13(0.80)
Attitude Toward Learning								
Attitude/Perf. App.	4.74(1.31)	4.53(1.46)	4.60(1.40)	4.56(1.46)	4.65(1.38)	4.95(1.45)	4.58(1.42)	4.41(1.54)
Attitude/Perf. Avoi.	4.37(1.35)	4.43(1.26)	4.43(1.31)	4.36(1.22)	4.24(1.41)†	4.67(1.18)†	4.51(1.27)†	4.25(1.22)†
Attitude/Mast. Avoi.	3.89(1.44)	4.05(1.42)	4.06(1.37)	3.89(1.53)	3.76(1.41)†	4.18(1.50)†	4.18(1.34)†	3.78(1.54)†
Attitude/Mast. App.	4.85(1.10)	4.87(1.09)	4.87(1.10)	4.86(1.09)	4.79(1.15)	5.01(0.98)	4.90(1.08)	4.80(1.12)
Perseverance for Goals								
Persev./Consist. of Interests	3.83(1.21)	3.67(1.19)	3.72(1.14)	3.72(1.31)	3.72(1.22)	4.09(1.16)	3.72(1.11)	3.58(1.34)
Persev./Persev. of Effort	4.77(0.96)	4.54(0.99)	4.56(1.00)	4.71(0.95)	4.79(.96)	4.74(0.97)	4.46(1.01)	4.70(0.95)
Identity								
Identity/Ideo. Diffusion	2.66(0.92)	2.60(0.77)	**2.70(0.81)**	**2.43(0.80)**	2.75(0.95)	2.46(0.83)	2.69(0.74)	2.42(0.79)
Identity/Ideo. Foreclosure	2.52(1.06)	2.48(0.99)	**2.58(1.01)**	**2.30(0.99)**	2.59(1.10)	2.36(0.94)	2.57(0.97)	2.28(1.01)
Identity/Ideo. Moratorium	2.78(0.90)	2.71(0.81)	**2.81(0.85)**	**2.53(0.78)**	2.84(0.96)	2.62(0.73)	2.80(0.80)	2.50(0.80)
Identity/Ideo. Achievement	4.00(0.92)	3.83(0.85)	**3.83(0.86)**	**4.00(0.89)**	3.90(0.88)	4.24(0.97)	3.79(0.85)	3.91(0.85)
Identity/Inter. Diffusion	2.64(0.90)	2.66(0.80)	2.68(.78)	2.61(0.86)	2.63(0.92)	2.67(0.87)	2.70(0.78)	2.58(0.85)
Identity/Inter. Foreclosure	2.50(1.00)	2.39(0.98)	2.51(1.00)	2.21(0.91)	2.52(1.05)	2.43(0.89)	2.51(0.98)	2.13(0.91)
Identity/Inter. Moratorium	2.85(0.82)	2.88(0.80)	2.90(0.80)	2.78(0.81)	2.89(0.86)	2.73(0.73)	2.91(0.79)	2.80(0.84)
Identity/Inter. Achievement	3.86(0.78)	3.74(0.91)	3.76(0.84)	3.81(0.97)	3.87(0.76)	3.84(0.85)	3.72(0.86)	3.79(1.02)

Bold indicates significance differences. †Not significant after post hoc testing.

Research Question 7

Are there differences between females and males and younger and older students regarding perseverance for goals (subscales: consistency of interests, perseverance of effort)?

A multivariate general linear model (GLM) was utilized to examine research question 7. The independent variables included sex (male/female), age (18-20, 21-29), and the interaction effect between (sex x age). The dependent variable was perseverance for goals (consistency of interests, perseverance of effort). There were no statistically significant main or interaction effects. In-between subject effects revealed no statistically significant interactions. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations.

Research Question 8

Are there differences between females and males/younger and older students regarding identity statuses (ideological/interpersonal domain)?

A multivariate general linear model (GLM) was utilized to examine research question 8. The independent variables included sex (male/female), age (18-20, 21-29), and the interaction effect between sex and age. Results indicated that there was a statistically significant main effect for age. F (8/353)= 2.33, $p=$.019. There was no statistically significant main effect for sex or interaction effect for sex and age. Between-subject tests revealed statistically significant effects between younger (18-20), and older (21-29) individuals for identity (ideological diffusion) F (1/363)=7.38, $p=$. 007; identity (ideological foreclosure) F (1/363)=4.14, $p=$.043; identity (ideological moratorium) F (1/363)=6.40, $p=$.012; identity (ideological achievement) F (1/363)=4.26, $p=$.040. Younger individuals (18-20) scored higher on diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium, and lower on achievement compared to older students (21-29). There were no

significant differences in any of the four interpersonal domains. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations.

