ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT AND INCIVILITY: DIFFERENCES IN FACULTY
AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS

by

Jessie Kosorok Mellor

_____

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2011

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Jessie Kosorok Mellor entitled Academic Entitlement and Incivility: Differences in Faculty and Students' Perceptions and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____

Mary McCaslin   Date: 04/14/11

_____

Thomas L. Good   Date: 04/14/11

_____

Heidi Legg Burross   Date: 04/14/11

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____ Date: 04/14/11
Dissertation Director: Mary McCaslin

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Jessie Kosorok Mellor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous amazing people helped me complete this dissertation. I am indebted to my committee chair, Dr. Mary McCaslin. Her invaluable, patient guidance helped me through my entire graduate experience. I also thank Dr. Tom L. Good for his unwavering support and Dr. Heidi Legg Burross for her endless statistical expertise. I learned so much from all of your courses. I would also like to thank Dr. Sheri Bauman for her help with my outcome assessment preparation; her guidance was paramount in helping me prepare this manuscript as well. Thank you to Dr. Deb Levine-Donnerstein and Dr. Jessica Summers for their help with my outcome assessment analyses which laid the foundation for my current work. I would like to thank Toni Sollars for always keeping me on track. My fellow graduate students were also vital in helping me through graduate school. I would like to thank Ruby for being such a wonderful friend and colleague. Her insight, advice, and friendship have meant a great deal to me over the years. I also owe her endless gratitude for her amazing ability to analyze qualitative data, thank you! I would also like to thank Amanda, Carrie, Ida Rose, Francesca, Jennifer, Amy O, Amy S, Adrienne, Huaping, Lisa, Jaime, Alyson, Diley, and Val. I enjoyed working with you all.

I must also thank my amazing family. My husband, Michael, has supported me throughout my entire college experience. He pushed me when I did not want to work anymore, made sure I rested when I needed to, and kept me smiling and laughing through the entire ten year process! During that time we were blessed with our son, Gryphon, who has truly given me the greatest joy anyone could ever experience. I would also like to thank Dagg, who even in the very early hours of the morning, would always sit by me keeping me company while I wrote, studied, or graded. Thank you my boys, you are my world!

I would like to thank my mother for her unconditional love and guidance. I owe her for instilling my love for education. Thank you to my dad, Nicco, and Mimo for only being a phone call away and for the great advice and laughter. Thank you to my siblings for the constant encouragement, jokes, and long talks. Britt, Renee, and Ivan you always know how to cheer me up and I have learned some great life lessons from Linds, JJ, and numerous members of my husband's family. Thank you all.

Finally, thank you to my dearest friends, Betty, Mandy, Kelley, Lizzard, Gurlimon, and Anna. Near or far, you have always been there for me and my family. I love you all and I am so grateful and blessed to have such an amazing group of people in my life. Thank you.

DEDICATION

In light of the topic, this dissertation is dedicated to……….

ME!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *Continued*

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

This study examined differences in faculty and students' perspectives regarding the frequency, acceptability, and attributions for classroom incivilities and academic entitlement (AE). Nine behaviors commonly defined as incivility were measured and include: 1) sleeping in class, 2) inappropriate use of technology, 3) talking to other students during lecture, 4) leaving lecture without permission, 5) answering the phone during lecture, 6) displaying rude behavior, 7) expressing boredom, 8) expressing anger, and 9) confrontations regarding grades during class. A qualitative analysis of incivility and academic entitlement (AE) was also conducted. Examinations of both faculty and student perceptions of incivility have been reported; however, including faculty and student measures of both incivility and AE behaviors is a new addition to the literature. The sample included 31 faculty and 82 students from a Southwestern research-1 university. Both faculty and students agreed that on some level all nine incivilities were unacceptable. However, students were significantly less likely than faculty to say that inappropriate use of technology, talking during lecture, and leaving class without permission were unacceptable student behaviors. Reasons explaining why faculty and students believe the incivilities and AE behavior occurred are outlined. Implications for college policy are also discussed in light of the significant faculty and student differences in perception regarding what constitutes appropriate classroom behavior.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Thesis Statement

No two college students are alike. Some students choose to sit in the front of the room every class and are active listeners and/or participants. Other students come to class when they please and when they do attend, they are not active listeners but instead talk to other students, use their electronic devices inappropriately, and engage in other multitasking behaviors. No two faculty are alike. Some faculty are distracted by students who are not active listeners and use electronic devices inappropriately in their class. For some faculty, these behaviors are not distracting, or the faculty report the behaviors do not occur in their class. Some faculty engage in inappropriate classroom behaviors as well.

No two colleges are alike, yet all have an expected student code of conduct. Generally, the colleges' student code of conduct includes behaviors that are seen as problematic in the classroom and on campus. Most colleges do not allow alcohol or illicit substance consumption on campus. Most colleges have a plagiarism policy, what steps will be followed if a student is caught cheating in some way, and clearly outline the consequences for such behavior. Colleges also discuss unacceptable classroom behaviors that include sleeping in class and displaying rude or threatening behavior toward other students or faculty. With the advancement of technology, colleges have had to decide if certain forms of technology are seen as a disruption in the classroom and if so, to include

the misuse of various forms of technology in their student code of conduct. Even with individual variation seen among students, faculty, and college campuses, the student code of conduct is applicable to all who attend or work on the campus. Individual variation in perceptions of and attributions for various classroom behaviors can result in differences of opinion regarding what constitutes appropriate classroom behavior.

