

**The Effects of Academic Entitlement, Stakes, and Power Distance on Grade Negotiation
Behaviour**

by

Fatima Kazoun

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

© 2013 Fatima Kazoun



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-94325-0

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-94325-0

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

The rise of academic entitlement has largely been documented anecdotally, leaving unanswered questions about the phenomenon and its behavioural manifestations. This study examined whether academic entitlement is related to students' inclination to negotiate grades or the type of negotiation strategy used. Additionally, stakes and power distance were manipulated to examine if the undergraduate sample ($N = 185$, 68% female) would make strategic negotiation choices based on these variables. Dependent variables were inclination to negotiate for a grade change, and the extent to which participants would negotiate using various negotiation strategies: forcing, avoiding, yielding, problem solving, and compromising. Results revealed a main effect of academic entitlement on inclination to negotiate, a main effect of power distance on problem solving, and an interaction of academic entitlement and stakes on the forcing negotiation strategy. Implications of academic entitlement and grade negotiation in higher education are discussed.

Acknowledgements

Words cannot express how eternally grateful I am to my family, friends, supervisor and committee members. Thank you so much. I could not have reached this point without your patience, support and guidance.

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Title Page..... | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| List of Tables..... | vi |
| List of Appendices..... | vii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Conceptualization of Entitlement..... | 5 |
| Academic Entitlement | 7 |
| Research on Entitlement and Grade Negotiation | 12 |
| Negotiation | 14 |
| Stakes in Negotiation and Entitlement | 16 |
| Power Distance in Negotiation and Entitlement | 18 |
| Overview of the Rationale for the Present Study | 20 |
| Hypotheses | 21 |
| Method..... | 22 |
| Procedures | 22 |
| Measures..... | 24 |
| Results | 27 |
| Descriptive Characteristics..... | 27 |
| Correlations | 28 |
| Manipulation Checks..... | 31 |
| Data Analyses..... | 31 |
| Discussion | 35 |

Discussion 35

Academic Entitlement 37

Power Distance and Stakes 38

Correlates of Academic Entitlement 41

Limitations and Future Directions..... 43

Implications for Higher Education..... 46

References 48

List of Tables

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: Intercorrelations of negotiation strategies, past negotiation experience, academic entitlement, and power | 30 |
| Table 2: Analysis of Variance for Inclination to Negotiate | 33 |
| Table 3: Analysis of Variance for Use of Forcing Strategy | 34 |
| Table 4: Analysis of Variance for Use of Problem Solving Strategy | 35 |
| Table 5: Analysis of Variance for Use of Compromising Strategy | 66 |
| Table 6: Analysis of Variance for Use Yielding Strategy..... | 67 |
| Table 7: Analysis of Variance for Use Avoiding Strategy..... | 68 |

List of Appendices

Appendix A 56

Appendix B 57

Appendix C 59

Appendix D 60

Appendix E..... 61

Appendix F..... 62

Appendix G 63

Appendix H 65

Appendix I..... 66

Appendix J..... 67

Appendix K 68

The Effects of Academic Entitlement, Stakes, and Power Distance on Grade Negotiation
Behaviour

Academic entitlement is a social psychological concept that refers to a phenomenon of individual differences in students' attitudes regarding academic expectations, independent of effort toward achievement of academic success (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson & Reinhardt, 2010). Specifically, students with high levels of academic entitlement (commonly referred to as "academically-entitled students") believe that they are deserving of a certain standing (e.g., high grades) for minimal effort, or academic privileges (e.g., rescheduling an exam) simply because they want special treatment (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008).

Professors have observed that academically-entitled students frequently display demanding attitudes toward their teachers (Jayson, 2005; Roosevelt, 2009). Examples of such attitudes include the expectation that teachers should promptly respond to emails from students or that professors should supply their personal lecture notes to students who miss class (Glater, 2006). These attitudes have become more pervasive in post-secondary settings as academically-entitled students may act in accordance with demanding attitudes by engaging in problematic behaviours such as complaining about grading practices or demanding higher grades to meet with "A-student" expectations. These problematic behaviours are causing concern among academic professionals because they can result in potential conflict between faculty and students (Greenberger et al., 2008). For example, students' academic entitlement expectations can lead to incongruent student-teacher perceptions of what is deserved in relation to grades. As

such, an ensuing conflict may result from these diverging views. Students often enact the entitlement behaviour of grade negotiation as an attempt to resolve this conflict (Achacoso, 2002; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008).

Grade negotiation is one of the most salient behavioural examples of academic entitlement within the educational domain (Achacoso, 2002; Ciani et al., 2008). As negotiation is a prevalent conflict resolution tactic in today's society, it is not surprising that students use this tactic in instances of academic conflict. Broadly defined as "a discussion between two or more parties with the apparent aim of resolving a divergence of interest and thus escaping social conflict" (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993, p. 2), negotiation has become a commonplace practice in a multitude of contexts such as employment relations, consumerism, and higher education. Social psychologists have proposed a number of theoretical frameworks that aid in our understanding of conflict resolution and negotiation (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Described in very simplistic terms, the use of negotiation in conflict resolution is a social process where parties desire different outcomes, and conflict typically arises when one party feels deprived of a desired or expected outcome (De Dreu, 2010). As such, parties then have the option of employing negotiation as a response to handling the conflict (De Dreu, 2010; Kramer & Messick, 1995). In an academic context, a student who feels deprived of a high grade in a course might opt to use negotiation as a behavioural response method for managing conflict. While negotiation is commonly used as a social exchange mechanism for conflict resolution, the specific type of negotiation behaviour can vary. For instance, negotiators can select from an assortment of strategies including: avoiding, yielding, compromising, problem solving, and forcing (De Dreu,

Evers, Beerma, Kluwer, & Nauta, 2001). How negotiators choose from this large variety of strategies is also known as negotiator strategic choice (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). As negotiator strategic choice can influence conflict resolution outcomes (De Dreu, 2010), many negotiation studies attempt to identify and clarify the role of the antecedents of negotiator behaviours (De Dreu, Weingart, & Kwon, 2000; Kramer & Messick, 1995; Thompson, 2005). To this end, researchers have found that negotiation behaviour choices are not simply based on self-interest, but, rather, they are based on *both* individual difference and situational variables (De Dreu et al., 2000).

One of the individual difference variables that has been examined as a predictor of individual negotiation behaviour is entitlement. More specifically, differences in entitlement beliefs have been documented to be predictive of negotiated outcomes such as salary (Barron, 2003; Corbett, 2007). These studies are limited in scope, as they only examined entitlement perceptions and negotiation behaviours for work-related outcomes. However, these findings may be useful in the examination of academic entitlement as they suggest that specific conditions will predict the strategic negotiation choices that students might make. That is, it is speculated that there will be variation in negotiation strategies depending on with whom students have to negotiate their grade (e.g., professor versus teaching assistant) and what sort of stakes are at risk (e.g., low course standing versus potential loss of scholarship). Given the lack of systematic research examining this issue, the current study aimed to explore how entitlement might interact with situational factors, such as power distance and stakes, to predict an inclination to negotiate as well as differential strategy use.

Given the recent increase in the education community's focus on academic entitlement, a more comprehensive understanding of potential factors that may affect academic conflict resolution is critical for universities and their clientele (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2011). Hence, the purpose of this study was to examine negotiation behaviours in an academic context. Since attitudes related to academic entitlement will likely vary between individuals, it is also expected that individual approaches to conflict resolution may differ as a function of this. In addition, situational variables may also influence inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use. This study examined the functions of situational variables in academic entitlement and negotiation by asking the following research questions: 1) Does academic entitlement affect one's inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use? 2) What is the effect of stakes on inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use? and, 3) How does power distance affect inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use?

I begin this thesis with a brief history of entitlement, its conceptualization, and ways it has been correlated with germane psychological concepts that are identified in the literature. In this section, I demonstrate that psychological entitlement is independent of narcissism but not vice versa. Following this, I present definitions of academic entitlement, including a discussion on its etiology, and I explain a few theories of how and why entitlement develops in students. In the next section, I review the research conducted on academic entitlement and grade negotiation. In short, this research has revealed that students feel entitled to negotiate their grades. In the following section, I introduce negotiation theory and apply it to argue that individual differences in entitlement affect inclination to negotiate and strategy use. Additional factors, such as

stakes and power distance in the context of entitlement and negotiation, are reviewed in later sections. In these sections, I elaborate on my main argument that students' entitlement tendencies will influence their negotiation behaviour by suggesting that when such variables are accounted for, there will be a person by situation effect on inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use. Based on this literature review and the rationale for the current study, I present the methods and results of my study.

Conceptualization of Entitlement

Psychologically, entitlement is defined as “the expectation of special privileges over others and special exemptions from normal social demands” (Raskin & Terry, 1988, p. 890). In other words, people simply think that they are special, not because they have a legal or moral right, but, because they have an inflated sense of status and privilege that is based on subjective individual perceptions. This inflated sense of self allows individuals to perceive themselves as entitled to things which may not be truly deserved; at the very least, they are no more deserving than others, except in their own perceptions. An example of this would be employees who feel entitled to a sign-on bonus or flexible hours, not because they have earned such privileges, but instead for simply being hired or fulfilling their personal desire (Fisk, 2010; Rousseau, 2005).

In order to better understand the psychological aspects of entitlement, we must first examine a related concept, narcissism, which is commonly regarded as the basis for feelings of entitlement. Narcissism is defined as a trait that encompasses a sense of selfishness, a distorted inflated sense of self-worth, and limited empathy toward others (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). In addition, it has been found to be associated with other self-inflating traits such as elevated self-esteem and ego inflation (Robins &

Beer, 2001). Empirical research has consistently demonstrated that psychological entitlement is a facet of narcissism (Ackerman et al., 2011; Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). In this regard, the entitlement dimension of narcissism is measured by a subscale of the widely used Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI, Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI is also the most common instrument used in the diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder (NPD), which is a recognized clinical disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Currently, there is controversy regarding the assessment of NPD, which can be problematic for situating narcissism and its facets, including entitlement (Foster & Campbell, 2007). However, some researchers continue to define entitlement in narcissistic terms, and to measure the construct using the NPI's entitlement subscale. These researchers also continue to study entitlement in this form within nonclinical populations and most frequently with student samples (Finney & Finney, 2010; Kubarych, Deary, & Austin, 2004).