These results have indicated that more statistically significant findings were present when examining academic entitlement with all other measures. It seems quite logical that higher levels of academic entitlement would coincide with low levels of attitudes toward learning and perseverance of goals. This might suggest that academically entitled individuals could be characterized as expecting success, and when success is not received, they place responsibility on others. In regards to sex and age, it appears that age may play a role in levels of academic entitlement. In addition, younger individuals are more likely to be score higher on diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium, and lower on achievement.

Discussion

It is important to note the findings regarding academic entitlement. Current literature concerning the matter presents academic entitlement in a meaningful manner (Lessard et al., 2011). While it is a topic that has gained popularity, students in this sample do not appear to be as academically entitled as the literature might have suggested. The majority of the students in the sample disagreed (slightly to moderately) with the items on the scale. The categorical variable (low/medium/high) revealed that the vast majority of students fell in the low category for academic entitlement. The reasons for this might be that students under-report their level of academic entitlement, or that faculty and staff over-report instances of academic entitlement. Further research will be needed to examine this finding in more detail.

Bivariate correlations using Pearson's correlations were conducted to examine the potential correlations between academic entitlement and the other scales. Positive correlations were found between academic entitlement and attitude toward learning (performance avoidance, performance approach) as well as identity in the ideological and interpersonal domains. These findings suggest that individuals who experience high levels of academic entitlement will also have high scores on performance avoidance. It would seem that this type of individual is not interested in either performance or mastering the material, but rather, finding ways to avoid failure.

The bivariate correlation using Pearson's Correlation also indicated that statistically significant negative correlations existed between academic entitlement and perseverance for goals (consistency of interests and perseverance of effort). This finding indicates that student's who score higher in academic entitlement, will have lower levels of perseverance for goals (consistency of interest, and perseverance of effort). As noted by Singleton-Jackson et al.

(2011), students who are academically entitled feel that a reward is deserved not based on their efforts and also that diminishes them of responsibility. One important aspect of perseverance for goals is the ability to work toward challenges and yet still maintain both effort and interest over elongated amounts of time, even when failure is present (Duckworth et al., 2007). It might be that a student who is academically entitled might relinquish all responsibility, especially in terms of failure, typically placing responsibility with the instructor. It is this type of student that cannot move forward in trying to find an alternative. Instead, these types of students feel that regardless of effort, an acceptable outcome should have been seen. It would appear that these individuals focus more on the outcome rather than the process.

The present study also examined academic entitlement as a categorical variable by creating low, medium, and high levels. When paired with attitude toward learning, a significant finding for attitude toward learning (mastery approach) was present. This might indicate that individuals who scored low on academic entitlement also have the highest score on attitude toward learning (mastery approach). As previously discussed, it appears individuals who are academically entitled typically do not look to the process of learning, rather focusing on the outcome (i. e. grades). In addition to the focus being placed on the outcome, the student typically expects to receive a good grade (or experience success), regardless of what time and effort is put forth. It would make sense then, that someone who is high is mastery approach would score low in the area of academic entitlement. This type of individual looks to "mastering" a subject, and wants to ensure that the material is not only learned, but comprehended as well. When a failure does occur, this type of individual realizes that it is their responsibility to try and figure out where improvements can be made as opposed to blaming others or their environment.

There was also a statistically significant finding concerning academic entitlement and for perseverance for goals (consistency of interest, and perseverance of effort). Findings indicated that those who scored lower on academic entitlement score high in consistency of interests. The same was found perseverance of effort as well. The current literature on academic entitlement notes that individuals who are academically entitled simply want to make a good grade, and disregard the amount of effort (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2011). Therefore, individuals who score high in consistency of interests might score low on academic entitlement, because they have a clear and consistent idea of not only what they are interested in, but also what must be done in order for success to occur.