Statement of the Problem

A student walks into her community college classroom ten minutes late. The faculty member has already begun the day's lecture to just over sixty students enrolled Human Sexuality, a 200 level course offered by the Department of Psychology at a community college. The student stands in front of the podium and waits for the lecture to stop; her arms are crossed and she is rolling her eyes, tapping her foot, and sighing as if to be annoyed that the faculty member is teaching. During a natural pause in the lecture, the student leans toward the faculty member and whispers, "I just have a quick question for you before I need to leave." How should the faculty respond? This occurred in my lecture in spring of 2010 and I replied, "I just have a quick lecture to give then I can answer your quick question." The student's jaw dropped and she proceeded to walk up the aisle and sit in the back of the room. The student stayed for almost the entire lecture then left through the back door five minutes prior to the end of class. She never actually asked her question.

More recently, I had a student arrive to a Psychology of Gender class with approximately 30 enrolled students. Arriving late is a regular behavior for the student, but

on this occasion she also left 30 minutes early (her total class attendance time for the day was 15 minutes, for a 75 minute class). As she left, she came to the front of the room, directly blocked my view of the class while I was discussing chapter terminology, gave me a note, smiled, informed me she "didn't want to interrupt" but she had a "very serious appointment", and then she left. Her note included her name for "attendance reasons". Both of these examples, among countless others have always left me asking, "Why"?

Research on the topic of disruptive classroom behavior has found that disruptive behavior considerably affects the classroom environment (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004; Seidman, 2005; Twale & DeLuca, 2008). Disruptive student behaviors are most commonly experienced by young, female faculty (Goodyear, Reynolds, Gragg, 2010) and disruptive faculty behaviors are reported to be "more common than uncommon" (Boice, 1996a, p. 479). Disruptive student behaviors include interrupting class by talking while others are speaking, being tardy to or leaving early from class, and expressing sarcasm clearly directed at the faculty (Boice, 1996a). Additional behaviors include general disruption from students who sleep, misuse their technology, or display aggressive or threatening behaviors (Goodyear, et al., 2010).

Questioning the prevalence of these behaviors has been the focus of previous research; however, examining how both students and faculty view the same behavior is generally not the focus (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). This study will add to the current literature by including both faculty and student perspectives regarding the frequency and acceptability of commonly identified problematic behaviors as well as

attributions for why the behaviors occur. Further, this study will add to the literature by examining both incivilities and AE, which have previously been examined separately.

Terminology Definitions

Today's faculty positions have seen a rise in entitlement (Twenge, 2006; Ciani, Summers, Easter, 2008) and student incivility, especially young female faculty (Goodyear, et al., 2010). A definition of common terminology used when discussing entitlement behaviors and incivility in the classroom is provided here.

Academic Entitlement

Academic entitlement (AE) is defined as student who expects success without putting forth the effort to achieve their success (Chowning & Campbell, 2009). The AE definition mirrors literature on entitlement (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggua, 2008), a facet of narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The clinical definition of narcissism is a person's need for admiration, lack of empathy, a grandiose sense of importance, and a sense of entitlement (APA, 2000). The definition of entitlement as a facet of narcissism includes a person who feels they are more deserving than others (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The individual does not just desire something; instead the individual believes it *should* occur (Major, 1994). Individuals with normal levels of entitlement will feel frustrated or upset if something did not go their way; however, individuals with an inflated sense of entitlement will become angry when they do not experience what they *deserve* (Kelln, 1997).

Classroom behaviors that have been related to narcissism include behaviors that undermine faculty classroom authority (Twenge & Campbell, 2001; Twenge, 2006; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008). Specific behaviors include student comments or reactions to grading, lectures, and classroom materials (Goodyear et al., 2010). AE behaviors are thought to lead to uncivil classroom behaviors (Chowning & Campbell, 2009)

Incivility

The definition of incivility according to Webster's Dictionary includes being uncivil, rude, or discourteous. The following defines uncivil, rude or discourteous behaviors and outlines examples of when these behaviors occur. Both students and faculty can display incivility in the classroom (Bray & Del Favero, 2004); in fact faculty displays of incivility are thought to be "more common than uncommon" (Boice, 1996a, p. 479). Incivilities in higher education are not a new phenomenon in the United States. "Constant warfare raged between faculty and students…the most outrageous pranks and disturbances were provoked by undisciplined and incredibly bold young men" (Brubacher & Rudy, 1975, p. 50) for the first 200 years of higher education in our country.

During this era, faculty were in charge of policing student behavior and student behavior was controlled in various life domains including: "regulated-promptness, attendance at classes and prayers, dressing, idling, fishing, gunning, dancing, drinking, gambling, fighting, gaming, swearing" and so on (Brubacher & Rudy, 1975, p. 51). Students engaged in extreme rebellion, including riot behaviors in response to such

control over every aspect of their personal life while on campus, mirroring the larger political issues of the time, the demand for democratic process (Brubacher & Rudy, 1975 and cited in McKenne, 2008). More contemporary examples of student incivility have been researched. Today's problematic student behaviors differ from the rebellion and rioting reported in the early years following the development of higher education in the United States. The most common student incivilities reported today include inappropriate use of technology, students talking during class disrupting other students, and students disrupting faculty lectures while talking (McKenne, 2008). Faculty also engage in classroom incivilities (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004).

