Are There Types of Academically Entitled Students?
A Cluster Analysis

Dennis L. Jackson
University of Windsor

Chelsea McLellan
University of Windsor

Marc P. Frey
University of Windsor

Carolyn M. Rauti
University of Windsor

Abstract

Academic entitlement (AE), which includes some students' tendencies to express deservingness of academic outcomes, not based on achievement, may have serious implications, such as academic dishonesty and classroom incivility. Some researchers have suggested that there may be different types of students with regard to AE, implying that motives for entitled behaviour may not be uniform. The current study extends previous work in identifying subtypes of AE. A sample of 751 undergraduate students responded to measures of AE, narcissism, and performance avoidance learning orientation. Cluster analysis revealed five distinct clusters: Entitled Narcissist, Entitled Non-Narcissist, Unobtrusive Entitlement, Not Entitled, and Performance Avoidant. The Entitled Narcissist cluster is small in size and members generally have a higher sense of entitlement. The Entitled Non-Narcissist cluster is larger in size and members tend to have high performance avoidance scores. Understanding typologies of AE could lead to different strategies for addressing highly entitled students.

Keywords: academic entitlement, student entitlement, cluster analysis, typologies

Résumé

La prétention scolaire (*Academic Entitlement* [*AE*]), qui inclut la tendance de certains étudiants à revendiquer la réussite scolaire sans qu'elle se fonde sur les résultats obtenus, peut avoir de sérieuses répercussions telles que la malhonnêteté scolaire et l'incivilité en classe. Certains chercheurs ont suggéré qu'il pourrait y avoir différents types d'étudiants en ce qui concerne l'*AE*, ce qui implique que les motifs derrière leur comportement peuvent ne pas être uniformes. La présente étude se veut le prolongement de travaux antérieurs visant l'identification de sous-groupes d'*AE*. Un échantillon de 751 étudiants universitaires a répondu aux mesures d'*AE*, de narcissisme et d'orientation de l'apprentissage par l'évitement des performances. L'analyse typologique révèle cinq sous-groupes distincts : les narcissiques, les non-narcissiques, les discrets (ces trois groupes croient que tout leur est dû), ceux qui n'ont pas le sentiment que tout leur est dû, et ceux qui évitent la performance. Les individus de type narcissique forment un groupe de petite taille et ont en général un sentiment plus fort que tout leur est dû. Les individus de type non narcissique forment un

groupe de plus grande taille et ont tendance à obtenir des scores d'évitement de performance plus élevés. La compréhension de typologies de l'*AE* pourrait conduire à différentes stratégies pour s'adresser aux étudiants qui ont un sentiment très fort que tout leur est dû.

Mots-clés : prétention scolaire, sentiment que tout leur est dû, étudiants, analyse typologique, typologies

Introduction

When university courses begin each fall and campuses are bustling with students, how many instructors do you suppose are crafting their syllabuses to anticipate unpredictable requests that will come up from students? Some requests may be legitimate, while others are viewed as unrealistic and entitled, such as those that follow.

> Labs for this course are shown as required on the enrollment system but I didn't get around to enrolling in a lab section until after Reading Week. I have missed those weekly lab points so I need you to send me those assignments so I can make them up and get the points that I missed.

> I just saw my final mark for the course is 78%. I need an 80% so that I can keep my scholarship. Can you please go ahead and round my mark up to an 80%?

> I am enrolled in your course but I have job training out of town during the semester. I will miss six weeks of class so I need for you to send me the assignments and let me submit them electronically. I also will not be able to participate in the group assignment so I will just need to do it individually.

These actual statements by students may be interpreted as manifestations of an underlying construct that researchers have termed academic entitlement (AE). A plethora of examples could be offered, including requests for the instructor's detailed lecture notes, expecting to receive a passing grade based on effort, or the assumption that the professor is solely responsible for their students' success. Possible causes for AE are outlined elsewhere and include the use of a consumer-based model for marketing education, such as the one described by Wright (2008) and other researchers (e.g., Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010); parenting (e.g., Greenberger et al., 2008); possible generational differences, such as increases in narcissism (Twenge & Campbell, 2008), and so on. Whatever the cause, changes in educational norms, such as grade inflation, likely contribute (Rojstaczer & Healy, 2012).

Regarding this last point, Rojstaczer and Healy (2012) found a grade inflation trend among higher education institutions in the United States, beginning in the mid-1980s and continuing through to 2008, the last year for which data were available at the

time of their publication. In the later years of that study, a grade of A became the most frequently assigned grade. Thus, in a system where a grade of C should denote average or typical performance, a grade of A has become average or typical. It seems plausible that once higher grades become the norm, students would feel entitled to those higher grades. Rojstaczer and Healy identify the consumer model of higher education as one of the underlying causes of grade inflation.

This article creates a typology of AE by identifying latent populations or clusters of students relative to AE and other key measures. We will begin with a brief review of some of the relevant literature on AE, followed by a discussion of the motivation for developing a typology. Keeping the possible causes of AE in mind as well as the subsequent background literature will serve to identify potential clusters a priori.

Background Literature

Achacoso (2002) was an early researcher in this area, and perhaps the first in psychology to formally study academic entitlement (AE). However, prior to that study, Morrow (1994) expressed concern over the erosion of academic standards. Morrow noted there was an emergence of students confusing achievement with a sense of being entitled to good grades, resulting in a degree based on effort rather than learning. As Morrow noted, this sense of entitlement has the potential to damage the institution of higher education to the point of rendering degrees less meaningful. Post-secondary degrees have long stood as a marker of intellectual achievement, and from a societal perspective, the main concern over AE is that it has the potential to diminish the validity of a university degree as a marker of intellectual achievement.