Examining academic entitlement and identity (ideological and interpersonal domains), some very interesting findings surfaced. One could assume that individuals in the diffused, foreclosed, and moratorium stages of identity would score highest on academic entitlement, and this appears to be fairly consistent. When examining identity diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium (in both the ideological and interpersonal domains) individuals who scored highest on academic entitlement also scored higher on diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium in both domains. A person high on foreclosure has committed without exploration, and is often reflective of the beliefs of significant others such as parent(s). In contrast, an individual scoring higher on diffusion has little to no exploration or commitments. Lastly, an individual reporting higher scores on moratorium engages in high exploration, but has not made commitments yet. Individuals who score higher on diffusion or foreclosure may experience high academic entitlement due to the lack of exploration. When failure occurs, these individuals may not have the capabilities to explore ways in which things can be done differently in order to for success to occur. As discussed above, an individual in the moratorium status engages in high exploration

and no or low commitments. It is possible that these individuals may score high in academic entitlement because while they are able to explore alternatives, they may become stuck exploring without making commitments.

Differences between sex, age, and the interaction between sex and age were explored for each measure. Differences between sex, age, and the interaction between sex and age are often seen in the literature (Ciani et al., 2008). When examining academic entitlement, a main effect for age was present. This finding suggests that one's age can perhaps be a predictor in the level of academic entitlement experienced. This may occur as the academic entitlement literature suggests that during adolescence, many children receive these self-inflating messages from teacher during grade school (Ciani et al., 2008), so it seems that the younger the student, the higher levels of entitlement will be present.

When sex, age, and the interaction of sex and age was paired with attitude toward learning (performance approach, performance avoidance, mastery avoidance, mastery approach) no significant main effects or interaction effects were found. While there seemed to be a between- subjects effect for sex and age for performance avoidance as well as mastery avoidance, after post hoc follow-up testing was conducted, these significant findings disappeared.

In regards to perseverance for goals (consistency of interests, perseverance of effort) and sex, age, and sex and age, there were no significant results indicating that sex, age, and sex x age do not predict one's perseverance for goals. Lastly, both domains (ideological and interpersonal) of identity were explored with sex, age, and sex x age. While there were neither main- nor interaction effects, in-between subjects tests revealed that there was significance differences for individuals in the ideological domain. Findings indicate that younger students (18-20) score

higher on ideological diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium. In contrast, older students (21-29) score higher on ideological achievement. These results are very congruent with the existing literature on identity processes. Research by Adams (1998) suggests that identity identification and imitation are useful processes in not only adolescence, but during emerging adulthood as well, "as individuals experiment with alternative values, beliefs, and ways of being as a function of resolving the distress which arises from the awareness of need for change" (p. 7).

In summary, it appears that academic entitlement is not as prevalent as one might have expected, at least in this sample. However, interesting associations between many of the variables were established, such as attitudes towards learning, perseverance for goals, and identity processes.

Limitations and Future Research

It would appear that one of the main limitations in the current study is student self-report. While self-report can provide the researcher with access to ample information, self-report also relies on student honesty as well as their level of social desirability. It is possible that students may under-report levels of academic entitlement. In addition, it is also possible that academic entitlement might be perceived as more prevalent because it can take so much of a faculty member's time. Future research is needed to examine this phenomenon. Future research regarding academic entitlement could also benefit from collecting data from different sources. More specifically, it would be interesting to also explore views coming from professors as well as students.

Another limitation to this study is that data was only collected from one southeast university. It would be interesting to see if similarities exist for other universities or community colleges. Additionally, males were underrepresented in the study; therefore a more balanced

sample would be beneficial in the future. A more ethnically diverse sample should also be

included. Furthermore, future research needs to investigate moderation and mediation effect

between the variables examined such as: Do attitudes towards learning moderate between

perseverance of goals and academic entitlement?

References

Adams, G. (1998). The objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual.

    http://www.uoguelph.ca/~gadams/OMEIS_manual.

Arnett, J.J., 2006. Emerging adulthood: What it is and what is good for? *Journal Compilation,*

    Society for Research in Child Development, *1*(2), 68-73.

Baer, J. C., & Cheryomukhin, A. (2011). Students' distress over grades: Entitlement or a coping

    response? *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(3), 565-577.

    doi:10.5175/JSWE.2011.200900127.

Bartoszuk, K., Vess, L., Jones, S. (2012, March). *Undergraduate retention- risk and protective*

    factors, and the role of identity processes. Poster presented at the 19th Meeting of the

    Society for Research on Identity Formation, British Columbia, Vancouver.