   Faculty incivilities. Faculty incivilities include "condescending negativism, inattentive planning, moral turpitude, particularistic grading, personal disregard, uncommunicated course detail, and uncooperative cynicism" that impact the classroom environment (Bray & Del Favero, 2004, p. 10, from Hirschy & Braxton, 2004). Hirshy and Braxton (2004) exemplified ways faculty foster classroom environment with their "pedagogical approach, preparation, and interventions" (p. 69). Easily approachable faculty with highly regarded discussion styles help create a positive classroom environment; however, student traits including their efficacy and if they feel they have supportive classmates have a greater impact on appropriate student classroom participation than faculty traits (Fassinger, 1995). Faculty incivility impacts student learning as well as their own teaching. For example, a faculty demonstration of discriminatory behavior or religious bigotry toward a student alters the learning environment and detracts from the course content. Further, a faculty with insufficient

course planning will not deliver course material in the same manner as a prepared faculty (Braxton & Bayer, 2004). Therefore, faculty incivilities are defined as any faculty mannerisms that have been shown to hinder classroom learning and fail to foster a positive classroom environment.

Student incivilities. Generally, any behaviors that hinder a "harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom" are seen as uncivil (Feldmann, 2001, p. 137). Goodyear et al. (2010) defined three levels of student incivility: 1) student disengagement, 2) general disruptive behavior, and 3) behaviors directed specifically at the instructor. Faculty defined student disengagement behaviors as texting in class, sleeping, and misusing Internet technology. Faculty defined generally disruptive behaviors as students talking to another classmate or answering their phone during lecture.

The most disruptive student behaviors were specifically directed at faculty and were categorized in two ways: equalizing power and angry/aggressive behaviors. Behaviors that equalized power between the student and faculty included negative or sarcastic comments about the faculty, expressions of entitlement and/or boredom, or sighing and/or rolling of eyes. Faculty identified angry and aggressive behavior as spitting on an exam book as it was returned, slamming books or doors, and angry responses to assignment and exam grades (Goodyear et al., 2010). Students' incivilities affect other students' learning opportunities as well as faculty classroom performance. For example, rude behaviors or disruptions from various technological devices were

identified as distracting to other students, diverting their attention from the learning

material. These behaviors were also reported to deter faculty from their role of teacher to

a role of disciplinarian (Braxton & Bayer, 2004).

Examining the perceived frequency of entitlement and uncivil classroom

behaviors from both the student and faculty perspective does not explain why students

and faculty believe the behaviors occur. Attribution theory is one framework in the field

of educational psychology used to explain why events occur (Weiner, 2000; 2005) and

the theory includes several underlying causal properties.

Attribution Theory

To date, attribution theory has been a central topic in motivation and educational

psychology research for over four decades (Weiner, 2000). The premise of attribution

theory is that humans are scientists that require an explanation for why things occur in

life, especially when the events do not happen in a way deemed as successful, particularly

when the event is perceived as personally important (Weiner, 1986; 2000; 2005). The

answer to the question is the causal attribution and research has found there are three

underlying causal properties (Weiner, 1986; 2000; 2005): locus, stability, and

controllability. Intentionality has been identified as another underlying causal property

(Rosenbaum, 1972; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981). The properties are further defined

below.

Locus. "Locus refers to the location of a cause, which is either within or outside of

the actor" (Weiner, 2000, p. 4); therefore, the actor can determine that an event occurred

(or did not occur) with an internal (within) or an external (outside) attribution. Generally, ability and effort are considered internal attributions. Task difficulty and the perceived luck of an event are considered external attributions (Weiner, 2000). For the purposes of this study, internal locus was defined as a student caring and external locus was defined as boring class material.

Stability. An event is considered stable if it is reoccurring or constant. Generally, it is thought that a person's aptitude is constant; however, a chance event is considered temporary and does not regularly occur. To determine the stability of the perceived uncivil or entitled behavior, stability was defined in two ways for the current study: 1) some students behave this way always and 2) everyone does this sometimes.

Controllability. If a person has the ability to impact an event, or if the event is subject to "volitional alteration" it is considered personally controllable. However, events that cannot be "willfully changed" are considered uncontrollable (Weiner, 2005, p. 76). For the purpose of this study, defining controllability included faculty and students' level of agreement with the statement "nothing seems to stop it" (it referring to the identified AE or uncivil behaviors for the survey item).

Intentionality. If the cause cannot be intentionally altered, it is considered uncontrollable because of the lack of free will (Weiner, 2000). Intentionality has also been defined as the probability of an individual behaving a certain way on purpose (Rosenbaum, 1973; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981). For the purposes of this study, intentionality was defined as an AE or uncivil behavior reported to have been performed

on purpose. Including an examination of attribution theory will hopefully answer why students engage in AE or incivilities in the classroom.