More recently, social psychological research has demonstrated that high levels of narcissism can also be manifested in nonclinical forms, as a trait, rather than a disorder (Foster & Campbell, 2007). This perspective is also supported by the fact that NPD will be removed from the newest edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV-TR; Zanor, 2010). As such, the study of narcissism from a social psychological perspective (i.e., the suggestion that narcissism is a dimensional personality trait) contributes to the understanding that entitlement, as a personality trait, can exist without narcissism (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004; Foster & Campbell, 2007). To further this notion, some researchers have conceptualized entitlement as an independent psychological construct (Campbell et al., 2004).

According to this conceptualization, entitlement is understood to be related to, but separate from, narcissism. In this view, entitlement is conceptualized as a stable trait and has been shown to be positively related to greed, selfishness, and aggression, and negatively related to agreeableness, perspective taking, and empathy (Campbell et al., 2004). This conceptualization has even been used in the recent study of sub-clinical narcissism (Brown, Budzek, & Tamborski, 2009). To date, empirical examinations have conceptualized entitlement as a relatively independent and general psychological construct.

Academic Entitlement

Until recently, the concept of academic entitlement has been a relatively unexplored topic. In fact, academic entitlement has been easily critiqued for not being well defined and its etiology is not well understood. Unlike narcissistic entitlement and the more general form of psychological entitlement, there is a debate among researchers as to whether academic entitlement is more context-specific (e.g., state) or innate (e.g., trait) (Kopp, Zinn, Finney, & Jurich, 2011). Given the limited number of studies exploring the overlap and relationship among the aforementioned forms of entitlement, it is difficult to draw any strong conclusions as to the nature of these associations. Nonetheless, researchers are now beginning to empirically study how academic entitlement is related to other constructs of entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). For example, academic entitlement has been found to be positively correlated with other forms of entitlement such as general psychological entitlement and narcissistic entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008), and notwithstanding the previous discussion, academic entitlement has been

linked to narcissism and other self-involved personality traits (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). However, in contrast, Kopp et al. (2011) suggest that academic entitlement is, by its very nature, a context-specific construct because it only exists in an academic setting.

As there are clearly differing conceptualizations of entitlement, it has been difficult for researchers to agree on a common definition (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2011). It should be noted, however, that there is a central feature among these varying conceptualizations. That is, students who score high on measures of academic entitlement have unreasonable demands and expectations of their instructors. For the purposes of this study, academic entitlement was defined as one's belief that he or she is entitled to positive academic outcomes irrespective of achievement. Also relevant to this study is the conceptualization of academic entitlement as an individual difference construct that is influenced by situational factors. By using this interactionist approach to study academic entitlement in relation to grade negotiation, my aim was to contribute to a deeper understanding of how this individual difference variable might be understood in an academic context in the prediction of entitlement-related behaviours (i.e., grade negotiation).

There is currently a documented rise of entitlement and other self-inflating positive views, such as narcissism, in today's youth (Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2008, 2009; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008a, 2008b). This is especially prominent in post-secondary settings. In fact, Twenge et al. examined generational differences in college students and found that over a period of two and a half decades there was a 30% increase in scores on the NPI. This suggests that university

students scoring high on the NPI are also likely displaying strong narcissistic entitlement tendencies in academia. At the same time, researchers (Gentile, Twenge, & Campbell, 2010) have documented the emerging self-esteem movement which began in the early 1980s school systems. As such, it has been theorized that this self-esteem movement may have propelled the rise in inflated students' entitlement (Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2009).

Investigators (Gentile et al., 2010) recently conducted a cross-temporal meta-analysis of studies during a 20-year period (1988 – 2008) that examined self-esteem in American youth and emerging adults (i.e., middle school students, high school students, and college students). They found that all three groups of students had increased self-esteem based on birth cohort. That is, students who were born in or closer to the twenty-first century had higher self-esteem as compared to students born in the 1980s and 1990s. They also found that middle-school students experienced the largest increase in self-esteem by birth cohort, with researchers documenting that twenty-first century middle-school students' self-esteem scores were on par with twenty-first century college students' self-esteem scores. As middle-school students' self-esteem scores have increased exponentially over time, it is possible that as they get older, their scores will eventually surpass that of current college students (Gentile et al., 2010).

The self-esteem movement was meant to bolster children's self-esteem in hopes of improving their academic performance. However, several challenges have since emerged (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003). The "participation ribbon" (i.e., where every child in an event receives recognition with a ribbon, if even just for participation) is a common example used by authors on the topic to illustrate this

movement and its problematic consequences (Alsop, 2008; Jayson, 2005). Some observers have even gone as far as using the label of “trophy kids” to describe that generation of children raised in an environment where even minimal effort warrants an award (Alsop, 2008). The reasoning for such a label is that it was common practice that every child who participated in a school-related activity would receive a ribbon or trophy simply for showing up, regardless of their level of achievement. While this type of treatment was supposed to have fostered a sense of encouragement, it appears to have resulted in a pervasive sense of entitlement that students seem to carry with them throughout their academic journey (Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). An example of this notion was supported by Greenberger et al.’s (2008) research, as they found that 34 percent of their post-secondary student sample expected course grades of a “B” simply for showing up to most of the classes (Greenberger et al., 2008).

Additionally, scholars have documented that as these “trophy kids” grow up and enter the workforce, they expect similar self-esteem boosting treatment in the workplace (Alsop, 2008). This also suggests that past experiences may directly influence (i.e., raise) entitlement attitudes (Fisk, 2010). Borrowing a theoretical explanation from the organizational psychology literature, Fisk (2010) proposes a reinforcement model of entitlement and claims that pre-employment experiences are an important factor in shaping employee expectations. When this notion is applied to explain how students come to expect high grades for minimal efforts, it is possible to conclude that academic entitlement is similarly affected by prior experiences with grade negotiation. For instance, Achacoso (2002) found that entitled students knew exactly which professors to approach based on their knowledge and past experience of “working the system” (p. 91).

According to Fisk's (2010) proposed reinforcement model, such students would have learned how to behave in an entitled manner (i.e., how to contest for higher grades) via positive reinforcement of their expression patterns, which would in turn raise their academic entitlement expectations (i.e., the expectation of high grades and the expectation that grade negotiation is acceptable).

In addition to this reinforcement model, "acceptable behaviour" is seen as the basis for the student incivility framework that some scholars use to study academic entitlement (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Lippmann, Bulanda, & Wagenaar, 2009). These researchers propose that academic entitlement is manifested through students' inappropriate and disrespectful behaviours. Such behaviours include students' inappropriate use of cell phones and computers during class, as well the use of informal language when communicating with instructors, particularly via email. For example, Chowning and Campbell (2009) found that academic entitlement predicted university students' judgment and self-reported likelihood of engaging in appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. These researchers also theorize that academic entitlement expectations and behaviours are based on students' externalization of academic responsibility. Examples of this externalization of academic responsibility have included placing the onus on instructors to give their students good grades and/or placing the onus on the academic institution to ensure that their students graduate.

These examples have been documented as part of the student-as-customer phenomenon (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). The increasing corporatization of universities has been seen as one of the biggest contributors to students perceiving themselves as customers of their universities, and this consequently fuels feelings of

entitlement across the post-secondary school system (Kopp et al., 2011). That is, it has been suggested that students have developed an entitled “consumer mentality” toward learning, because they perceive the university as selling them the “product” of education that is purchased through the payment of tuition fees (Finney & Finney 2010; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). Additionally, academically-entitled students view educators as service providers. However, simply providing the service of education is not enough to these consumers; the receipt of good grades for minimal effort is part of their expectations (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010).

Research on Entitlement and Grade Negotiation

Prior research indicates that post-secondary students have an ever growing sense of entitlement to an extent that automatically includes negotiation. For example, in Achacoso’s (2002) qualitative exploration of academic entitlement, she found that those high in academic entitlement were very presumptuous about their ability to influence a grade change. Specifically, students with a strong sense of entitlement often assumed that their instructors were not only approachable for this kind of discussion, but that their personal demands would be met (Achacoso, 2002; Twenge, 2009). Additionally, when expectations were not met, students with elevated academic entitlement appeared surprised and often became angry at professors’ denial of their requests (Jayson, 2005; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Applying an attribution analysis to explain this type of behaviour suggests that students perceive grades as assigned, rather than earned based on work (Achacoso, 2002; Ciani et al., 2008). That is, students high in entitlement may tend to externalize their responsibility for *earning* high grades (Chowning & Campbell, 2009). This notion is likely a predominant factor contributing to the assumption made by those

with high entitlement that they are readily able to negotiate for a higher grade (Greenberger et al., 2008).

Only a handful of studies has examined academic entitlement and grade negotiation, and the focus of most of this research has been limited to entitlement to negotiate, not specific negotiation behaviours, in an academic setting (Achacoso, 2002; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Ciani et al., 2008). Interestingly, Achacoso (2002) found a significant positive relationship between grade negotiation and higher grades among her sample of college students. In addition, Ciani et al. (2008) focused on gender differences and studied entitlement to negotiate grades in their sample of American college students. They found that gender and year in college had a significant effect on entitlement to negotiate. That is, male students more than female students reported that they would argue for better grades. Further, it was found that seniors compared to freshmen were more likely to feel entitled to negotiate their grade. Chowning and Campbell (2009) used a student incivility approach and found that academic entitlement was related to students' knowledge and judgement of appropriate behaviours. The college student sample was asked to rate their likelihood of engaging in various behaviours in response to four vignettes, including a scenario where they received a lower than expected grade. The various behaviours were classified by the authors as appropriate or inappropriate. Although the authors did not explicate their results for each vignette, overall they found that academic entitlement was a significant predictor of participants' ratings of appropriate behaviours.