Berzonsky, M. (1995). Public self-presentations and self-conceptions: The moderating role of

    identity status. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(6), 737-745.

Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic

    entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled

    expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(4), 982-997. doi:

    10.1037/a0016351.

Ciani, K. D., Summers, J. J., & Easter, M. A. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement

    among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 169* (4), 332-344.

Collier, P. J., & Morgan, D. L. (2008). "Is that paper really due today?": differences in first-

    generation and traditional college students' understandings of faculty expectations.

    Higher Education 55: 425-446. doi:10.1007/s10734-007-9065-5.

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and

    passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6),1087-

    1101. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2x2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, 80(3), 501-519. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.80.3.501.

Finney, S. J., Pieper, S. L., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Examining the psychometric properties of

    the achievement goal questionnaire in a general academic context. *Educational and*

    Psychological Measurement 64: 365-382. doi:10.1177.0013164403258465.

Freilino, M. K., & Hummel, R. (1985). Achievement and identity in college-age vs. adult women

    students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14*(1), 1-10.

Jones, S.K., Vess, L.R., Cowan, J.K., Bartoszuk, K. (2012, April). *Academic entitlement: what's*

    stress got to do with it? Poster presented at the Appalachian Student Research Forum,

    Johnson City, TN.

Kopp, J. P., Zinn, T. E., Finney, S. J., & Jurich, D. P. (2011). The development and evaluation of

    the academic entitlement questionnaire. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and*

    Development, 44(2), 105-129. doi: 10.1177/0748175611400292.

Kroger, J., & Marcia, J. E. (2011). The identity statuses: Origins, meanings, and interpretations.

    In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.L. Vignoles (Eds.), Handbook of Identity Theory and

    Research (pp. 31- 53). New York: Springer Science + Business Media. doi: 10.1007/978-

    1-4419-7988-9_2.

Lessard, J., Greenberger, E., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2011). Are youth's feelings of

    entitlement always "bad"?: Evidence for a distinction between exploitive and non-

exploitive dimensions of entitlement. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 521-529.

doi:10.1016/j.adolescence/2010.05.014.

Luyckx, Schwartz, S. J., Goossens, L., Beyers, W., & Missotten, L. Processes of personal

identity formation and evaluation. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.L. Vignoles (Eds.),

Handbook of Identity Theory and Research (pp. 77-96). New York: Springer Science +

Business Media. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_4.

Mattern, R. A. (2005). College students' goal orientations and achievement. *International

Journal of Teacher and Learning in Higher Education, 17*(1), 27-32.

Read, D., Adams, G. R., & Dobson, W. R. (1984). Ego-identity status, personality, and social

influence style. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(1), 169-177.

Rozendaal, J.S., Minnaert, A., & Boekaerts, M. (2003). Motivation and self-regulated learning in

secondary vocational education: Information-processing type and gender differences.

Learning and Individual Differences, 13, 273-289. doi: 10.1016/S1041-6080(03)00016-5.

Singleton-Jackson, J. A., Jackson, D. L., & Reinhardt, J. (2011). Academic entitlement:

Exploring definitions and dimensions of entitled students. *The International Journal of

Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5*(9), 229-236.

Smith, J. L., Sansone, C., & White, P. H. (2007). The stereotyped task engagement process: The

role of interest and achievement motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1),

99-114. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.99.

Tempelaar, D.T., Schim van der Leoff, S., Gijselaers, W. H., & Nijhuis, J. F. H. (2011). On

subject variations in achievement motivations: A study in business subjects. *Res Higher

Education, 52*, 395-419. doi: 10.1007/211162-010-9199-7.

Tippin, G. K., Lafreniere, K. D., Page, S. (2012). Student perception of academic grading: Personality, academic orientation, and effort. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 13*(1), 51-61. doi:10.1177//146987411429187.

Tuckman, B.W. (1996). The relative effectiveness of incentive motivation and prescribed learning strategy in improving college students' course performance. *Journal of Experimental Education, 64*(3), 197-210.

Twenge, J.M., (2006). Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled—and more miserable than ever before. New York: Free Press.

Zusman M., Knox, D. & Liberman, M. (2005). Gender differences in reactions to college course requirements or "why females are better students." *College Student Journal, 39*(4), 621-626.