Differing Perceptions

Understanding various perceptions of classroom incivility has been previously attempted by measuring what students label as uncivil behaviors (Amada, 1994). When both student and faculty perceptions of uncivil behaviors were assessed, faculty reported that student immaturity and inattentive student behavior are most problematic and students were most upset when faculty exhibited poor communication and lacked empathy for the student (Appleby, 1990). Students and faculty both agreed that students talking during lecture, students confronting faculty with sarcasm, and emotional outbursts from one or two students during lecture make for a tense classroom environment (Boice, 1996a; 1996b). However, students and faculty do not always agree on their perceptions of uncivil classroom behavior (McKenne, 2008). For the purposes of this study, both student and faculty perceptions are defined as the frequency and perceived acceptability of nine behaviors commonly defined as problematic and their corresponding attributions for each of the nine behaviors. Both students and faculty were given the same instrument to measure their perceptions.

Policy

The idea that classroom incivility is related to failure to implement effective policy is not a new argument (Braxton & Mann, 2004; McKenne, 2008). Although policy can be implemented on various levels, including federal and state, this study will focus on

current policy implemented at the school level of intervention. However, the results will be discussed with potential implications for how well-implemented school level policy can inform policy at both the state and federal level.

Traditionally, college policy has focused on cheating and plagiarism as examples of inappropriate behavior and not included other student levels of incivility (Boice, 1996a; Braxton & Bayer, 2004; Bray & Del Favero, 2004). Historically, policy outlining appropriate student and faculty behaviors (i.e. foregoing any sexual relationships with each other) has also been documented more than other examples of student incivility (Bray & Del Favero, 2004). Some institutions even strictly outline what constitutes appropriate conduct for sexual relationships among students. Strict abstinence with the consequence of suspension if violated was a recent case for a high profile athlete (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/03/danica-mendivil-brandon-davies-girlfriend_n_831092.html). Some student incivilities have detrimental consequences to other students and faculty.

Recent college tragedies including the shootings at Virginia Tech and The University of Arizona College of Nursing have shocked the education community and prompted more recent research on the topic of incivility. Unfortunately, an enrolled community college student took his violent behavior off campus in Tucson, Arizona on January 8th, 2011. Although the shooting behavior is a more extreme behavior than the literature defining AE and classroom incivility, the argument that more serious problematic behaviors could be drowned out with the noise created by AE and general

classroom incivility is a possibility. For example, "teachers accustomed to working amid disorder suppose that little can be done to change it and do less to discourage the rudeness, violence, and demoralization that follow" (Boice, 1996a, p. 455 from Toby, 1993). The Tucson shooting prompted various community benefit concerts, a fund for community civility, and the university created a pamphlet outlining guidelines for faculty and staff on how to identify and manage disruptive and threatening student behavior in the classroom and on campus (deanofstudents.arizona.edu).

The six disruptive behaviors outlined in the pamphlet include: 1) being persistently tardy or leaving early, 2) talking incessantly while lecture is given, 3) a student who interrupts the flow of class, 4) belligerent behavior if their inappropriate behavior is confronted, 5) ringing cell phones or texting with their phone or online, and 6) unreasonable demands for time in and out of the classroom. The pamphlet was created just after the survey for the current study was approved; however, variations of all the behaviors listed in the pamphlet were measured with the current survey examining academic incivility in the classroom.

The literature reviewed here is focused on frequencies of academic incivility and entitlement as well as attributions for why the behaviors occur; however, examining if faculty and students agree on what defines inappropriate behavior has not usually been the focus with the exception of few designs (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). This study will add to the literature by focusing on how faculty and students perceive the frequency and severity of various disruptive behaviors and their corresponding attributions for the

behaviors. The discussion relates the current study's results of faculty and students' perceptions of and attributions for AE and incivility to current university policy with respect to disruptive behavior.

Research Questions

Historically, inappropriate student behaviors are nothing new on the college campus; however, rarely are both student and faculty perceptions about the frequency of the behaviors examined (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). Further, examining both incivility and AE is new to the literature. Specific questions addressed in the study are:

1. Do faculty and students report instances of student incivility and AE with the same frequency and severity?

2. Do students and faculty share similar attributions when given hypothetical incidents of student incivility and AE?

It is hypothesized that students and faculty will differ in their reports of instances and severity of AE and incivility with students reporting incivilities with more frequency (see McKenne, 2008) and faculty reporting the incivilities as more severe (Boice, 1996a). It is also hypothesized that young female faculty will report more levels of student incivility and AE (see Goodyear et al., 2010). This study design is new to the literature. Achacoso (2006) examined the relationship between student's levels of entitlement and their attributions for entitlement behaviors, but had no measures of incivility. She found higher levels of entitlement beliefs were related to external attributions and lower levels

of entitlement beliefs were related to internal attributions for the behaviors. Mckenne (2008) examined incivilities, but not AE. Results indicated that faculty and students disagree on the frequency of incivilities with students reporting higher frequencies.

Because both students and faculty will be asked their perceptions regarding attributions for why *specific* classroom incivilities and AE occur, there is scant literature available to form a hypothesis for expected attributions. However, based on the few studies similar in nature, it is hypothesized that student incivilities and AE behaviors will be attributed to internal student attributions (student not caring, lazy) for both students and faculty.