Despite this existing research, ascertaining if students would negotiate a grade based on a measure of academic entitlement, reported grades, gender, or year in college

or university, does not provide enough information to address the various factors that may contribute to our understanding of grade negotiation behaviour. What is lacking in the research to date is a social-psychological perspective that might add to our understanding, by including such variables as the perceived stakes involved in relation to the assigned grades, the power relations between the student and educators, and the type of negotiation strategy adopted in relation to these variables. A central goal in this study of grade negotiation was to explore which students would negotiate their grade and to identify the conditions that predict strategic choice in negotiation.

Negotiation

In order to truly understand the psychology of negotiation and conflict resolution, one must first consider the negotiator's motive. Deutsch's (1949) theory of cooperation and competition offers a very broad categorization of socially-oriented motives: cooperative, individualistic, and competitive. Cooperative negotiators have a pro-social orientation meaning that they will be more motivated by their concern for the other negotiator rather than concern for the self. The individualistic and competitive negotiators have a pro-self orientation (Carnevale & De Dreu, 2005). In the individualistic category, a negotiator's concern will be for the self and not for others. Conversely, in the competitive category, the negotiator's concern is still for the self, but he or she will be more motivated in competing with the other negotiator for the results that best suit his or her own goals.

While the theory of cooperation and competition offers a good starting point for understanding negotiation behaviour, the dual concern model of negotiation extends the dimensions of the theory to include five negotiation strategies: forcing, problem solving,

compromising, yielding, and avoiding (De Dreu et al., 2001; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Each of these strategies is predicted by attitudes towards the self and other involved in negotiation. For example, this theory posits that when concern for the other party is low and concern for self is low, an avoidance negotiation strategy is employed. When concern for other is high and concern for self is low, a negotiator will use a yielding strategy. When concern for other is low but concern for self is high, a forcing strategy is typically employed. When concern for other is high and concern for self is high, a negotiator will use a problem solving strategy. When concern for other and self is intermediate then a compromising strategy is chosen.

As is apparent from the theory of cooperation and competition and the dual concern model of negotiation, there are many strategic negotiation choices an individual can make when deciding how to approach social conflict. Therefore, one might investigate the factors that influence how negotiators make the strategic choice to cooperate or compete. Indeed, an important consideration in strategic choice is the negotiator's motivational orientation (De Dreu, 2010). Negotiators tend to have a preference for a particular strategy stemming from either the pro-social or pro-self orientation, which is typically reflective of a number of dispositional and situational factors (Carnevale & De Dreu, 2005). That means that both trait conditions, personality or individual differences (e.g., entitlement), as well as situational factors such as circumstantial power differentials and threat of loss, can be predictive of strategic choice (Thompson, 2005).

While academic entitlement researchers have explored students' sense of entitlement in relation to negotiation action (i.e., whether or not a student will negotiate a

grade) (Ciani et al., 2008; Greenberger et al., 2008), the conditions predictive of student strategic negotiation choices in academic conflict situations have rarely been examined systematically. Further, using the conflict resolution lens to examine this relationship allows for the possibility that students might employ certain negotiation strategies and that these behaviours are rooted in students' sense of academic entitlement. In this regard, the tenants of the dual-concern model of negotiation and the self-orientation embedded in a person's sense of entitlement (Campbell et al., 2004) fit together very well in predicting a person's conflict management style. This notion may then be transferable to academic entitlement in that the style and extent to which grades are negotiated is dictated by one's level of entitlement. For example, a student who is high in academic entitlement would naturally exhibit a high concern for self, and a low concern for others, such that they would likely employ a forcing strategy in a negotiation. In contrast, a student who is low in academic entitlement would be less likely to have selfish tendencies and, when coupled with low concern for others, would use an avoiding negotiation strategy. In addition, approaches to conflict resolution may present differently as a function of individual differences in academic entitlement attitudes, as well as situational variables, such as stakes and power distance.

Stakes in Negotiation and Entitlement

There is always something at stake when one considers negotiation as a means of conflict resolution. Most real-world negotiations have similar stakes in common, and these stakes have been operationalized and studied for research purposes. For example, an often-used stake in negotiation research is salary. Further, the study of salary in negotiation research typically uses the student population as participants. While the

examination of student views in relation to salary and negotiation has proved informative, it seems more relevant to use a currency that students use in the academic environment, such as grades. Therefore, negotiation research as it is related to grades may yield a more accurate picture of academic entitlement and negotiation behaviour.

On the basis of past research, it is understood that students who feel highly entitled would likely negotiate for better grades (e.g., Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Ciani et al., 2008). However, researchers also found some students, who were categorized as low in feelings of academic entitlement, did negotiate for their grades (Ashacoso, 2002). This suggests that there are many situational variables to consider when examining students' strategic negotiation choices. Students contemplating whether or not they should negotiate for a higher grade may consider such factors as the loss or gain of student funding, the recognition for their effort regardless of work quality, the need to pass a mandatory course, escaping or getting off of academic probation, and the amount of parental pressure exerted (Greenberger et al., 2008). In fact, researchers have suggested that students often use grade negotiation in the context of a dire circumstance, such as failing a course or program of study if they do not get the grade they desire (Greenberger et al., 2008).

Negotiation researchers have used stakes as a variable in experimentation with negotiators' gain and loss frames (Bazerman, Magliozzi, & Neale, 1985; Neale, Huber, & Northcraft, 1987). This research has been found to support an aspect of Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979); that is, losses loom larger than equivalent gains. As such, negotiators are driven by a loss-aversion motive to negotiate, prompting them to behave in particular ways. Not surprisingly, research has demonstrated that negotiators who

minimized losses rather than maximized gains tended to use more forceful tactics, such as having higher demands, making smaller concessions, and being less likely to settle (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992).

Consistent with the loss aversion premise, Singleton-Jackson and her colleagues (2010) determined that loss of funding is an important factor to students. Specifically, first-year university students participated in focus groups and expressed "...that marks should definitely be rounded up to make sure that students pass and that scholarships are not lost" (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010, p. 351). In keeping with the notion that students would be motivated to minimize losses as much as possible, for the present research it was speculated that even students who would not have otherwise argued for a better grade would do so if presented with a loss frame. Therefore, in order to test the person-situation effect that may influence negotiation choices, loss of student funding was used as a variable in this study. To gain a clearer understanding of the motivational mechanisms at work in such situations, the stakes at risk were experimentally manipulated to be low or high. It was expected that the higher the stakes (i.e., the amount of funding lost), the more students would want to negotiate for a higher grade. Further, given the previous research in this area, it was expected that a forcing negotiation strategy would be used.

Power Distance in Negotiation and Entitlement

Given the context of grade negotiation, students attempting to raise their grade would have to negotiate with either their professor or their teaching assistant. This situational circumstance includes inherent asymmetric power differentials where student negotiators are powerless relative to their negotiating partner. This naturally renders the

professor as the high-power negotiator and the teaching assistant as the low-power negotiating partner for students to have to face.¹ Tjosvold, Johnson, and Johnson (1984) found that unequal power distribution alone had little effect on conflict resolution strategies. However, a competitive situational context coupled with unequal power distribution among negotiators did affect negotiation behaviours in a destructive manner (Tjosvold et al., 1984). These researchers found that while negotiators in the low-power, highly competitive condition were willing to negotiate, “competition seemed to promote a belief that oneself and the other will act in egocentric ways without concern for each other” (Tjosvold et al., 1984, p. 199). Consequently, negotiators in competitive and unequal power conditions were less willing to come to mutual agreement (Tjosvold et al., 1984).

A competitive context is typically a win-lose negotiation situation, where if one party achieves their desired outcome, the other party will not. By extending this definition to the context of grade negotiation, it is possible to perceive such a situation as competitive. For example, in the context of the student negotiating for a higher grade with a professor, the professor may be seen as “losing face” or having his or her grading competence questioned if the grade is actually changed. At the same time, if the student fails to get the grade change, it is an obvious loss situation. As such, in my study I construed academic grade negotiation as a zero-sum or win-lose negotiation. That is, the

¹ As not to confound the power distance variable with student perceptions of authority, it was made clear in this study that teaching assistants have the authority to change grades.

student had to negotiate for a better grade, not on the basis of merit as intended by the professor, but on the basis of their perceived need.

When considering Tjosvold et al.'s (1984) findings from a strategic choice perspective, one might expect that negotiation strategy would vary according to competitive power struggle stemming from negotiators' perceptions of the negotiation context. In this study, the students' perception of a competitive power struggle was manipulated with respect to the students' power distance proximity to their negotiating partner. It was hypothesized that students who negotiated with the professor would view the grade negotiation context as more competitive and would, in turn prefer to use a competitive strategy such as forcing.

Overview of the Rationale for the Present Study

This study attempted to contribute to the existing literature on academic entitlement and conflict resolution by identifying factors that affect students' inclination to negotiate, as well as the use of particular conflict management strategies when negotiating grades. Specifically, by using grade negotiation vignettes in an experimental design, the extent to which students were inclined to negotiate their grade and the extent to which students indicated the use of five self-report negotiation strategies was investigated as a function of varying levels of *academic entitlement*, *stakes* and *power distance*.