The literature suggests that there are potentially serious implications for student entitlement, such as grade inflation (Mansfield, 2001) and academic dishonesty (Greenberger et al., 2008). Chowning and Campbell (2009) expressed concern that AE is related to student incivility, and Taylor et al. (2015) found that more highly entitled students displayed poorer engagement with research participation. Another consistent finding is that students who have higher levels of AE are more prone to performance or grade-oriented learning (Jackson et al., 2011). Similarly, Andrey et al. (2012) found that AE scores correlated positively with a measure of surface learning strategy. In other words, students

who are high in AE are less likely to engage in deep learning or attempt to master course material.

Additionally, females tend to show lower levels of AE compared to males (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Wasieleski et al., 2014), which has been attributed to gender socialization (Boswell, 2012). AE has shown some relationship to personality, specifically to agreeableness and conscientiousness (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; McLellan & Jackson, 2017; Taylor et al., 2015) and narcissism (Greenberger et al., 2008). AE has also been related to an external locus of control (e.g., Kopp et al., 2011) and lower self-efficacy (Boswell, 2012). It has been suggested that both external locus of control and narcissism are important components of AE (Greenberger et al., 2008; Wasieleski et al., 2014). Finally, there is agreement among researchers that AE is related to, but distinct from, psychological entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008; Kopp et al., 2011).

Types of Academic Entitlement

While there are many aspects of AE worthy of study, and many unanswered questions regarding AE, we chose to pursue a specific question having to do with whether or not students can be characterized as homogeneous with respect to their level or profile of AE traits (i.e., whether there are latent populations). For instance, can two students seem to have similar levels of AE but for different reasons, perhaps resulting in different behavioural patterns or profiles with respect to relevant measures? Some researchers have suggested that what appears to be entitled behaviour may be a coping mechanism used by students to improve their academic outcomes and/or allay their anxiety about their academic outcomes (Baer, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). Presumably a student in higher distress over grades might make requests to alleviate their anxiety, such as requesting detailed lecture notes or special accommodations. So, what appears as entitlement to instructors may be an expression of academic distress or anxiety. Another student who has narcissistic tendencies might be entitled in most aspects of his or her life, and being entitled in an academic setting is merely an extension of this person's general orientation toward a variety of situations. On the surface, both of these students might appear similarly entitled.

There is utility in viewing AE in this way. For instance, an intervention designed to ameliorate AE would not be equally effective with both of these hypothetical students. We believe that a fuller understanding of AE can be gained by attempting to understand whether there are latent populations with respect to AE. The main goal of this article is to identify clusters of individuals with respect to AE, estimate how many clusters there are, and describe these clusters. A definitive answer to the number and nature of clusters cannot be offered with a single study. Our goal is to begin such an exploration and point to future research directions.

There have been three previous studies that bear directly on our work. First, the aforementioned study by Baer (2011) reported a latent class analysis where the authors specified self-esteem to be the class variable and AE to be a latent variable. The authors found two classes, low and high self-esteem, and found measurement model varied as a function of class, with the high self-esteem group having all AE indicators with negative significant loadings, thus negatively related to self-esteem. For class 2 (the low self-esteem group), only two items were significant and they were related to self-evaluation. Professor evaluation items in the AE scale were not significantly related to self-esteem. This provides evidence that AE may have a different meaning based on an individual's level of self-esteem, and thus is offered as support for the purpose of the current study.

A study by Andrey et al. (2012) combined a measure of AE with scales measuring deep, surface, and strategic learning approaches. Deep and surface learning are as they sound. Deep learners attempt to grasp the nuance of content to its fullest extent, while surface learners focus more on superficial aspects, such as definitions. The strategic learning approach involves using strategy to know where to put effort and how to get the most out of effort. Strategic learners would switch back and forth between deep and surface learning approaches depending upon their goals and the context. The authors used a cluster analytic approach and arrived at eight clusters, which they named Relaxed Student, Student Scholar, Just Puttin' in Time, Worker Bee, Inquiring Mind, Strategist, Memorizer with Expectations, and Driven to Succeed. Some clusters differed in terms of AE: Driven to Succeed and Memorizer with Expectations clusters had high scores on a measure of AE (and surface learning) while the Student Scholars cluster had low scores on AE (and high scores on deep learning).

Finally, Luckett et al. (2017) assessed AE group membership and student expectations regarding communication and pedagogical issues, as well as demographic factors.

The authors identified four clusters of students in terms of AE, which they named: Model Student, Under the Radar, Instructor as Servant, and The Privileged. The Model Student group scored the lowest on all AE dimensions (behavioural, service, and grade entitlement). Females, mature students, and those with higher GPA were over-represented in this cluster. The Under the Radar group scored slightly higher on the AE dimensions compared to the Model Student, but relatively lower than the remaining two groups of students. The Instructor as a Servant cluster was the most highly entitled (highest on grade and service entitlement, as well as general entitlement). This group was over-represented by males, younger students, and students from higher-income families. Lastly, The Privileged cluster scored the highest on behavioural entitlement and showed little regard for common rules and classroom manners. This cluster comprised mostly male students, students from higher-income families, and had the lowest average GPA out of the four clusters.