Overview of the Research Project

Chapter two reviews the literature on AE, including literature on narcissism and the entitlement facet of narcissism. The origins of incivility are reviewed from a sociological explanation paradigm and results from the examination of both student and faculty incivilities in the classroom are outlined. Attribution theory is further discussed with respect to AE and the research relating motivation and AE behaviors. Research that examined student and faculty perceptions of both the frequency and acceptability are also reviewed. Chapter three discusses the approval process for the current study, the participants, the materials and procedures implemented including all instruments and modality of data collection. Chapter four presents the results of the current research. Both a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data are reported. Chapter five discusses the implications for the research with respect to faculty and student perceptions, how the data

can be used to inform policy, and what is recommended to enhance the overall classroom

experience for both faculty and students.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Research has found that both entitlement behaviors and incivility have a great impact on the classroom environment (Hirshy & Braxton, 2004). Academic entitlement and incivility have been linked with increased classroom distraction for both faculty and students (Braxton & Bayer, 2004). Although examining both AE and incivility from a faculty and student perspective has been researched with respect to attributions for the behaviors (Achacoso, 2006); rarely are both faculty and student perspectives examined simultaneously (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). This is the first study to examine both incivility and AE congruently. Understanding AE, incivility and the different faculty and student perspectives of and attributions for each is crucial to implementing a research design that will add to our current knowledge of the relationship between these variables.

Academic Entitlement

AE occurs when a student expects success without putting for the effort to achieve the success (Chowning & Campbell, 2009). This mirrors literature on entitlement, a facet of narcissism that states that individuals who rank high in overall levels of narcissism can also be ranked on their subscale score of entitlement; highly entitled individuals think they are more *deserving* than others (Raskin & Terry, 1989). Psychoanalytic theorists such as Freud (1914) and Kohut (1966) felt that narcissism

occurred when an individual had not developed their ego properly and therefore lacked the ability to empathize with other individuals.

Narcissism

Early life experiences including exposure to various parenting styles were thought to lead to narcissistic behaviors (Freud, 1914; Kohut, 1966). For example, children who experienced permissive parenting styles, or parental behaviors that tend to cater to the child and overlook obnoxious behavior, were reported to express "immature grandiosity", or behaviors related to narcissism such as being greedy, demanding, and inconsiderate (Watson, Little, & Biderman, 1992).

Some researchers, however, argue that narcissistic tendencies are not syndromes or a result of life experience, but rather a personality trait inherent within that involves various attributes of leadership, authority, self-admiration, self-absorption, superiority/arrogance, and exploitiveness/entitlement (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Hall; 1979). Researchers who adhere to the trait definition of narcissism argue that individuals displaying these characteristics have little to no regard for others and because of their high self-esteem are not as sensitive to criticism. This is referred to as overt narcissism (Wink, 1991).

Overt narcissism is most commonly measured using the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI is reported to be the most widely used and well-validated measure of narcissism (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI includes subscales that measure different facets of narcissism including

authority (i.e. seeks power), exhibitionism (i.e. seeks attention), superiority (i.e. feels better than others), entitlement (i.e. more deserving in comparison to others), exploitiveness (i.e. use others for own benefit), self-sufficiency (i.e. no need to rely on others), and vanity (i.e. arrogance). When describing the rates of narcissism among the general population, it is reported that the levels are lower in older participants, males are reportedly more narcissistic than females, and individuals from more individualistic societies (such as the United States) are more narcissistic than those in collective cultures (Foster, Campbell, and Twenge, 2003). It is also noted that there is no relative cut-off score that determines narcissism when examining the 40-item NPI (J.D. Foster, personal communication, January 13, 2010). Although no clear cut-off has been established, there are popular claims that young students enrolled in college today are highly narcissistic and entitled (Twenge, 2006).

Twenge (2006) reported that students enrolled in college during 2004-2006 were "the most narcissistic group of all" (p. 70) based on her and her colleagues' findings which examined 84 samples of college students who took the NPI between 1979 and 2006. Overall, their meta-analysis found that NPI scores have increased by one-third of a standard deviation, suggesting that almost two-thirds of the NPI scores from recent college students are 30% higher than the mean NPI scores from 1979-1985 (Twenge et al., 2008).

Twenge (2006) related the increase in narcissism found in her sample of college students to several social problems including lack of work ethic and high expectations for

salary and mobility within the corporation. She reported that a sense of entitlement has

lead college students to feel that they are deserving of the higher salaries and corner

offices right out of college and while in college, they are deserving of higher grades just

for showing up for class, not necessarily because they worked hard for a high grade.

Further, she noted that tragic occurrences of school violence, such as the tragedy at

Columbine High School in 1999 can be related to individuals who feel underappreciated

by their peers, but their 'self view' is that they are special and better than others;

therefore, they needed to get even to prove their worth.

Much of the reasoning behind the reports of inflated entitlement and narcissism

are attributed to the self esteem movement of the 1980s and 1990s in the United States

(Twenge, 2006). Although Twenge and her colleagues have had several publications on

the topic of narcissism and entitlement, (Twenge, 2000; Foster et al., 2003; Twenge,

2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2001; Twenge, et al., 2008) not all researchers are in

agreement with their interpretations.