Appendix A

Demographics

1. Are you?　　　□ Female　　　□ Male

2. What is your age in years? _____

3. How would you describe your race/ethic background? _____

4. Are you an international student?　□ Yes　　□ No

5. What was your GPA during the last semester of school (High School if 1st year freshman)? _____

6. What is your student status?
   □ Freshman　　□ Sophomore　　□ Junior　　□ Senior　　□ Graduate

7. Are you a _____ student?
   □ Full-time　　　　□ Part- time

8. What is your major? _____

9. What is your minor? _____

10. How many semester hours are you currently taking? _____hours this semester

11. What are your educational goals?
    □ Bachelor's Degree　　□ Master's Degree　　□ Advanced Degree (MD, law, PH.D, etc.)

12. What are your occupational goals (be specific)?
    _____
    _____

13. What is your employment status?
    □ Unemployed, not seeking employment (student, full-time caregiver, homemaker)
    □ Unemployed, seeking employment
    □ Employed less than 25 hours a week; Type(s) of work_____
    □ Employed less than 40 hours a week; Type(s) of work_____
    □ Employed 40 hours a week or more; Types(s) of work_____

The Academic Entitlement Questionnaire Kopp, J. P., Zinn, T. E., Finney, S. J., & Jurich, D. P. (2011). Eight items associated with feelings of academic entitlement . Participants rated the items on a 6-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*)

Academic Entitlement Questionnaire

1. If I don't do well on a test, the professor should make tests easier or curve grades.
2. It is the professor's responsibility to make it easy for me to succeed.
3. I am a product of my environment. Therefore, if I do poorly in a class, it is not my fault.
4.   I should be given the opportunity to make up a test, regardless of the reason for absence.
5. Professors should only lecture on material covered in the textbook and assigned readings.
6. If I am struggling in a class, the professor should approach me and offer to help.
7. Because I pay tuition, I deserve passing grades.
8. If I cannot learn the material for a class from lecture alone, then it is the professor's fault when I fail a test.

Attitude Toward Learning (Finney, Pieper, & Baron, 2004). Twelve items associated with Attitude toward learning. Participants rated items concerning their attitudes towards learning and performance in college classes on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true of me*) to 6 (*very true for me*).

Attitude Toward Learning

1. **Performance Approach**
    a. My goal this semester is to get better grades than most other students.
    b. It is important for me to do well compared to other students this semester.
    c. I want to do better than other students this semester.

2. **Performance Avoidance**
    a.   I just want to avoid doing poorly compared to other students this semester.
    b. The fear of performing poorly Is what motivates me.
    c. My goal this semester is to avoid performing poorly compared to other students.

3. **Mastery Avoidance**
    a. I am afraid that I may not understand the content of my courses as thoroughly as I'd like.
    b. I worry that I may not learn all that I can this semester.
    c. I am definitely concerned that I may not learn all that I can this semester.

4. **Mastery Approach**
    a. Completely mastering the material in my courses is important to me this semester.
    b. I want to learn as much as possible this semester.
    c. The most important thing for me this semester is to understand the content in my courses as thoroughly as possible.

Perseverance and Passion for Long-Term Goals (GRIT) (Matthews & Kelly, 2007). Twelve items associated with an individual's perseverance for passion for long- term goals. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Not all the time*) to 6 (*Very much all the time*).

Perseverance and Passion for Long- Term Goals (GRIT)

1. **Consistency of Interests**
   a. I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one (reverse).
   b. New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones (reverse).
   c. I become interested in new pursuits every few months (reverse).
   d. My interests change from year to year (reverse).
   e. I have been obsessed with a certain idea or project for a short time but later lost interest (reverse).
   f. I have difficulty maintaining my focus on projects that take more than a few months to complete (reverse).

2. **Perseverance of Effort**
   a. I have achieved a goal that took years of work.
   b. I have overcome setbacks to conquer an important challenge.
   c. I finish whatever I begin.
   d. I am diligent.
   e. I am a hard worker.
   f. Setbacks don't discourage me.

The Revised Version of the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams, 1998). Includes 64 items in which participants rated items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1(*Strongly Disagree*) to 6(*Strongly Agree*).

The Revised Version of the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status

1. **Ideological Diffusion**
   a. There's no single "life style" which appeals to me more than another.
   b. When it comes to religion, I just haven't found anything that appeals and I don't really feel the need to look.
   c. I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I'm just working at whatever is available until something better comes along.
   d. I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or the other.
   e. I haven't really considered politics. It just doesn't excite me much.
   f. I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to flow with what is available.
   g. I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or the other.
   h. I guess I just kind of enjoy life in general, and I don't see myself living by any particular viewpoint to life.