These studies, taken together, suggest that looking for types of AE students is a worthy endeavour. Like Luckett et al. (2017), our approach employs a multidimensional measure of AE. Most measures of AE have more than one dimension (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Kopp et al., 2011), thus an approach using a multidimensional measure should be pursued for the sake of completeness. Our approach differs from previous work in that we combined the multidimensional measure of AE (described below) with a measure of narcissism as its inclusion has been argued for (Wasieleski et al., 2014), based on a critique of current AE measures.

Our General Approach and Outcome Expectations

Cluster analysis (CA) is a data analytic technique used to find groupings of objects (in this case, people), based on their similarities and differences to one another. Ideally, the procedure will find well-defined clusters of people who are similar to each other, while dissimilar and distinct from other clusters of people. With real data, however, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding whether the clusters that are found truly represent distinct groups, since random data can yield clusters (Milligen & Hirtle, 2003). The success of applying CA depends greatly on the measures used, and the challenge is to find a set of

measures that reveals a cluster structure, while excluding extraneous measures that do not contribute to the cluster structure (Gordon, 1999; Milligan & Hirtle, 2003).

Study Expectations

We began with the fundamental assumption that students might display entitled behaviours for different reasons. This was based on classroom experience and empirical evidence (Andrey et al., 2012). Some students are likely high in entitlement because it is a central part of their personality and they probably feel entitled across most aspects of their lives. This would be indicative of someone high in both AE and narcissism. Based on previous research, we would anticipate this to be a small cluster and over-represented by males (Twenge et al., 2008).

We also feel that there are possibly at least two other groups of highly entitled students. One group likely comprises students who are entitled in an academic setting, based on the assumption that they are treating an education as a commodity to be purchased and, as a paying customer, they are entitled to certain outcomes. Additionally, we feel that there is likely a group of students who appear entitled, but these entitled behaviours are actually a way of coping with the demands of higher education (e.g., Baer, 2011). Members of this group may lack intellectual capacity or skills to perform well in an academic environment, are not efficient at studying, or even have time constraints placed on them by outside obligations such as work or family. Finally, we anticipate that there will be a group of students who are not entitled. Beyond these groups, we have no expectations but are open to the possibility of there being more clusters, such as a middle-group with some entitlement proclivities.

Method

Participants

A sample of 751 undergraduate students from a mid-sized Canadian university participated in this study. The average age of participants was 20 years old (Median = 20) and most of the sample self-identified as female (79.4%) and White/European-Canadian

(69.5%). More participants were in their first (31.1%) or second (27.4%) year of study, compared to third (20.2%) and fourth (21.4%) year.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from the psychology department's participant pool system. This allowed for a broad range of students both inside and outside of the social sciences, as many students in other disciplines take psychology courses either as electives or to fulfill a social science requirement, and these students are encouraged to enroll in the participant pool. When completing studies, students log into the participant pool website and see a list of ongoing studies, listed in random order. Students who chose this study were provided with a link to the online survey, where they provided consent and answered the survey questions. Participants were compensated with course credit for research participation. This study was approved by the university's research ethics board.

Measures

Some measures were included in the study for the purpose of clustering people, and some for external validation of the final cluster solution. The measures used are described below.

  Academic Entitlement Questionnaire (AEQ). The AEQ is a 60-item measure with questions adapted from other AE measures, as well as items written by the authors. It measures seven dimensions of AE (summarized in Table 1). One scale measures general AE, modelled on a psychological entitlement measure (Campbell et al., 2004). The remaining six scales measure specific domains of AE, some of which can be considered outcomes of AE (e.g., Customer Service Expectations), while others are more at the heart of AE (e.g., Accommodation). Past data collection has yielded satisfactory reliability (α = .75 to .95; Reinhardt, 2012).

Table 1

List of Academic Entitlement Dimensions

Scale	Number of items	Designed to measure…	Example item
Reward for Effort	7	students' tendency to feel they should receive higher grades based on effort	Even if I do not perform well, I should get a good grade if I worked hard.
Accommodation	8	the extent to which students feel they should receive accommodations to help them succeed	My test date should be moved if I am not prepared.
Responsibility Avoidance	8	the degree to which students seek to avoid responsibility for coursework and performance	If I do poorly in a course, the fault lies with my professor.
Customer Orientation	8	students' tendency to see themselves in a customer role or to possess customer attitudes	Professors work for students.
Customer Service Expectations	7	behaviours associated with a customer orientation	I should be able to call my professors at home if I need help.
Grade Haggling	7	attitudes regarding arguing for higher grades that are not based on merit	Asking for extra points on an assignment is an acceptable strategy to improve your grade.
General AE	7	a general disposition toward being academically entitled	Great academic success should just come to me.

Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16). The NPI-16 (Ames et al., 2006) contains 16 pairs of items measuring facets of narcissism. Items are presented in a forced-choice format. Past research has indicated that the NPI-16 is reliable ($\alpha = 0.72$), highly

correlated with a longer version of the NPI (r = .90), and relates to self-judgements (Ames et al., 2006).