Trzesniewski, Donnellan, and Robins (2008) were interested in gaining a better

understanding of the reported increases in narcissism and the hype surrounding the topic.

They noted the limitations with sampling procedures found in Twenge et al. (2008)

reporting that small samples subject to selection biases were used in the meta-analysis.

Trzesniewski et al. (2008) replicated the study with what they reported to be a more

nationally representative sample with data drawn from mass testing sessions of

introductory psychology students between 1996 and 2002. They reported no significant

increases in NPI means. Trzensniewski et al. (2008) focused on effect sizes rather than significance levels and compared data from current college students to that of Raskin and Terry's (1988) original NPI data and found no evidence for an increase in overall NPI scores or subscale scores; however, scores on three subscales (entitlement, exploitiveness, and self-sufficiency) increased slightly, but were non-significant increases. They reported the difference in results compared to Twenge et al. (2008) can be attributed to sampling procedures as well as analysis techniques. Trzensniewski et al. (2008) reportedly used larger more nationally representative samples and examined the full NPI scale, as well as the facet levels unlike Twenge et al. (2008) who reportedly used smaller, less representative samples and summary statistics from meta-analytic results based on aggregated data.

Mellor (2009a) also did not find a significant difference in total levels of narcissism among currently enrolled college students for the 2009-2010 academic year. Overall rates of narcissism, $M = 15.6$, $SD = 6.2$, ($n = 99$), were similar in comparison to previous research findings examining college students with no significant differences in age or race due to lack of participant variability. Foster et al. (2003) found White ($M = 14.8$, $SD = 6.8$, $n = 2564$) and Asian participants ($M = 14.9$, $SD = 6.5$, $n = 237$) were slightly less narcissistic ($p < .05$) than both Black ($M = 16.7$, $SD = 6.5$, $n = 222$) and Hispanic participants ($M = 16.5$, $SD = 6.4$, $n = 230$), but the differences were not significant.

The entitlement facet of overt narcissism has received attention from researchers interested in examining the prevalence of entitlement among college students (Twenge, 2000; Foster et al., 2003; Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2001; Twenge, et al., 2008; Trzienenski, et al, 2008).

Entitlement. Freud's (1914) examination of the ego as undeveloped and resulting in narcissism was taken further to explain the entitlement facet of narcissism as a result of parenting received as a child (in Dorn, 1988). Indulgent parenting (catering to the child's every demand and want, well beyond ensuring basic needs are met) as well as permissive parenting (allowing the child to behave inappropriately without consequence for the inappropriate behavior), create the sense of entitlement (inflated sense of being more *deserving* than others). The development of entitlement has also been reported to be a result of a successful completion of the Oedipal complex encountered in Freud's phallic stage of psychosexual development (Speigel, 1987). Further, entitlement can either be expressed as restrictive (an individual does not feel they are deserving of help or resources) or exaggerated (an individual feels they are completely deserving of all resources and special treatment available) (Volkan & Rogers, 1988). Entitlement behaviors tend to be more extreme among the clinical population when compared to the nonclinical population. Clinical population behaviors include irrational thoughts and angry outbursts when desires are not met, an inflated sense of self-importance, and a belief that what is desired should be obtained without effort because it is *deserved* (Kerr, 1985). The latter is similar to the definition of Academic Entitlement (AE) and can be

seen in the classroom when a student expects classroom success without needing to put forth any effort to achieve that classroom success (Chowning & Campbell, 2009).

Mellor (2009a) used the NPI to measure narcissism as well as the entitlement facet of narcissism. The full scale reliability of the NPI reported in Mellor (2009a) was .81, comparable to that of previous research (Raskin & Terry, 1988; Emmons, 1987). Mellor (2009a) also conducted a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using EQS software (Bentler, 1993) to validate the seven scales on the NPI. All factor loadings were significant at $p < .001$, and the corresponding fit statistics were as follows: χ^2 (719) = 107.18, $p < .001$; CFI = .54; NNFI = .50; RMSEA = .07. These fit statistics did not meet the standards of good fit described by Hu and Bentler (1999) suggesting the seven subscales widely reported in the literature do not necessarily fit the model proposed for the CFA. Further, only one of the six entitlement statements appropriately loaded on the entitlement factor of the NPI.

Given the evidence of a substantial rise in the number of students who harass their professors over their grades and their expectations of professors to accommodate their needs, regardless of the quality of work (Greenberger, et al., 2008), it is hard to discount the fact that entitlement behaviors are prevalent among college campuses. However, based on Mellor (2009a) it could be argued that the entitlement behaviors witnessed in the classroom are not well measured using the NPI because the behavior varies from the clinical trait definition of narcissism that has been studied recently. The latter has been identified in the literature as academic entitlement (AE). Although the construct is

different than narcissism, AE has been reported to have a moderate overlap with measures of entitlement and narcissism as measured by the NPI (Greenberger et al., 2008; Mellor, 2009a). A better understanding of college students' sense of entitlement could be explained with further exploration of AE to determine the prevalence among the college population. The AE literature also recommends that future AE research examine teacher perceptions of student's reported entitled behaviors (Greenberger et al., 2008) and examine how race and gender impact academic outcomes with respect to entitlement (Ciani, et al., 2008). According to Chowning and Campbell (2009), AE occurs when a student expects academic success without actually being personally responsible for the success and student incivility is thought to be a result from AE behaviors (Chowning & Campbell, 2009).