2. Ideological Foreclosure
   a. I might have thought about a lot of different jobs, but there's never really any question since my parents said what they wanted.
   b. . I guess I'm pretty much like my folks when it comes to politics. I follow what they do in terms of voting and such.
   c. My own views on a desirable life style were taught to me by my parents and I don't see any need to question what they taught me.
   d. My parents decided a long time ago what I should go into for employment and I'm following through their plans
   e. My parents' views on life are good enough for me, I don't need anything else.
   f. I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents, it must be right for me.
   g. I attend the same church my family has always attended. I've never really questioned why.
   h. My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like abortion and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.

3. Ideological Moratorium
   a. I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.
   b. I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many that have possibilities.
   c. I'm not sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.
   d. There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.
   e. Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong for me.
   f. In finding an acceptable viewpoint in life itself, I find myself engaging in a lot of discussions with others and some self-exploration.
   g. I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.
   h. I'm looking for an acceptable perspective for my own "life style" view, but I haven't really found yet.

4. Ideological Achievement
   a. Politics is something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it's important to know what I can politically stand for and believe in.
   b. A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.
   c. After considerable thought I've developed my own individual viewpoint of what is for me an ideal "lifestyle" and don't believe anyone will be likely to change my perspective.
   d. It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know for sure what direction to move in for a career.

e. I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.

f. I've gone through a period of serious questions about faith and now can say I understand what I believe in as an individual.

g. It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.

h. After a lot of self-examination, I have established a very definite view on what my own lifestyle will be.

5. **Interpersonal Diffusion**
   a. I sometimes join in recreation activities when asked, but I rarely try anything on my own.
   b. I haven't really thought about a "dating style." I'm not concerned whether I date or not.
   c. I've never really seriously considered men's and women's roles in a marriage. It just doesn't seem to concern me.
   d. I don't think about dating much. I just kind of take it as it comes.
   e. I don't have any real close friends and I don't think I'm looing for one right now.
   f. Sometimes I join leisure activities, but I don't really see a need to look for a particular activity to do regularly.
   g. I don't have any close friends. I just like to hang around with the crowd.
   h. I have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or another.

6. **Interpersonal Foreclosure**
   a. My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will work for me.
   b. My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose my friends.
   c. My ideas about men's and women's roles come right from my parents and family. I haven't seen any need to look further.
   d. I only pick friends my parents would approve of.
   e. I've always liked doing the same recreational activities my parents and haven't ever seriously considered anything else.
   f. I only go out with the type of people my parents expect me to date.
   g. All of my recreational preferences I got from my parents and I haven't really tried anything else.
   h. I date only parents would approve of.

7. **Interpersonal Moratorium**
   a. There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me.
   b. There's so many ways to divide responsibilities in marriage, I'm trying to decide what will work for me.
   c. While I don't have one recreational activity I'm really committed to, I'm experiencing numerous leisure outlets to identify one that I can really get involved with.

    d. I'm trying out different types of relationships, I just haven't decided what is best for me.

    e. I've been thinking about the roles that husbands and wives play a lot these days and I'm trying to make a final decision.

    f. My preferences about dating are still in the process of developing. I haven't fully decided yet.

    g. I've been experiencing a variety of recreational activities in hopes of finding one or more that I can enjoy for some time to come.

    h. I really don't know what kind of friend is best for me. I'm trying to figure out exactly what friendship means to me.

8. **Interpersonal Achievement**

    a. There are many reasons for friendship, but I choose my close friends on the basis of certain values and similarities that I've personally decided on.

    b. Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now.

    c. I've chosen one or more recreational activities to engage in regularly from lots of things and I'm satisfied with those choices.

    d. I've spent some time thinking about men's and women's roles in marriage and I've decided what will work best for me.

    e. I've dated different types of people and now know exactly what my own "unwritten rules" for dating are and who I will date.

    f. There are many ways that married couples can divide up family responsibilities. I've thought about lots of ways and now know exactly how I want it to happen for me.

    g. After trying a lot of different recreational activities I've found one or more I really enjoy doing by myself or with friends.

    h. I've tried many different friendships and now I have a clear idea of what to look for in a friend.