Academic Goal Orientations. The academic goal orientations measure, adapted from Bong (2001), and has four scales measuring learning orientations: performance approach (degree to which students' learning goals are to make good grades and compete with other students); performance avoidance (goal is to avoid making bad grades or looking stupid); mastery approach (goal is to master course content); or mastery avoidance (goal is to avoid not learning enough). Chronbach's alpha reliability for this sample ranged from .78 (Mastery Orientation) to .94 (Performance Orientation). Performance Avoidance (α = .82) was used for clustering cases because the content of these questions, insecurity about academic performance, was thought to relate to the anticipated cluster structure. The other scales were used for external validation.

Academic Self-Efficacy. Our measure of academic self-efficacy was adapted from the College Self-Efficacy Scale (Owen & Froman, 1988). The original measure consists of 33 items. However, we reduced it to 10 items, with two subscales. The first subscale deals with participating in large classes (e.g., answering questions in a large class) while the second deals with learning and success (e.g., understanding content). For our sample, both scales had adequate reliability, Chronbach's α = .87 and .89, respectively.

Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES). The PES (Campbell et al., 2004) is a nine-item measure of general psychological entitlement. The PES has been shown to be reliable (Chronbach's α > .87, test-retest = .72) and valid, correlating in predictable ways with other measures and experimental manipulations (Campbell et al., 2004).

Attitudes Toward Academic Dishonesty (ATAD). The ATAD (Frey et al., 2016) is a nine-item measure designed to measure attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Participants are given a scenario and asked to rate how honest it is on a 100-point sliding scale. For our sample, the scale has shown to be reliable (Chronbach's α = .87). The measure also has significant positive correlations with the AE scales, notably Responsibility Avoidance and Customer Service Expectations.

Academic Entitlement Scale (AES). We used an eight-item AE scale developed and validated by Kopp et al. (2011), who showed that data from the scale has produced good reliability (ω = .81) and concurrent validity. This scale was used for external validation of the cluster structure.

Data Preparation and Clustering Strategy

Given the exploratory nature of this study, several cluster solutions were examined using different sets of variables and using different numbers of clusters. The final cluster solution was chosen based on the interpretability and external validation of the clusters.

Data Cleaning

The original data set consisted of 1,104 cases. Data cleaning procedures included missing data analysis, time completion, response patterns, response consistency, and voluntary withdraw (Rauti, 2017). Cases that had excessive missing data (more than 20% missing) and where participants took less than five seconds per completed question were discarded. This latter cut-off was established based on pilot testing. We also eliminated cases where there was no variability in responding over five blocks of items, where the items numbered 58 in total (five blocks of 10 from various scales and one block of 8 consistent with the Kopp et al. [2011] measure of AE). Finally, we used reverse-worded and positively worded pairs of items to construct a correlation coefficient. This index should be negative, as participants agreeing with the positively phrased item should disagree with a negatively phrased item that asks essentially the same question. An example pairing is "I do not necessarily deserve special treatment from my professors" and "I honestly feel I am more deserving than other students." We used a cut-off corresponding to a one-tailed test (p = .10). Out of the original data set of 1,104 cases, 751 were retained for analysis. Being an online survey, many of those cases effectively had null data and were discarded when checking for excessive missing data. This would represent participants who opened the survey but decided to close their browser either after answering only a few questions, or not answering any at all.

Cluster Analysis Strategy

Several considerations go into cluster analysis. As a first step, we chose a k-means approach. In this approach, partitions are established in the data reflecting the number of clusters and objects are assigned an initial cluster, then cases are moved to other clusters based on minimizing the squared Euclidean distance between cases and cluster centers. This process continues iteratively until moves no longer result in an improved cluster solution. The goal is to maximize cluster separation and cohesion (i.e., like objects are grouped into the same cluster and clusters are distinct from each other). This approach has the advantage over hierarchical cluster procedures that do not move a case once it has been assigned to a cluster. Scaling of the variables used in the analysis is also an important consideration. Variables with large variances can dominate the solution, but the large variances can result from the underlying cluster structure (Milligen & Hirtle, 2003). We rescaled our variables since some differences in variability among scales would necessarily be introduced by using different measures. One strategy that appears to work well is to rescale the variables taking into account the range. We used the following formula for rescaling the variables, based on Milligen and Hirtle (2003):

$$z = \frac{x - Min(x)}{Max(x) - Min(x)}$$

where z is the transformed measure which can range from zero to one, x is the measure being transformed, and Min and Max are the minimum and maximum functions that, together, define the observed range of the variable x.

Another major consideration is in the choice of variables to use in the cluster analysis. Ideally only variables that contribute to separation of the clusters should be used. Extraneous variables can mask the underlying cluster structure (Milligen & Hirtle, 2003). We used the AEQ subscales, the NPI, and the Performance Avoidance scale from the Academic Goal Orientations questionnaire. Given that this is an exploratory study, we tried including other variables, such as the Performance Orientation scale from the Academic Goal Orientations questionnaire and the measure of Academic Self-Efficacy.

A last major consideration was related to choosing a suitable solution. We used several criteria. One criterion we used was interpretability. An important aspect of this is

that we strongly anticipated a small Entitled Narcissist cluster. Solutions that did not contain this as a distinct cluster were abandoned. We also anticipated at least one more entitled cluster that did not have high average NPI scores, and a Not Entitled cluster. Through many iterations, trying different measures and leaving others out, it appeared that these three clusters tended to show up in many of the solutions. We also wanted a solution as parsimonious as possible. We wished to avoid finding small clusters that might not replicate in another study. Finally, we set aside some measures for use as external validity measures, such as the Kopp et al. (2011) AE measure and Campbell et al.'s (2004) General Entitlement measure. The different clusters should have significant variation on scores for the external validation measures.