Incivility

Hirschy and Braxton (2004) cite several definitions classifying various forms of student incivility. They include Feldmann's (2001) definition of classroom incivilities as behaviors that hinder a "harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom" (p. 137). They also include Boice's (1996a) work suggesting that the incivilities often appear in the first few days of class but any semester events can alter the frequency of the incivility's occurrence. For example, after observing many classes over the course of the entire semester, Boice (1996a) reported that classroom incivility is set early in the semester as skeptical students test their teachers. If the teacher displays low self-esteem or fails to respond, the incivility becomes exacerbated and students increase

their levels of incivility, continually testing the teacher's limits. According to Boice (1996a) behaviors defined as uncivil include talking loudly when others are speaking, tardiness or leaving early to or from class, and sarcasm clearly aimed at the faculty.

Bray and Del Favero (2004) clearly state that classroom incivilities are not unidirectional, but rather faculty can also display classroom incivilities. Bray and Del Favero (2004) reviewed sociological explanations for the incivilities both students and faculty display. The sociological explanations outlined below are from Bray and Del Favero's (2004) review and include social control theory, deterrence theory, rational choice theory, anomie, social exchange theory, and social bond theory.

Sociological Explanations

Social control theory focuses on what prevents deviant behavior from occurring even if the behavior has personal appeal to an individual (Hirshi, 1969). In the classroom setting, this may be a faculty member who focuses more on their research responsibilities rather than improving their lesson plans and lectures (Bray & Del Favero, 2004). Historically, faculty members have been rewarded in their career (mainly with tenure status) based on their research expertise, publications, and notoriety not their pedagogy. According to social control theory, incivility occurs because faculty are focusing on their own research gains, not creating a classroom environment that prevents or easily distinguishes uncivil behavior.

Deterrence theory includes the idea that individuals consider the probability and how severe a punishment might be if they engage in the uncivil behavior (Akers, 1997).

An example used by Bray and Del Favero (2004) was a student who cheats in class. The reward of a better grade is possible and if the student holds the perception that they will not get caught and there is little consequence even if they do get caught, they are more likely to engage in the cheating behavior. According to deterrence theory, incivilities are prominent when the perceived punishment is negligible (Bray & Del Favero, 2004; Michaels & Miethe, 1989).

Rational choice theory is like a blend of deterrence and social control theory. The theory considers why people avoid inappropriate behavior and similar to deterrence theory, it considers the punishment for being caught behaving negatively; however, it also adds the potential rewards for the negative behavior (Akers, 1997). An example of the latter is given by Bray and Del Favero (2004). They describe a student who just wants ten more minutes of sleep. The student may feel that sleeping a little longer and being a few minutes late to class really is more rewarding than getting less sleep but being on time. Therefore, according to rational choice theory, incivilities occur because the behavior is actually perceived by the student as more beneficial.

According to Durkheim (1951), anomie occurs when society has a sense of normlessness, or people feel that there are less commonalities between them and others in their society (as cited in Bray & Del Favero, 2004). In essence, the norms of society really created a sense of strain because not everyone in the society will live up to the norms set. Therefore, "student behaviors of insolent inattention and disrespectful disruption…result directly from students feeling removed from the educational franchise"

(Bray & Del Favero, 2004, p. 13). According to Merton (1938), students with lower socioeconomic status would be more likely to display incivility in the classroom.

Social disorganization, similar to anomie, says that it is more a rapid change in society that shifts the behavioral patterns considered normal in society and that is the result of changed behaviors (Akers, 1997). Therefore, if societal norms deem self exploration appropriate (much like the college norm), failing to do so may affect students' classroom attention and instead lead to classroom incivility. "Student apathy and disinterestedness can yield tardiness, sarcasm toward professors who cannot seem to relate, cheating just to get the grade, or outright withdrawal" (Bray & Del Favero, 2004, p. 14).

A crucial point made by Bray and Del Favero (2004) is that both faculty and students can display incivilities. The incivilities can occur because of mutuality among those participating in a social interaction. Social exchange theory is concerned with an individual's decision-making process and according to White and Klein (2002), the individual's decision-process involves a ratio of costs and rewards and the individual will usually make a decision based on maximizing their rewards in a particular situation. In order for an individual to examine the ratio of costs and rewards, the individual is assumed to be rational and the situation is assumed to be salient. The individual is then left with comparing various scenarios to determine how to maximize their reward. The comparisons made can be two fold. The first is the comparison level (CL) of yourself to others in your similar situation. The second is the comparison level alternative (CL_{alt}) or

comparing your current situation to others in an alternative situation (White & Klein, 2002).

In the classroom, "this theory suggests that learning, both in and outside the classroom, is a process of exchange among class participants…mainly faculty and students" (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004, p. 14). They key aspect of the exchange involves the mutuality in the relationship. When mutuality is lacking, the relationship cannot remain strong. For example, faculty honor good student performance with good grades. That same faculty may also hold the assumption that the student will give a good teacher evaluation in exchange for their good teaching (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004). If the exchange is not honored wherein both parties can profit, it could stifle or end the relationship; however, if the relationship is not able to be terminated, hostile or uncivil behavior can arise as a consequence (Homans, 1975).