The current study involved a 3 (Academic Entitlement: High, Moderate, vs. Low) X 2 (Power Distance: High vs. Low) X 2 (Stakes: High vs. Low) between-subjects design, with random assignment to Stakes and Power Distance. Six dependent variables

included inclination to negotiate, and five strategic negotiation choice scores (Forcing, Problem Solving, Compromise, Yielding, and Avoiding).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a: It was expected that the level of academic entitlement (high, moderate, or low) would have an effect on the extent to which students were inclined to negotiate for their grades. Specifically, it was hypothesized that those who are high in academic entitlement would report a greater inclination to negotiate grades.

Hypothesis 1b: It was expected that level of power distance (high or low) would have an effect on the extent to which students were inclined to negotiate for their grades. That is, those in the low power condition were expected to be more inclined to negotiate their grades.

Hypothesis 1c: It was expected that level of stakes (high or low) would have an effect on the extent to which students were inclined to negotiate for their grades, such that those in the high stakes condition would be more inclined to negotiate their grades.

Hypothesis 2: It was expected that the level of academic entitlement (high, moderate, or low) would have an effect on the chosen negotiation strategies. It was expected that those high in academic entitlement would be more likely to engage in forcing, problem solving and compromising strategies than those who were low in entitlement.

Hypothesis 3: It was expected that level of stakes (high or low) would have an effect on the extent to which students make strategic negotiation choices. Given the previous research in this area (e.g., Neale et al., 1987), I expected that those in the high-

level stakes group would indicate a stronger preference for a forcing strategy as compared to those in the low-level stakes group.

Hypothesis 4: It was expected that level of power distance (high or low) would have an effect on the extent to which students made strategic negotiation choices. As suggested by prior research (e.g., Tjosvold et al., 1984), those in the high power distance condition would be more likely to use a forcing strategy than those in the low power distance group.

Hypothesis 5: It was expected that there would be a 3-way interaction effect of academic entitlement, power distance, and stakes on the likelihood that students would use a forcing negotiation strategy. Specifically, I expected that when academic entitlement was high, power distance was high, and stakes were high, participants would indicate stronger preference for using a forcing strategy than when academic entitlement, power distance and stakes were low.

Method

Procedures

Undergraduate students who participated in the Carleton University Psychology Department's mass testing and successfully signed up through the SONA participant pool were recruited via email to participate in a study on academic decision making. These student volunteers were selected for participation in the proposed study on the basis of their Academic Entitlement Scale scores which were collected during mass testing (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008; See Appendix A).

Each potential participant received an email inviting them to participate in the study via a web-based survey that would take approximately fifteen minutes to complete.

Students wishing to participate followed a link to a survey that was posted online for fourteen days. After reading an informed consent form and agreeing to participate, participants were presented with a vignette and asked to respond to a series of questions (Appendices A to H). Upon completion of the survey, participants were presented with a debriefing form and thanked for their participation. Students received grade-raising course credit (0.25%) in exchange for their participation.

Academic Decision Making Vignettes (Appendix B). Each participant was randomly assigned to read one of four vignettes. The basic scenario described an academic conflict situation that a student was experiencing. Each vignette included the same general description of a student and his or her academic efforts, as well as a description of a situation in which the student had received a grade on an assignment and discovered that it is two percentage points below the cut-off to the next grade level. The student was also described as being in danger of losing a certain amount of funding if he or she did not achieve a certain grade level. Each scenario included one level of the independent variables, power distance and stakes.

The independent variable of stakes was manipulated by describing the amount of funding the student stands to lose if the grade is not raised to the next level, either \$1000 (high stakes) or \$100 (low stakes).

The independent variable power distance was manipulated by having the student's assignment be graded by a professor or teaching assistant. That is, in the *high power distance* versions of the scenario, a professor had graded the student's assignment and must be approached in terms of grade negotiation, whereas in the *low power distance* scenario, a teaching assistant had done the grading.

Measures

Inclination to Negotiate (Appendix C). A single question measuring students' inclination to negotiate for a grade change was asked of participants. Specifically, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they would be inclined to negotiate for a grade change after reading the academic decision making vignette. A 5-point Likert-type response scale was used, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*). Higher scores represented that participants would be more inclined to negotiate for a grade change.

Adapted DUTCH Test for Conflict Handling. (De Dreu, Evers, Beerma, Kluwer, & Nauta, 2001). (Appendix D). The 20-item DUTCH Test for Conflict Handling was used to assess types of negotiation strategies. The DUTCH is a self-report scale that measures the extent to which an individual applies each of five different negotiation strategies when handling conflict: yielding, avoiding, problem solving, forcing, and compromising (De Dreu et al., 2001). A 5-point Likert-type scale was used (ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*) to indicate the extent to which participants reported use of a particular negotiation strategy. The DUTCH scale is divided into five subscales, with four questions for each subscale that reflect the five aforementioned negotiation strategies. Higher scores indicated a stronger preference toward a specific negotiation strategy. Scale reliability ranged from an alpha of .63 to .84 and convergent and divergent validity in previous studies is also acceptable (De Dreu et al., 2001). This scale had an acceptable reliability level in the present study ($\alpha = .76$).

The five subscale scores were used in this study as five separate dependent variables (i.e., yielding, avoiding, problem solving, forcing, and compromising) which constituted strategic negotiation choices. I adapted the wording of the questions to reflect

the conflict scenario that participants had just read. Based on the subscales that Miller, Farmer, Miller, and Peters (2010) adapted for their study, the phrase “in the discussion with my professor [TA]” was added to some sentences (e.g., I try to realize a middle of the road solution *in the discussion with my professor [TA]*). Further, the word “professor” or the word “teaching assistant” was used to replace any items that used the words “other party” (e.g., I give in to the wishes of the *professor [TA]*).

Academic Entitlement Scale (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008) (*Appendix A*). The independent variable of academic entitlement was measured by the Academic Entitlement Scale. This 15-item scale measures the degree to which students feel academically entitled. Examples of items on the scale include: “If I have completed most of the reading for a class, I deserve a B in that course” and “If I have explained to my professor that I am trying hard, I think he/she should give me some consideration with respect to my course grade”. Students rated their level of agreement on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). These scores were used as an independent variable with 3 levels: high, moderate, and low academic entitlement. This scale is shown to be an adequate measure of academic entitlement and has a reliability of $\alpha = .86$ (Greenberger et al. 2008) and had a similar level of reliability in the present study ($\alpha = .87$).

Manipulation Checks (Appendix E). As a manipulation check of the *power distance* variable, participants were asked to indicate whether the vignette presented described a professor or a teaching assistant. Similarly, as a manipulation check of the *stakes* variable, participants were asked to indicate whether the amount of potential funding loss was \$100 or \$1000.

Past Experience (Appendix F). To measure past student experience, participants were asked about their previous experience with grade negotiation in high school and university. An example form this measure is: “In university, when I received a lower than expected grade, I would negotiate with my teacher for a better.”

Demographic variables (Appendix G). Demographic information included participants’ self-reported student status (e.g., year study), age and gender. The information collected in this part of the survey was used to describe the sample.

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Impression Management Subscale. Version 6 Form 40A (Paulhus, 1991) (Appendix H). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) scale assesses the degree to which a participant responds to questions with a socially-desirable bias. This 40-item scale is used to measure two constructs: Self-deceptive enhancement and impression management. Self-deceptive enhancement refers to people who honestly believe their unintentional portrayal of themselves in a favourable light. Impression management indicates that someone deliberately distorts their self-image to be seen in a favourable light. Each subscale is comprised of 20 questions. The impression management (IM) subscale scores were used in this study to determine if participants were answering in a socially desirable fashion. Items in the impression management subscale are endorsed on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*not true*) to 5 (*very true*). The IM subscale asks questions about overconfidence in the participant’s judgment and reliability. Half of the items are reverse scored and negatively keyed. The scale uses dichotomous scoring, where one point is assigned for all 4- and 5-point responses and zero points are assigned to any item that has a 3-point or less response. The total subscale scores can range from 0 to 20. The

dichotomous scoring method ensures that only individuals who have indicated an extreme response will attain high scores. Internal consistency ranges from an alpha of .75 to .86 for the impression management subscale and had an acceptable level of reliability in the present study ($\alpha = .71$). Validity is also acceptable as it has been shown to be correlated with other social desirability measures (e.g., .71 with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Inventory).

Results

Data Screening

Prior to conducting any analyses, the data set was screened for missing data and cleaned according to strategies suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). Mean substitution was performed where two or less scale item scores were missing. Preliminary analyses and data plotting revealed that the statistical assumptions necessary to conduct further tests were met, unless otherwise stated (Field, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Descriptive Characteristics

The sample consisted of 185 participants, 56 male, 126 female; 3 participants chose not to disclose gender. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 54 years with the majority ($n = 145$) of participants ranging in age from 18 to 21. The mean age was 20.99 ($SD = 5.66$ years) and the modal age was 18 years old. Fifty participants reported being 18 years of age and 51 participants reported being 19 years of age. Most of the participants ($n = 114$), reported being in their first year of study. A large number of participants ($n = 144$) self-identified as Caucasian. The majority of participants (65%) indicated that their education was financed by their parents or relatives, 48% reported receiving scholarships/grants/bursaries, 37% indicated they had financial aid loans, and 44% indicated self-finance. Forty percent of participants indicated their education was

financed by only one option, while the remaining 60% indicated that their education was financed by two or more sources.

Participants' scores on the Academic Entitlement Scale ranged from 1 to 4.87 on a 6-point scale, and the sample mean was 2.53 with a standard deviation of 0.80. The sample mean for students' past negotiation experience in high school was 4.22 ($SD = 2.22$) on an 8-point scale ranging from "Not at all like me" to "Very much like me." Likewise, the sample mean for students' past negotiation experience in university was 3.71 ($SD = 1.91$). Participants who indicated they had experienced past grade negotiations in university were then asked to estimate the percentage of negotiations that they had with a teaching assistant and a professor (separately). A majority of these participants reported these negotiations happened less than fifty percent of the time with a teaching assistant (89%) and less than fifty percent with a professor (88%).