Results

In some of the early attempts to cluster analyze our data, the General AE dimension of the AEQ did not appear to contribute to the cluster solutions, nor did our measure of Academic Self-Efficacy. When included in the cluster analysis, they tended to yield solutions that were difficult to interpret. We used a couple of approaches to make initial interpretations. One was to examine the cluster means on the variables used to conduct the cluster analysis and make a preliminary interpretation of the cluster based on that information and cluster size. As a second method, we employed Discriminant Function Analysis to create orthogonal dimensions of the input variables used in the clustering to discriminate amongst the clusters derived from the CA. Profiles were then graphed to provide visual interpretation. It was through this process that we discovered that the General AE scale from the AEQ and the measure of Academic Self-Efficacy were not helping to define meaningful clusters.

Interpreting the linear discriminant functions is problematic in this instance due to the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices (Box's $M = 546.98$, $F_{(144, 254184.3)} = 3.69$ $p < .001$) according to several authors (e.g., Tatsuoka, 1988). Examination of the group variance-covariance matrices indicated that the ratio of variances for the group with the largest variance to the group with the smallest variance (see Stevens, 2012), for each variable was less than 4.0, with the exception of the variable Responsibility Avoidance. The group with the largest variance was the

Entitled Narcissist group and it was eight times larger than the variance of this variable for the Not Entitled group. This problem could be remedied, but an examination of the correlations among the variables used in the cluster analysis, by cluster, also revealed different patterns. In the Entitled Narcissistic group, for instance, Grade Haggling was more strongly related to several other AE dimensions than for all the other groups. The pairs of variables that had the largest discrepancies in terms of correlations across the five clusters were Responsibility Avoidance and Customer Service Expectations, which were correlated at nearly .70 ($r = .68$) for the Entitled Narcissist group, to not significantly related ($r = .12$) for the Unobtrusive Entitlement group. This was followed by the relationship between the NPI and Performance Avoidance ($r = .40$) for the Entitled Narcissist cluster and near zero for many of the other groups. Due to violations of assumptions, the linear combinations emerging from the discriminant analysis were not interpreted. Instead, we relied more heavily on interpreting mean differences in the clustering variables themselves and external validation analyses to form an interpretation.

Two cluster solutions met our criteria for interpretability and for having the anticipated clusters present. One was based on the remaining six AEQ scales, the NPI, and the Performance Avoidance scale from the Academic Goal Orientations questionnaire. The other was based on the remaining six AEQ scales and the NPI. For both solutions, we used the distance of each case from its respective cluster to identify potential outliers, then removed those outliers and re-ran the k-means cluster analysis. The solution involving AEQ, NPI, and Performance Avoidance replicated well after removing outliers, but the solution without Performance Avoidance did not. We then opted to treat the solution with AEQ, NPI, and Performance Avoidance as our preferred cluster solution. All other solutions we explored tended to lack clear interpretation or tended to exclude the anticipated high narcissism/high AE cluster.

Table 2 contains the number of participants assigned to each cluster and the scaled means and standard deviations for each variable used in the clustering for each group. Three of the anticipated clusters were present. The Entitled Narcissist cluster included members who tended to score higher on most aspects of AE than participants in the other clusters, and especially high on NPI. There was a second entitled group, Entitled Non-Narcissist, this one scoring high on aspects of AE, low on NPI, and high on Performance Avoidance. As anticipated, this cluster may include students who are entitled as a coping mechanism. Finally, there was a cluster we labelled Not Entitled. Members of this

cluster tended to have low scores across all the cluster variables. The remaining clusters contained one group that is distinguished based on higher scores on Performance Avoidance (labelled Performance Avoidant). The last cluster, labelled Unobtrusive Entitlement, falls into the average range, slightly elevated on Customer Orientation and Reward for Effort. We did not find the entitled-consumer group that we suspected might be present, but this group may be mixed with the Entitled Non-Narcissist group.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation for Clusters in the Preferred Cluster Solution

	Performance Avoidant		Entitled Narcissist		Not Entitled		Unobtrusive Entitlement		Entitled Non-Narcissist	
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Reward for Effort	.44	.15	.62	.16	.31	.13	.57	.16	.70	.14
Accommodation	.18	.11	.49	.15	.09	.08	.26	.10	.38	.14
Responsibility Avoidance	.13	.11	.45	.20	.06	.07	.16	.11	.32	.15
Customer Orientation	.45	.15	.55	.13	.33	.14	.54	.13	.64	.13
Customer Service Expectations	.19	.14	.57	.17	.11	.10	.29	.15	.45	.18
Grade Haggling	.19	.11	.53	.16	.14	.10	.31	.14	.48	.15
NPI	.20	.16	.55	.22	.17	.14	.28	.17	.26	.15
Performance Avoidance	.64	.14	.37	.20	.21	.15	.26	.15	.62	.17
N	169		57		199		215		111	

Interpretation of Clusters Based on Clustering Variables

Because we could not rely on interpreting the linear discriminant functions, we based our interpretation on multiple univariate F-tests (see Table 3) and the Games-Howell post-hoc test (Games & Howell, 1976). Given the exploratory nature of the study we did not correct for Type 1 error, but made our interpretation with effect sizes in mind. While Table 2 reports rescaled means, used in the cluster procedure, the ANOVAs were based on raw scores. What follows is a summary of mean differences for each of the groups. First, the Entitled Narcissist group scored significantly higher than all other groups on the NPI. The next closest group was the Unobtrusive Entitlement group, and the mean difference

was considerable (Cohen's $d = 1.49$). The group with the lowest NPI score was the Not Entitled group, followed by the Performance Avoidant group.