Correlations

A correlation matrix was computed using two-tailed Pearson's correlation tests to assess the intercorrelations of inclination to negotiate, the five negotiation strategies, academic entitlement, power distance, stakes, impression management, scholarship amount, age, gender, high school and university grade point average, as well as past negotiation experience in high school and university. The significant correlations are reported in Table 1. No significant correlations were found between stakes, impression management, and scholarship amount with any of the other variables. Past negotiation experience in university and high school revealed moderate to strong, significant correlations with academic entitlement, as well as three of the dependent variables (i.e., inclination to negotiate, yielding strategy, and problem solving strategy). In fact, past

negotiation experience in university had the strongest association with the inclination to negotiate grades. Interestingly, past university grade negotiation experience was found to have a positive moderate correlation with university grade point average. Similarly, past high school grade negotiation experience was moderately associated with high school grades. Much smaller, significant correlations between gender, academic entitlement, problem solving strategy and age were also found. Relative to males, females tended to be slightly lower on academic entitlement, were slightly less likely to use a problem solving strategy, and slightly younger.

Table 1

Intercorrelations of negotiation strategies, past negotiation experience, academic entitlement, and power

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|----|
| 1. Inclination To Negotiate | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Yielding | .44** | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Compromising | .02 | .25** | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Forcing | .22** | .41** | .46** | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Problem Solving | .34** | .59** | .29** | .57** | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Avoiding | .21** | .38** | .43** | .47** | .47** | - | | | | | | | | |
| 7. AE | .23** | .17* | .02 | .15* | .13 | .21** | - | | | | | | | |
| 8. Power | .03 | .03 | .01 | .05 | .17* | .05 | .09 | - | | | | | | |
| 9. University GPA | -.01 | .04 | -.03 | .03 | .08 | -.07 | -.11 | .04 | - | | | | | |
| 10. High School GPA | -.02 | .10 | -.07 | -.09 | .05 | .01 | .07 | .05 | .27** | - | | | | |
| 11. Age | -.11 | -.05 | -.02 | -.02 | .03 | -.04 | -.24** | -.06 | .16* | -.16* | - | | | |
| 12. Gender | -.09 | -.07 | -.06 | -.03 | -.16* | -.03 | -.15* | -.02 | -.01 | .13 | -.15* | - | | |
| 13. University Negotiation Experience | .54** | .25** | -.05 | .07 | .21** | .01 | .16* | -.00 | .24** | .09 | .06 | -.13 | - | |
| 14. High School Negotiation Experience | .39** | .27** | .01 | .03 | .17* | .13 | .22** | .05 | .03 | .27** | -.08 | -.02 | .47** | - |

Note. AE = Academic Entitlement. GPA = Grade Point Average.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed

Manipulation Checks

The manipulation check for power distance revealed that 14 participants incorrectly identified the assignment marker in their given vignette and 19 participants indicated they did not know, whereas 82.2% of the sample correctly identified either the teaching assistant or professor in their respective vignettes. The results indicate that 52% of the sample received the teaching assistant vignettes. From this subsample, 82.3% correctly identified the teaching assistant as having the authority to change a grade, while 7.6% incorrectly indicated that the teaching assistant did not have the authority to change a grade. Eight participants indicated that they did not know if the teaching assistant had the authority to change their grade. Ninety-three percent of the sample correctly identified the proper stakes in their given vignettes. Only 2% of the sample incorrectly identified whether they were in the 100 or 1000 dollars condition and 5% of the sample acknowledged that they did not know².

Data Analyses

To test the hypotheses six Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to examine if the independent variables of power, stakes, and academic entitlement had an effect on the dependent variables of inclination to negotiate and the preference for use of the five negotiation strategies: forcing, avoiding, yielding, problem solving, and compromising. The independent variable of academic entitlement was divided into three groups based on the range of scores within the sample on the Academic Entitlement

² Results were also calculated with participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation checks were removed, and findings were similar.

Scale. The response scores can span from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*) on this scale and in the current study ranged from 1 to 4.87. Participants who scored between 1 and 1.99 were categorized as low ($n = 50$), those who scored between 2 and 2.99 were categorized as moderate ($n = 75$), and those who scored between 3 and 4.87 were categorized as high ($n = 56$).

The first analysis looked at the effects of all three independent variables on participants' inclination to negotiate – that is, a 2 (power) x 2 (stakes) x 3 (academic entitlement) ANOVA – and found that there was a main effect for academic entitlement on inclination to negotiate (see Table 2). Post hoc comparisons demonstrated that participants categorized as high in academic entitlement ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .91$) were more inclined to negotiate their grade as compared to participants categorized as low in academic entitlement ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.21$). This is in direct support of hypothesis 1a. However, levels of power and stakes did not affect participants' inclination to negotiate as hypothesized in hypothesis 1b and 1c.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Inclination to Negotiate

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | .24 | .001 | .625 |
| Stakes | 1 | .62 | .002 | .433 |
| AE | 2 | 3.16 | .035 | .045* |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | .31 | .002 | .577 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .65 | .007 | .522 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | .65 | .007 | .524 |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | 1.68 | .019 | .190 |
| Within group error | 166 | (1.06) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$

Five separate ANOVAs were calculated with the preference for the use of five negotiation strategies as dependent variables. An ANOVA with the independent variables (power, stakes, and academic entitlement) was conducted with the dependent variable of use of forcing strategy. Results indicated that there were no main effects. However, there was a significant two-way interaction between stakes and academic entitlement (see Table 3). Using post hoc comparisons, results revealed one significant effect. In the low stakes condition, participants high in academic entitlement ($M = 14.54$, $SD = 2.45$) preferred the use of the forcing negotiation strategy more than participants low in academic entitlement ($M = 12.32$, $SD = 2.75$).

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Use of Forcing Strategy

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | .31 | .002 | .580 |
| Stakes | 1 | .94 | .012 | .334 |
| AE | 2 | 1.45 | .024 | .237 |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | .81 | .004 | .370 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .41 | .004 | .661 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | 3.25 | .036 | .041* |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | .10 | .001 | .901 |
| Within group error | 169 | (6.91) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$

An ANOVA with the above-mentioned independent variables (power, stakes, and academic entitlement) was conducted with the dependent variable of use of problem solving strategy (see Table 4). Results indicate that there was a main effect of power, such that participants in the high power condition ($M = 13.45$, $SD = 2.55$) preferred to use a problem solving strategy as compared to participants in the lower power condition ($M = 13.10$, $SD = 2.25$).

Table 4

Analysis of Variance for Use of Problem Solving Strategy

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | 4.83 | .029 | .029* |
| Stakes | 1 | .12 | .000 | .731 |
| AE | 2 | 2.40 | .032 | .094 |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | .07 | .000 | .794 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .22 | .002 | .802 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | 2.40 | .026 | .094 |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | .13 | .001 | .884 |
| <i>S</i> Within group error | 169 | (5.72) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$

Three more ANOVAs using the same independent variables (power, stakes, and academic entitlement) with the dependent variables of the compromising, yielding, and avoiding strategies were conducted as well (see Tables 5, 6, 7 in appendices I, J, K).

None of these ANOVAs had significant results.

Discussion

Complementing a body of literature that has studied academic entitlement and social behaviours among university students (e.g., Achacoso, 2002; Ciani et al., 2008; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008; Kopp et al., 2011; Lippmann et al., 2009; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010), this study extends the findings on academic

entitlement in the context of grade negotiation. As will be recalled, the purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of academic entitlement, a phenomenon that may affect academic conflict resolution. It was expected that academic entitlement attitudes would likely vary between individuals, and consequently individual approaches to grade negotiation would differ accordingly. It was also expected that situational variables may affect inclination to negotiate grades and negotiation strategy use. To this end, in this study I manipulated stakes and power distance to examine how these factors affected students' grade negotiation behaviours. Specifically, the functions of situational variables in academic entitlement and negotiation were investigated by asking the following research questions: 1) Does academic entitlement affect one's inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use? 2) What is the effect of stakes on inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use? and, 3) How does power distance affect inclination to negotiate and negotiation strategy use?

The overall results support the claim that students' academic entitlement attitudes affect their inclination to negotiate. Also as expected, the students' grade negotiation behaviours were related to varying levels of stakes and power distance. However, further examination of the results suggested that a confluence of other factors may shape academic entitlement attitudes. As such, this study served as a good starting point for future research on this complex phenomenon and its social behaviours.

In addition to discussing my specific results, I review how previous theory and literature can contribute to their interpretation. I also describe some potential limitations of the study and directions for future research. In the concluding section, I outline the implications for my research for higher education.

Academic Entitlement

A key finding in this study was that students' levels of academic entitlement had an effect on their inclination to negotiate for a higher grade. As hypothesized, those who were categorized as high in academic entitlement were more inclined to negotiate their grade than those who were low in entitlement. This finding is in line with previous research that has investigated entitlement to grade negotiation among students (Achacoso, 2002; Ciani et al., 2008). For example, Achacoso (2002) found that highly academically-entitled students perceived that grade negotiation was an acceptable practice and, therefore, that they were entitled to negotiate. Ciani et al. (2008) also found that students who were more academically-entitled felt more unconstrained to negotiate for a better grade.

It should be noted that similar to Greenberger et al.'s (2008) findings, the mean score and range of scores on the Academic Entitlement Scale were modest. That is, while the response scores can span from 1 to 6 on this scale, the highest score reported within the current study's sample was 4.87. The division of the low, moderate, and high academic entitlement levels was based on the range found in this sample. Therefore, students categorized as "high" in academic entitlement actually fell somewhat close to the midpoint of the scale. The fact that the low and high groups differed significantly from each other indicates that even moderate changes in academic entitlement levels affect students' negotiation behaviour. In fact, Achacoso's (2002) qualitative study found that even students categorized as low in academic entitlement negotiated for their grades.

Additionally, upon further examination, the frequency responses to the "Inclination to Negotiate" question revealed that only three percent of the current study's

sample indicated that they would *not* argue for a better grade. As a whole, these findings lend empirical support to the existing anecdotal evidence that suggests that student-teacher grade disputes are very prevalent. Additionally, while the concept of academic entitlement is relatively new and not fully understood, it appears to offer some explanation for students' grade negotiation behaviour. However, the effect size of academic entitlement was small ($\eta^2 = .035$).

Power Distance and Stakes

Contrary to my other hypotheses pertaining to students' inclination to negotiate, there were no main effects for power distance and stakes. This suggests that an inclination to negotiate one's grade is more closely related to academic entitlement and not necessarily to these two situational factors as portrayed in the experimental scenarios. As such, this finding does not lend support to a person by situation framework, and I speculate this may result from students, especially those high in academic entitlement, viewing grade negotiation as a "right" (Achacoso, 2002; Ciani et al., 2008). Subsequently, these individuals may naturally feel more comfortable attempting grade negotiation regardless of other situational factors at play (i.e., whether it is with a teaching assistant vs. a professor, or whether they have less vs. more to lose). That said, it should be noted that stakes and power distance were related to the use of some of the negotiation strategies. Although these situational variables may not influence the overall inclination to negotiate, they certainly may play some role in how this negotiation is carried out.

My findings revealed a significant interaction effect between academic entitlement and stakes, such that students' entitlement attitudes had an effect on the

extent to which they would use the forcing negotiation strategy when stakes were low. Although this is not the expected three-way interaction between academic entitlement, stakes, and power distance on negotiation strategies that I hypothesized, it does provide limited support to a person by situation interaction in the prediction of grade negotiation.

An examination of this two-way interaction revealed that in the low stakes condition, students who were categorized as high in academic entitlement reported that they would use the forcing strategy to a greater extent (as compared to students who were low in academic entitlement). Thus, when stakes were low, academically-entitled students appeared to be more willing to risk using forceful tactics to negotiate for their grade. As loss scenarios have often been manipulated in negotiation research (Bazerman et al., 1985; Neale et al., 1987), it was expected that presenting a loss of scholarship money in the experimental scenarios would be quite salient to students. Although contrary to initial hypotheses (i.e. that students in the high stakes group would use a forcing negotiation strategy) the overall finding does support research that demonstrates that a potential loss of funding can be of great concern to students (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010).

The significant interaction found between academic entitlement and stakes is consistent with the dual concern model of negotiation, which purports that when one's concern for others is low, but concern for self is high, a forcing strategy is typically employed in negotiation (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Considering that students were presented with a) a loss scenario, and b) were entitled, this combination highlighted their pro-self orientation. A synthesis of the above findings may indicate that those with high academic entitlement in low stakes conditions report a greater likelihood of exhibiting

pro-self negotiation strategies (i.e., forcing). Given that academically entitled students had “less to lose” in low stakes scenarios, it can be speculated that students might be less likely to care if they offend or anger their negotiating partner through aggressive negotiation tactics.

Contrary to my fourth hypothesis, students in the high power distance condition chose to use the problem solving strategy to a *greater* extent than students in the low power distance condition. Originally, it was believed that students would view negotiation situations with a high power holder (e.g., professor) as more competitive than with a low power holder, thus employing a competitive negotiation strategy (i.e., forcing strategy). However, my results indicated that students were more likely to want to work toward a mutually beneficial solution with a high power holder in contrast with a low power holder by using a cooperative negotiation strategy (i.e., problem solving strategy).

Operating from the perspective of the dual concern model, it was expected that assigning students to a competitive situation (e.g., high power distance) would lead to the use of a competitive negotiation strategy. Typically, users of this type of strategy have high concern for self, but low concern for other (De Dreu et al., 2001; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). On the other hand, the problem solving strategy is typically employed by those who have high concern for self and high concern for other (De Dreu et al., 2001; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Although the results were counter-intuitive to the original competition idea, the use of a problem solving strategy still aligns with the dual concern model given students’ necessity to maintain relationships with high power holders. In regard to the current study, it can be speculated that students preferred to use a problem solving strategy as a means of preserving and furthering the student-teacher relationship.

An explanation for this finding could be that students typically interact with a professor more frequently than a teaching assistant and may perceive the need to maintain good relations in the event that they require academic accommodations (e.g., rescheduling an exam, lecture notes). Additionally, they might have to take other classes with the same professor or possibly ask for a letter of reference. As part of the manipulation checks participants were asked the open-ended question, "Please explain why you [do not] perceive a professor and a teaching assistant to have equal power." Interestingly, students who chose to answer this question indicated that they viewed the professor as the ultimate power holder, having power over the teaching assistant. This information is meaningful because it suggests that students have different experiences depending on their perceptions of power and that they are especially sensitive to situations that have a power imbalance.

Correlates of Academic Entitlement

A review of the key significant correlations supports many of the claims in the literature. For example, academic entitlement was associated with past negotiation experience in both high school and university. These significantly positive correlations between academic entitlement and past negotiation experience indicated that as one had more negotiation experience, they also demonstrated higher degrees of academic entitlement. Conversely, these correlations can be interpreted in such a way that as one's level of academic entitlement increases, the participants also gain negotiation experience. These correlations are not surprising, as previous research has found associations between academically-entitled students and past negotiation experience. In fact, Achacoso (2002) highlighted that students who had prior experience with grade

negotiation were more knowledgeable about navigating the politics of the academic system and expected that their demands would be met.

Past negotiation experience in high school and university was also strongly, significantly correlated with three dependent variables: Inclination to negotiate, the yielding strategy, and the problem solving strategy. All significant correlations were positive in nature, indicating that students who had more negotiation experience, were a) more inclined to negotiate for a grade, b) had a preference for using the yielding strategy, and c) had a preference for using the problem solving strategy. Once again, it is speculated that one's preference to use more cooperative strategies such as yielding and problem solving may be associated with past negotiation experiences and, in particular, experiences in which an individual has learned to effectively negotiate within the educational system.

Gender was negatively correlated with academic entitlement, which was consistent with previous literature (Greenberger et al., 2008; Ciani et al., 2008) that finds women tend to be less academically-entitled than men. Similarly, gender was negatively correlated with the problem solving negotiation strategy. This would appear to suggest that women were less likely to use this strategy as compared to men. However, caution should be used when interpreting these results. For instance, the current study employed written vignettes for its participants. Stuhlmacher, Citera, and Willis (2007) note that men typically display greater consistency in their negotiation style, whereas women vary depending on the situational context. More specifically, women were found to be more hostile in a virtual environment in contrast to face-to-face situations. As the vignettes in the present study did not involve true face-to-face interactions, the female participants

may have felt that they could be more forceful or assertive in these scenarios to gain their desired outcome (i.e., obtain a higher grade). Given that the majority of participants were female (68%), it is possible that a more balanced sample would have produced different results.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study is an original contribution to the literature in an examination of academic entitlement and grade negotiation, and it extended the findings in this area to include situational variables that were hitherto unexplored. However, the current study had limitations, and thus it only presented part of a whole picture as it is related to academic conflict behaviours associated with academic entitlement.

For example, one limitation of the current study is the artificial nature of experimental designs to replicate an everyday experience; that is, the interaction between professors and students. The experimental design may lack external validity. It is certainly possible that the manipulations of stakes and power were not effective enough in simulating the experiences of students. This limitation may explain the lack of the expected effects for these variables. Academic entitlement was found to have an effect on students' inclination to negotiate, however, it did not have a main effect on their preferences for any of the five negotiation strategies. Power distance was found to have a main effect on the problem solving strategy, but it did not have an effect on the other dependent variables. Stakes did not have a main effect on any of the dependent variables, although it did interact with academic entitlement on the forcing strategy. These findings could be related to the design of the study, as imagining an interpersonal interaction and how one would act in that situation may not reflect students' actual behaviour. In this

regard, it can be speculated that students' reactions to written vignettes may differ from their responses to real world negotiation situations. Hence, future studies might want to explore how situational variables affect behaviour in a naturalistic setting.

Another possible limitation may have been the use of the current instrument to measure academic entitlement in this study. While it is believed that this measure captured students' overall sense of entitlement well, future studies should consider a comparison of all existing academic entitlement instruments. Perhaps including more explicitly "entitled" scale items would allow for a fuller understanding of entitlement attitudes and behaviours. For example, Chowning and Campbell (2009) included this item in their scale: "My professors should reconsider my grade if I am close to the grade I *want*". Achocoso (2002) included an interesting item that assessed whether or not students would actually tell their instructor if they felt they deserved a higher grade. Both of these items are clearly demonstrative of highly entitled thoughts and actions. It is unknown whether or not the incorporation of these items or the use of different academic entitlement measures would have affected the current data.

In addition, gender disparity in this study may be reflective of the disparity within the sampled population, however, it may also be likely that the gender differences did affect the results, as female participants constituted 68% of the sample. Future studies may benefit from sampling a more equivalent representation of males, and consequently, the results may vary accordingly. Moreover, as gender was found to be correlated with the dependent variable of problem solving strategy, future studies should also consider examining a predictive model that uses gender and past negotiation experience as

potential mediators or moderators of the relations between academic entitlement and grade negotiation strategies.

The ability to generalize the findings is limited to first-year undergraduate students at a large research-intensive university, as there is no way to know how specific these findings are to the region or university. While there is no reason to suspect that Carleton University students are different from other university students, future studies should carefully consider collecting data across a variety of geographical locations and post-secondary institutions. It may also be of interest to explore differences in academic entitlement and grade negotiation based on incoming students' high schools. It may be, for example, that students from highly competitive secondary schools may be more familiar with grade negotiation. Given that grade negotiation experience is a significant predictor of grade negotiation in university, this is certainly a variable of interest for future research. Research of this type might also help us sort out the "chicken and egg problem" of which comes first, entitlement attitudes or experience with grade negotiation.