Table 3

Source Table for Clustering Variables

Clustering Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p	ω^2
Reward for Effort	13.72	4	3.43	157.86	.000	.46
Error	16.21	746	.02			
Accommodations	10.61	4	2.65	216.43	.000	.53
Error	9.14	746	.01			
Responsibility Avoidance	9.60	4	2.40	177.58	.000	.48
Error	10.09	746	.01			
Customer Orientation	8.33	4	2.08	111.78	.000	.37
Error	13.90	746	.02			
Customer Service Expectations	15.30	4	3.83	192.97	.000	.51
Error	14.79	746	.02			
Grade Haggling	13.53	4	3.38	205.57	.000	.52
Error	12.27	746	.02			
NPI	7.31	4	1.83	69.66	.000	.27
Error	19.58	746	.03			
Performance Avoidance	26.44	4	6.61	275.55	.000	.59
Error	17.90	746	.02			

Continuing with the Entitled Narcissist group, these participants scored higher on average on Responsibility Avoidance, Accommodation, Customer Service Expecctations, and Grade Haggling. The other highly entitled group, Entitled Non-Narcissist, scored highest on Reward for Effort and Customer Orientation. They also scored relatively high on Performance Avoidance. Thus, these two entitled groups differ primarily on their NPI scores (Entitled Narcissist group scoring higher) and Performance Avoidance (Entitled Non-Narcissist group scoring higher). This Entitled Non-Narcissist group appears to be the hypothesized group of entitled students who are entitled as a coping response.

The Not Entitled group simply scored lower than all other groups on all measures used to cluster the participants. On some dimensions of AE their average scores were near the minimum for the sample, such as Responsibility Avoidance and Accommodations. The Performance Avoidant cluster of participants did not, on average, have inflated AE scores relative to the other groups. In fact, they tend to score toward the low end on some AE scales, such as Accommodation, Responsibility Avoidance, Grade Haggling, and Customer Service Expectations. They stand out in that they have very high Performance Avoidance scores, similar to the Entitled Non-Narcissist group, and low NPI scores. These students may have concerns about their academic performance and/or abilities, but those concerns do not appear to manifest themselves as entitlement. The Unobtrusive Entitlement group stands apart from the others by merely scoring, on average, toward the middle of all the groups on all the clustering variables. This cluster may resemble the "Under the Radar" cluster found by Luckett et al. (2017) in which students display some AE proclivities, but less noticeably than those who are highly entitled.

External Validation

Additional measures were used to describe the groups further and provide some evidence of validity of the cluster solution. Students in the Entitled Narcissist cluster should score higher than the other groups on Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES) (Campbell et al., 2004). Further, both the Entitled Narcissist and the Entitled Non-Narcissist groups should score high on the Kopp et al. (2011) measure of AE, while the Not Entitled group should score low on that measure. Our measure of General AE, which was removed from the clustering procedure, is thought to measure the general trait of academic entitlement. We would anticipate a similar pattern as with Kopp et al.'s measure of AE.

The Entitled Narcissist group scored significantly higher than all other groups on the PES. Interestingly, the Entitled Non-Narcissist group scored significantly higher than the remaining groups (e.g., Not Entitled, Performance Avoidant, etc.) on the PES. Both the Entitled Narcissist group and the Entitled Non-Narcissist group scored significantly higher than all other groups on the Kopp et al. (2011) measure of AE. The Not Entitled group scored significantly lower than all other groups on the Kopp et al. AE measure. This pattern was the same for the General AE measure from the AEQ.

Past research has suggested that students who exhibit AE are prone to academic dishonesty. In our sample, the two highly entitled groups, Entitled Narcissist and Entitled Non-Narcissist, endorsed academically dishonest scenarios as more honest than the other groups. These comparisons were significant except for the Unobtrusive Entitlement group—this group did not endorse the scenarios as being as honest as the two other entitled groups, but the difference was not statistically significant using our adopted post-hoc procedure (Games & Howell, 1976).

Some past research has found that students who are high in AE generally have lower levels of mastery learning orientation (Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Greenberger et al., 2008; Jackson et al., 2011; Kopp et al., 2011) and higher levels of performance learning orientation (Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Jackson et al., 2011; Vallade et al., 2014; Warren, 2013). We examined this in our analyses with the expectation that the two highly entitled clusters should score lower on mastery orientation and higher on performance orientation. The Entitled Narcissist group ($M = 10.54$, $SD = 3.19$) scored significantly higher than the Not Entitled group ($M = 8.90$, $SD = 3.67$, $d = .50$) on performance learning orientation and the Entitled Non-Narcissist group scored significantly higher on this measure ($M = 11.66$, $SD = 2.75$) than both the Not Entitled group ($d = .84$) and the Unobtrusive Entitlement group ($M = 9.80$, $SD = 3.46$, $d = .57$). The pattern for mastery learning orientation was consistent with expectations; the Entitled Narcissist group scored lower than all other groups and the Entitled Non-Narcissist group scored lower than all other groups except for the Entitled Narcissist group. However, none of these differences was statistically significant. It should also be noted that the Performance Avoidant cluster also scored high on performance orientation, in the range of the entitled groups.

We had expected that the entitled groups would exhibit lower academic self-efficacy than other groups. The Entitled Narcissist group did score significantly lower than all other groups on the measure of class participation ($d = -.455$ for the next lowest group, Entitled Non-Narcissist). In general, however, there was not a great deal of variability in the scores between clusters for either scale.

Finally, we anticipated that the Entitled Narcissist cluster would contain more males compared to females than would the other clusters. For our sample, 20.2% were male and of the Entitled Narcissist participants, 43.6% were male. Males were slightly under-represented in the Performance Avoidant cluster (15.5%) and the Not Entitled cluster (14.1%). This prediction was based on previous research indicating that males

have a higher prevalence of narcissism (Twenge et al., 2008). The Entitled Non-Narcissist cluster contained 18.5% male participants. There were 742 cases for which we had all data (including gender) and the odds of being in the Entitled Narcissist group were small (.07). The odds of being in this group for females were .05 and the odds for males were .16. Thus, males are just over 3 times (3.08) more likely to be in the Entitled Narcissist cluster than females.

Discussion

The approach of clustering people based on their AE scores appears to show promise. Using six dimensions of the AEQ, the NPI-16, and a measure of performance avoidance, we came up with five clusters that appear interpretable and could be useful for further research. Notably, we were able to recover the three groups that we felt should be present. The Entitled Narcissist group was present and, as expected, had high scores on AE measures and high scores on the NPI. This group was also the smallest, as anticipated, and was overrepresented by males. This may be one of the more difficult groups for instructors to deal with, so their relative infrequency is reassuring.

We also have the second entitled group, Entitled Non-Narcissist. As expected, these students have higher scores than the other groups on AE measures and their performance avoidance scores are also relatively high, but they do not have high NPI scores relative to the other groups. This appears to corroborate researchers' hunches about there being an entitled group of students who are perhaps using entitled behaviours and attitudes as a coping mechanism to deal with insecurity about their academic potential. This group constitutes approximately 15% of the sample, and thus is of an appreciable size. We had anticipated that there might be another group of entitled consumers, students who adopt the view that they are entitled to certain outcomes because they are customers of the university, paying for their education. We did not find this group, but members of the Entitled Non-Narcissist cluster did tend to have relatively high Customer Orientation scores. It may be that this group doesn't exist, or requires different measures to reveal it as a separate group.

The Not Entitled group, which we also hypothesized to exist a priori, was more substantial, representing about a quarter of our sample (26.5%). This group deserves a

closer look, as it would be informative to know whether these students are confident in their abilities, and thus not prone to exhibit high AE scores, or whether there is an element of amotivation among students in this cluster. Future research might find that this cluster further subdivides based on academic competence and motivation.

The Performance Avoidant group is interesting as well. Members of this group do not, on average, appear to exhibit AE. The learning style could be more personality-based, or it could reflect insecurities about their academic potential. This group represents over a fifth of our sample (22.5%). One could argue that this is not a legitimate AE cluster, since they do not distinguish themselves relative to AE. When examining just the AE measures, they look very much like the Not Entitled group; however, the Performance Avoidance variable seemed to be important in separating the two entitled groups. This cluster may be an artifact of using this measure in clustering.

Finally, the Unobtrusive Entitlement group was the largest cluster in our sample, representing nearly 30% of our sample (28.7%). While this may represent a typical student encountered in a course, it would be useful to know whether they are indeed a homogeneous group. For instance, is there a mix of clusters found by Andrey et al. (2012), such as Just Puttin' in Time and Relaxed Student?

A question that comes to mind is, "To what extent do these clusters represent stable behavioural patterns, versus transient patterns?" Is it possible that, for instance, the students in the Unobtrusive Entitlement cluster might move into one of the other entitled clusters, given the right circumstances? Or do students in one of the entitled clusters appear more average in a course where things are going well for them? Finally, to what extent are clusters dependent upon the institution? Will students at a commuter institution, who might be primarily first-generation university students, yield a vastly different cluster structure using the same clustering variables and procedure when compared to, for instance, students at a more prestigious residential university?

We feel an important aspect of this work pertains to the distinction between Entitled Narcissist and Entitled Non-Narcissist. In terms of classroom interaction, it implies that entitled behaviours and attitudes could be just that, entitled behaviours and attitudes, but it seems that it is more likely to be a manifestation of anxiety about academic performance. When confronted with entitled attitudes and behaviours from students, instructors are encouraged to explore the motives of the student, perhaps asking them how they feel

about how they are doing in the course. Taking an interest in this way and offering advice about improving their performance could curtail these behaviours.

Future research could take many avenues. In the near term, replication should be prioritized, and perhaps conceptual replication using some different measures. For one, what if a different measure of learning orientation, such as the one used by Andrey et al. (2012) was included in conjunction with a multidimensional measure of AE? Another avenue for future research would be to use a mixed method design, where students from the different clusters would be interviewed to understand their academic goals and attitudes better. Once a better understanding of the cluster structure and interpretation is in place, some experimental manipulations to validate the cluster structure would seem warranted and this could inform possible interventions. If, for instance, members of the Entitled Narcissist cluster are exhibiting a trait, there may be little that can be done in terms of changing their attitudes. However, if the other entitled cluster is validated and a component of that cluster is low academic ability or high academic anxiety, then some remediation of academic success skills could be quite useful.