While beyond the scope of this study, additional research is needed to gain a more comprehensive understanding regarding the impact of academic entitlement and the subsequent negotiation tactics tied with it. For example, an exploration of potential mental health outcomes (e.g., anxiety, depression, social distress) involving both parties (i.e., student and educator) would offer additional empirical support regarding the impact of academic entitlement within the post-secondary domain. Similarly, future studies may also wish to explore factors such as teacher burnout to determine if there is a relationship with academic entitlement.

Implications for Higher Education

The consequences of academically-entitled students who negotiate for their grades can be far reaching, not only for students' academic outcomes, but also for instructors' interactions with all students. For example, Lippmann and colleagues (2009) note that the time that instructors must devote to interacting with academically-entitled students is significant and it can detract from teaching. Further, such conflicts can also negatively affect the professor "...by reducing the attractiveness of the classroom and the joy of teaching" (Coates & Morrison, 2011, p. 113). Hence, addressing academic entitlement is important, given the current study's finding that academically-entitled students were more inclined to negotiate for a higher grade.

Although academic entitlement has recently garnered attention from scholars, there is currently a dearth of literature examining the topic, therefore, the theoretical underpinnings of this social psychological phenomenon are not widely understood. Studying this phenomenon and its behavioural manifestations could potentially further develop knowledge of this research area and in turn highlight many practical implications for students and professors, as well as educational institutions. For example, students and educators alike can learn how to better identify if academic entitlement is the basis for problematic student behaviours such as academic integrity infractions (Greenberger et al., 2008) or adversarial grade negotiation. In addition, uniform rules and regulations could be formulated at the institutional level to ensure that grade negotiation happens fairly. For example, Lippmann et al. (2009) recommend policies that state if and when a student wishes to challenge their grade, they must prepare and present a written justification for a grade change. They also suggest including policy statements on course syllabi, such that

a grade review request would mean that the reviewer will re-evaluate the assignment, and consequently the outcome could be a lower instead of higher grade.

In light of the study findings that virtually all students are inclined to negotiate for grades, it may be especially beneficial to provide educators with additional tools that may prepare them for dealing with these students, especially those that exhibit high levels of academic entitlement. As such, educating instructors, as well as teaching assistants, on proactive approaches to negate problematic behaviours associated with academic entitlement may be helpful for higher education staff members, as well as students, by strengthening communication between both parties. For example, university teaching centers might consider running workshops on cooperative conflict management in order to prepare professors, teaching assistants, and students for potential grade disputes. A unique aspect of the current study was the incorporation of stakes and power distance as independent variables and five negotiation strategies as dependent variables. This is particularly important for teaching assistants given the finding that professors are more likely to be approached by students using problem solving negotiation tactics.

Lastly, the findings from this study highlight and link the normative nature of grade negotiation in university to students' prior negotiation experience. As such, it might be that engaging students in negotiation is contributing to an environment that supports academic entitlement. Hence, high schools may have to implement policies that outline clear conditions under which grades can be challenged. At the higher education level, perhaps incoming student orientation activities need to specifically address this issue, by helping students to appropriately adjust their entitlement expectations and educating them regarding proper entitlement behaviour in university.

References

- Achacoso, M. V. (2002). What do you mean my grade is not an A? An investigation of academic entitlement, causal attributions, and self-regulation in college students (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ABI/INFORM database. (UMI No. 3241781)
- Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the Narcissistic Personality Inventory really measure? *Assessment, 18*, 67–87. doi: 10.1177/1073191110382845
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed., Text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Alsop, R. (2008). *The trophy kids grow up: How the Millennial generation is shaking up the workplace*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Barron, L. (2003). Ask and you shall receive? Gender differences in negotiators' beliefs about request for a higher salary. *Human Relations, 56*, 635-662. doi: 10.1177/00187267030566001
- Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*, 1–44. doi: 10.1111/1529-1006.01431
- Bazerman, M. H., Magliozzi, T., & Neale, M. A. (1985). Integrative bargaining in a competitive market. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 34*, 294-313. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(85)90026-3
- Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of

narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 951-64.

doi:10.1177/0146167209335461

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004).

Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83, 29-45. doi:

10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Carnevale, P. J., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2005). Motive: The negotiator's raison d'être. In

L. L. Thompson (Ed.), *Negotiation theory and research* (pp. 55-76). New York,

NY: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

Carnevale, P. J., & Pruitt, D. G. (1992). Negotiation and mediation. *Annual Review of*

Psychology, 43, 531-582. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.43.020192.002531

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

academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized

responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101,

982-997. doi: 10.1037/a0016351

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

entitlement among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 169,

332-344. doi: 10.3200/GNTP.169.4.332-344

Coates, K. S., & Morrison, B. (2011). *Campus confidential: 100 startling things you*

don't know about Canadian universities. Toronto, Canada: James Lorimer &

Company Ltd.

Corbett, T. (2007). Getting the salary you deserve: An examination of the impact of

gender differences in entitlement on accepted salaries (Doctoral dissertation).

Retrieved from ABI/INFORM database. (UMI No. 3241781)

De Dreu, C. K. W., Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E., & Nauta, A. (2001). A theory-based measure of conflict management strategies in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22*, 645-668. doi:10.1002/job.107

De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010). Social conflict: The emergence and consequences of struggle and negotiation. In S.T. Fiske, D.T Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed.). New York: Wiley.

De Dreu, C. K. W., Weingart, L. R., & Kwon, S. (2000). Influence of social motives on integrative negotiation: A meta-analytical review and test of two theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 889-905. doi: 10.1037/AX122-3514.78.5.889

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of co-operation and competition. *Human Relations, 2*, 129-152. doi:10.1177/001872674900200204

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 291-300. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_11

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Finney, T. G. & Finney, R. Z. (2010). Are students customers of their universities? An exploratory study. *Education and Training, 52*, 276-291. doi: 10.1108/00400911011050954

Fisk, G. (2010). "I want it all and I want it now!" An examination of the etiology,

- expression, and escalation of excessive employee entitlement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 102-114. doi: 10.1014/j.hrmr.2009.11.001
- Foster, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2007). Are there such things as “narcissists” in social psychology? A taxometric analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 1321-1332. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.04.003
- Gentile, B., Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Birth cohort differences in self-esteem, 1988–2008: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 14, 261-268. doi: 10.1037/a0019919
- Glater, J. D. (2006, February 21). To: Professor@University.edu. Subject: Why It’s all about me. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/21/education/21professors.html?pagewanted=all>
- Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. P. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 1193-1204. doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9284-9
- Jayson, S. (2005, February 15). Yep, life’ll burst that self-esteem bubble. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/life/lifestyle/2005-02-15-self-esteem_x.htm
- 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, 105-29. doi:10.1177/0748175611400292

- Kramer, R. M., & Messick, D. M. (1995). *Negotiation as a social process*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47, 263-92. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1914185>
- Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 857-72. doi:10.1016/S0191-8860(03)00158-2
- Lippmann, S., Bulanda, R. E., & Wagenaar, T. C. (2009). Student entitlement: Issues and strategies for confronting entitlement in the classroom and beyond. *College Teaching*, 57, 197-204. doi: 10.1080/87567550903218596
- Miller, J. K., Farmer, K. P., Miller, D. J., & Peters, L. M. (2010). Panacea or snake oil? Interest-based bargaining in the U.S. airline and rail industries. *Negotiation Journal*, 26, 177-201. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2010.00268.x
- Neale, M. A., Huber, V. L., & Northcraft, G. B. (1987). The framing of negotiations: Contextual versus task frames. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39, 228-41. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(87)90039-2
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social attitudes* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993). *Negotiation in social conflict*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and*

settlement. New York, NY: Random House.

Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1988). A principle-components analysis of the Narcissistic

Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 890-902. doi: 10.1037/0022-

3514.54.5.890

Robins, R. W., & Beer, J. S. (2001). Positive illusions about the self: Short-term benefits

and long-term costs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 340-352.

doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.80.2.340

Roosevelt, M. (2009, February 17). Student expectations seen as causing grade disputes.

The New York Times. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/18/](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/18/education/18college.html)

[education/18college.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/18/education/18college.html)

Rousseau, D. M. (2005). *I-deals: Idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves*.

Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

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. doi:10.1007/s10755-010-9151-y

Stuhlmacher, A. F., Citera, M., & Willis, T. (2007). Gender differences in virtual

negotiation: Theory and research. *Sex Roles*, 57(5-6), 329-339. doi:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9252-y>

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2000). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston,

MA : Allyn & Bacon.

Thompson, L. (2005). *The mind and heart of the negotiator* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle

River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Tjosvold, D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1984). Influence strategy, perspective-taking, and relationships between high- and low-power individuals in cooperative and competitive contexts. *Journal of Psychology, 116*, 187-202. doi: 10.1080/00223980.1984.9923636
- Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation me*. New York: Free Press.
- Twenge, J. M. (2009). Generational changes and their impact in the classroom: Teaching Generation Me. *Medical Education, 43*, 398-405. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03310.x
- Twenge, J. M. & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Increases in positive self-views among high school students: Birth cohort changes in anticipated performance, self-satisfaction, self-liking, and self-competence. *Psychological Science, 19*, 1082-1086. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02204.x
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.
- Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008a). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 875-902. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494-2008.00507.x
- Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008b). Further evidence of an increase in narcissism among college students. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 919-927. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00509.x
- Zanor, C. (2010, November 29). A fate that narcissists will hate: Being ignored. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/30/>

[health/views/30mind.html](#)

Appendix A
Academic Entitlement Scale (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008)

Please respond to the following 15 items using the following 6-point scale:

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

Appendix B Vignettes

Each participant will be presented with one of the following scenarios.

Please read this scenario very carefully and answer the questions that follow. To the best of your ability, put **yourself** in the position of the person being described.