Limitations

One limitation is that this study involved students at one academic institution and it was not a random sample of students. This means a great weight cannot be placed on interpreting the cluster sizes with any sense of generalizing to a population. A second limitation is that our measure of Academic Self-Efficacy did not work as well as we had hoped. We felt the measure should have been more useful in clustering cases, but it was not, nor was it particularly helpful in our external validation analyses. Either our theory of why it is important for clustering is wrong, or a different measure would perhaps work better.

References

Achacoso, M. V. (2002). *"What do you mean my grade is not an A?" An investigation of academic entitlement, causal attributions, and self-regulation in college students* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas.

Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*(4), 440–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002

Andrey, J., Joakim, E., Schoner, V., Hambly, D., Silver, A., Jayasundera, R., & Nelson, A. (2012). Academic entitlement in the context of learning styles. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *35*(4), 3–30.

Baer, J. C. (2011). Students' distress over grades: Entitlement or a coping response? *Journal of Social Work Education*, *47*(3), 565–577. https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2011.200900127

Bong, M. (2001). Between- and within-domain relations of academic motivation among middle and high school students: Self-efficacy, task-value, and achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93*(1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.23

Boswell, S. S. (2012). "I deserve success": Academic entitlement attitudes and their relationships with course self-efficacy, social networking, and demographic variables. *Social Psychology of Education*, *15*(3), 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-012-9184-4

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *83*(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitlement expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(4), 982–997. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016351

Frey, M., Jackson, D., McLellan, C., & Rauti, C. (2016, June 9–11). *Development and assessment of an academic dishonesty measure* [Poster presentation]. The Canadian Psychological Association's 77th Annual Convention, Victoria, BC, Canada.

Games P. A., & Howell, J. F. (1976). Pairwise multiple comparison procedures with unequal n's and/or variances: A Monte Carlo study. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, *1*(2), 113–125. https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986001002113

Goodboy, A. K., & Frisby, B. N. (2014). Instructional dissent as an expression of students' academic orientations and beliefs about education. *Communication Studies*, *65*(1), 96–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.785013

Gordon, A. D. (1999). *Classification* (2nd ed.). Chapman and Hall.

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. P. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*(10), 1193–1204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9284-9

Jackson, D. L., Singleton-Jackson, J. A., & Frey, M. P. (2011). Report of a measure of academic entitlement. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, *1*(3), 53–65.

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175611400292

Luckett, M., Trocchia, P. J., Noel, N. M., & Marlin, D. (2017). A typology of students based on academic entitlement. *Journal of Education for Business*, *92*(2), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2017.1281214

Mansfield, H. C. (2001). Grade inflation: It's time to face the facts. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *47*(30), B24.

McLellan, C. K., & Jackson, D. L. (2017). Personality, self-regulated learning, and academic entitlement. *Social Psychology of Education*, *20*(1), 159–178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9357-7

Milligan, G. W., & Hirtle, S. C. (2003). Clustering and classification methods. In J. A. Schinka & W. F. Velicer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology, research methods in psychology*. Wiley.

Morrow, W. (1994). Entitlement and achievement in education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *13*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01074084

Owen, S. V., & Froman, R. D. (1988, April 6–8). *Development of a college academic self-efficacy scale* [Paper presentation]. The Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA, United States.

Rauti, C. M. (2017). *Assessing the effects of survey instructions and physical attractiveness on careless responding in online surveys* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Windsor.

Reinhardt, J. (2012). *Conceptualizing academic entitlement: What are we measuring?* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Windsor.

Rojstaczer, S., & Healy, C. (2012). Where A is ordinary: The evolution of American college and university grading, 1940-2009. *Teachers College Record*, *114*(7), 1–23.

Singleton-Jackson, J. A., Jackson, D. L., & Reinhardt, J. (2010). Students as consumers of knowledge: Are they buying what we're selling? *Innovative Higher Education*, *35*, 343–358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9151-y

Stevens, J. P. (2012). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Erlbaum.

Tatsuoka, M. M. (1988). *Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research* (2nd ed.). Macmillan.

Taylor, J. M., Bailey, S. F., & Barber, L. K. (2015). Academic entitlement and counterproductive research behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *85*, 13–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.04.024

Twenge, J. M., & Keith Campbell, W. (2008). Increases in positive self-views among high school students' birth-cohort changes in anticipated performance, self-satisfaction, self-liking, and self-competence. *Psychological Science*, *19*(11), 1082–1086.

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Keith Campbell, W., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(4), 875–902. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02204.x

Vallade, J. I., Martin, M. M., & Weber, K. (2014). Academic entitlement, grade orientation, and classroom justice as predictors of instructional beliefs and learning outcomes. *Communication Quarterly*, *62*(5), 497–517. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2014.949386

Warren, S. T. (2013). *Inflated expectations: An investigation into college students' academic entitlement beliefs* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Mississippi State University.

Wasieleski, D. T., Whatley, M. A., Briihl, D. S., & Branscome, J. M. (2014). Academic entitlement scale: Development and preliminary validation. *Psychology Research*, *4*(6), 441–450.

Wright, R. E. (2008). Targeting, segmenting and positioning the market for college students to increase customer satisfaction and overall performance. *College Student Journal*, *42*(3), 891–894.