Scenario 1: High Power Distance, Low Stakes

You are now finishing your second semester of university and you're taking a course as part of your major. So far you've attended most of the scheduled lectures and have kept up with the assigned readings in the course. Your last written assignment is worth 50% of the final course grade. The professor has just finished grading the assignments. When you check your grade, you discover that you are 2% away from an A-. This news is particularly disappointing because it may have implications for the funding you receive for academic performance.

Specifically, if all of your grades this semester are not at LEAST an A-, you stand to lose one hundred dollars (\$100) of your funding for next year.

You know that the professor can change your grade but before deciding how to proceed, you read over the course syllabus and the professor's comments very carefully because you know that in order to get a grade change an exception might have to be made to accommodate your situation.

Scenario 2: High Power Distance, High stakes

You are now finishing your second semester of university and you're taking a course as part of your major. So far you've attended most of the scheduled lectures and have kept up with the assigned readings in the course. Your last written assignment is worth 50% of the final course grade. The professor has just finished grading the assignments. When you check your grade, you discover that you are 2% away from an A-. This news is particularly disappointing because it may have implications for the funding you receive for academic performance.

Specifically, if all of your grades this semester are not at LEAST an A-, you stand to lose one thousand dollars (\$1000).

You know that the professor can change your grade but before deciding how to proceed, you read over the course syllabus and the professor's comments very carefully because you know that in order to get a grade change an exception might have to be made to accommodate your situation.

Scenario 3: Low Power Distance, High Stakes

You are now finishing your second semester of university and you're taking a course as part of your major. So far you've attended most of the scheduled lectures and have kept

up with the assigned readings in the course. Your last written assignment is worth 50% of the final course grade. The teaching assistant (TA) has just finished grading the assignments. When you check your grade, you discover that you are 2% away from an A-. This news is particularly disappointing because it may have implications for the funding you receive for academic performance.

Specifically, if all of your grades this semester are not at LEAST an A-, you stand to lose one thousand dollars (\$1000).

You know that the TA can change your grade but before deciding how to proceed, you read over the course syllabus and the TA's comments very carefully because you know that in order to get a grade change an exception might have to be made to accommodate your situation.

Scenario 4: Low Power Distance, Low Stakes

You are now finishing your second semester of university and you're taking a course as part of your major. So far you've attended most of the scheduled lectures and have kept up with the assigned readings in the course. Your last written assignment is worth 50% of the final course grade. The teaching assistant (TA) has just finished grading the assignments. When you check your grade, you discover that you are 2% away from an A-. This news is particularly disappointing because it may have implications for the funding you receive for academic performance.

Specifically, if all of your grades this semester are not at LEAST an A-, you stand to lose one hundred dollars (\$100).

You know that the TA can change your grade but before deciding how to proceed, you read over the course syllabus and the TA's comments very carefully because you know that in order to get a grade change an exception might have to be made to accommodate your situation.

Appendix C
Inclination to Negotiate

To what extent would you be inclined to negotiate for a higher grade in response to the scenario you just read. Please circle one number ranging from 1=Not at all to 5=Very much.

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Not at all | | | | | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

Appendix D

DUTCH Test for Conflict Handling (De Dreu, Evers, Beerma, Kluwer, & Nauta, 2001)

Please rate the extent to which you would use the following strategies in response to the scenario you just read. Circle one number ranging from 1=Not at all to 5=Very much.

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Not at all | | | | | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

1. I would give in to the wishes of my professor [TA].
2. I would try to realize a middle of the road solution in the discussion with my professor [TA].
3. I would push my own point of view in the discussion with my professor [TA].
4. I would examine issues until I find a solution that really satisfies me and my professor [TA].
5. I would avoid confrontation with my professor [TA].
6. I would concur with my professor [TA].
7. I would emphasize that we have to find a compromise solution in the discussion with my professor [TA].
8. I would search for gains in the discussion with my professor [TA].
9. I would stand for my own and my professor's [TA's] gains and interests.
10. I would avoid differences of opinion as much as possible with my professor [TA].
11. I would try to accommodate my professor [TA].
12. I would insist we both give in a little in the discussion with my professor [TA].
13. I would fight for a good outcome for myself in the discussion with my professor [TA].
14. I would examine ideas from both sides to find a mutually optimal solution with my professor [TA].
15. I would try to make differences between myself and my professor [TA] loom less severe.
16. I would adapt to my professor's [TA's] goals and interests.
17. I would strive whenever possible towards a fifty-fifty compromise in the discussion with my professor [TA].
18. I would do everything to win in the discussion with my professor [TA].
19. I would work out a solution that serves my own as well as my professor's [TA's] interests as good as possible.
20. I would try to avoid confrontation with my professor [TA].

Appendix E
Manipulation Checks

- 1) In the scenario you have just read how much funding would potentially be lost if the grade was not raised?
 \$100
 \$1000
 Don't know

- 2) In the scenario you have just read who marked the assignment?
 Professor
 Teaching Assistant
 Don't know

If presented scenario included teaching assistant:

In the scenario you have just read did the teaching assistant have the authority to change grades? Yes No Don't know

- 3) Do you perceive a professor and a teaching assistant to have equal power?
 Yes No

- 4) Please explain why you [do not] perceive a professor and a teaching assistant to have equal power:

Appendix F
Past Experience

- 1) In **high school**, when I received a lower than expected grade, I would negotiate with my teacher for a better: (please choose one)

Not at all like me Exactly like me
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

- 2) In **university**, when I receive a lower than expected grade, I would negotiate for a better grade: (please choose one)

Not at all like me Exactly like me
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

If so, estimate the percentage of negotiations that you have had with teaching assistants

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| 0% | 21-30% | 51-60% | 81-90% |
| 1-10% | 31-40% | 61-70% | 91-100% |
| 11-20% | 41-50% | 71-80% | |

If so, estimate the percentage of negotiations that you have had with professors

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| 0% | 21-30% | 51-60% | 81-90% |
| 1-10% | 31-40% | 61-70% | 91-100% |
| 11-20% | 41-50% | 71-80% | |

Appendix G
Demographic Variables

- 1) Gender: ___Female ___Male
- 2) Age: _____
- 3) What is your year of study? (please choose one):
- a) 1st year
 - b) 2nd year
 - c) 3rd year
 - d) 4th year
- 4) **On average, how many hours per day do you spend studying outside of class time? (please choose one)**
- 0 hours
 - 1-5 hours
 - 6-10 hours
 - 11 hours or more
- 5) Estimate your current cumulative academic average/Grade Point Average (GPA): (please choose one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| A+ 90-100 (12) | B+ 77-79 (9) | C+ 67-69 (6) | D+ 57-59 (3) | F 0-49 (0) |
| A 85-89 (11) | B 73-76 (8) | C 63-66 (5) | D 53-56 (2) | |
| A- 80-84 (10) | B- 70-72 (7) | C- 60-62 (4) | D- 50-52 (1) | |
- 6) What was your academic average upon graduating **high school**? (please choose one)
- | | | | | |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| 90-100% | 77-79% | 67-69% | 57-59% | 0-49% |
| 85-89% | 73-76% | 63-66% | 53-56% | |
| 80-84% | 70-72% | 60-62% | 50-52% | |
- 7) How is your education financed? (please choose all that apply)
- Parents/guardians/relatives
 - Scholarships/grants/bursaries
 - Financial aid (loans)
 - Self-financed
- If you chose scholarships/grants/bursaries, what is the **total amount** of funding you receive? (please choose one)
- \$750 not renewable

\$1000 renewable over 4 years
\$2000 renewable over 4 years
\$3000 renewable over 4 years
\$4000 renewable over 4 years
\$5000 not renewable
_____ not renewable
_____ renewable over _ years

- 8) Are you the first person in your immediate family (parents and siblings) to attend university? ___ Yes ___ No
- 9) Which racial/ethnic group (if any) do you self-identify with? (please choose all that apply)

Caucasian
African/African-Canadian
Hispanic or Latino/a
Middle Eastern
East Asian
Southeast Asian
South Asian
I do not identify with a group
Mixed ethnicity
Other (please specify) _____

Appendix H

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding - Impression Management Subscale
Version 6 Form 40A (Paulhus, 1991)

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.

| Not True | | Somewhat True | | Very True |
|----------|---|---------------|---|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
22. I never cover up my mistakes.
23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
24. I never swear.
25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
30. I always declare everything at customs.
31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
39. I have some pretty awful habits.
40. I don't gossip about other people's business

Appendix I

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Use of Compromising Strategy

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | .04 | .000 | .851 |
| Stakes | 1 | .09 | .000 | .766 |
| AE | 2 | .27 | .003 | .765 |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | 2.91 | .016 | .090 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .16 | .002 | .849 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | 2.00 | .022 | .139 |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | .86 | .010 | .427 |
| Within group error | 169 | (4.50) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$

Appendix J

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Use of Yielding Strategy

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | .01 | .000 | .917 |
| Stakes | 1 | 2.46 | .013 | .118 |
| AE | 2 | 2.71 | .029 | .069 |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | .00 | .000 | .959 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .48 | .005 | .623 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | 2.13 | .023 | .123 |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | 1.31 | .014 | .272 |
| Within group error | 169 | (5.68) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$

Appendix K

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Use of Avoiding Strategy

| Source | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Power | 1 | .91 | .005 | .341 |
| Stakes | 1 | .125 | .000 | .724 |
| AE | 2 | 2.47 | .027 | .088 |
| Power x Stakes | 1 | .35 | .002 | .557 |
| Power x AE | 2 | .66 | .007 | .518 |
| Stakes x AE | 2 | 1.18 | .013 | .310 |
| AE x Stakes X Power | 2 | .28 | .003 | .756 |
| Within group error | 169 | (5.3) | | |

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. AE = Academic Entitlement.

* $p < .05$