Classroom incivilities can also occur or be prevented when individuals experience a bond or unity as explained in social bond theory, almost the opposite of anomie theory (Hirshi, 1969). If the unity is towards a group unlikely to engage in deviant behavior, the behavior can be prevented and vice versa. The individual must have a sense of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief to that group, however. In the classroom, if a student feels committed to a group of students that endorse cheating, arriving late and leaving early, and other inappropriate classroom behaviors, it may increase the likelihood of that student conforming to the group norms (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004). When discussed in reference to cheating, the behavior will be deterred if

the student's attachment is to that of a peer group that is law abiding. Commitment is how much a student feels devoted to their particular group; therefore, cheating can also be deterred if it is not dictated as appropriate behavior by that group. How engaged a student is with a group's common activities defines their level of involvement. Cheating can be avoided if a student is involved with a group where cheating is not the norm. Finally, a student's belief is their understanding that their behavior is indeed an acceptable behavior for their group. If the student truly believes that cheating is not an appropriate behavior based on their peer group norms, it can also be deterred. The opposite is true for other incivilities and according to social bond theory, these incivilities will become prevalent in the classroom if the unity or bond to prevent inappropriate behavior is lacking (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004).

Classroom Incivilities

Classroom incivilities are reported to be "more common than uncommon", particularly faculty displays of classroom incivility (Boice, 1996a, p. 479). Various uncivil behaviors have been identified in the research and include sleeping, talking during lecture, leaving class early without permission, misuse of technology, angry behaviors from students directed at other students or faculty, and confronting a faculty about a grade (Goodyear et al., 2010). Other research has presented even longer lists of classroom incivilities. Nilson and Jackson (2004) reviewed research conducted by Indiana University (2000) who identified over twenty classroom incivilities:

"1) arriving late to class; 2) noisily packing up early; 3) leaving early; 4) talking in class; 5) coming to class unprepared; 6) repeating questions; 7) eating in class; 8) acting bored or apathetic; 9) groaning disapprovingly; 10) making sarcastic remarks or gestures; 11) sleeping in class; 12) inattention; 13) not answering a direct question; 14) using a computer in class for nonclass purposes; 15) letting cell phones and pagers go off; 16) cutting class habitually; 17) dominating discussion; 18) demanding make-up exams, extensions, grade changes, or other special favors; 19) taunting or belittling other students; 20) challenging the instructor's knowledge or credibility; 21) making harassing, hostile, or vulgar comments to the instructor in or out of class; 22) sending the instructor inappropriate emails; and 23) making threats of physical harm to the instructor" (Nilson & Jackson, 2004, p. 3).

These behaviors are generally identified as student incivilities, but both faculty and students can behave in uncivil ways (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004). Research has found that in some universities almost one third of faculty mistreat students in an uncivil manner that ranges from verbal or physical assault as well as using their power as faculty to coerce sexual favors (Boice, 1996a). The following outlines research that has identified both faculty and student incivilities and given examples for how to prevent and react to the incivilities. Unfortunately in the field of higher education, research on the topic of classroom incivilities is generally considered lacking (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). This has been attributed to the 'taboo' topic of classroom incivilities because admitting

these behaviors occur also admits there is a problem. The problem then becomes construed as faculty or institution incompetence and rather than address the issue and deal with any embarrassments, it has been reported that institutions have intentionally withheld publications on the topic when the research on classroom incivility was done on their campus (Boice, 1996a).

Faculty incivilities. Student interpretation of their faculty's ability to implement prosocial behaviors and immediacy has been shown to have great impact on the presence or absence of classroom incivilities (Kearny & Plax, 1992). Faculty prosocial behaviors include comments of encouragement and ensuring student understanding of course content. Faculty immediacy is referred to as both verbal and nonverbal cues of "warmth, friendliness, and liking". Examples of warm nonverbal behaviors include smiling, eye contact, and leaning forward during conversation. When faculty do not display prosocial behaviors and immediacy, they are perceived as "cold, uncaring, and incompetent by their students" (Boice, 1996a, p. 458, from Kearny & Plax, 1992). Kearny & Plax collected this data from laboratory simulations where they coded student and faculty interactions.

Additional research on immediacy has found that teachers who humiliate students when they ask questions are perceived as arrogant and uncaring (Boice, 1996a; McKenne, 2008). However, teachers who are perceived as lacking the interpersonal ability of immediacy can make improvements if they are cognizant they lack immediacy (Boice, 1996a). According to Boice, it is more of a personal style that teachers radiate, not necessarily their teaching experience that is related to their interpersonal student

interactions. Even though faculty incivilities are reported as prevalent (Boice, 1996a), student incivilities as well as mutual behaviors between faculty and students also impact the classroom environment (McKenne, 2008).

Student incivilities. Common incivilities performed by students identified in the literature included talking during lecture, confronting their teachers, being sarcastic, rude, groaning, and using technology for purposes other than class (Boice, 1996a; Feldmann, 2001; McKenne, 2008). These behaviors have been identified as annoying and frustrating to both faculty and other students in the class (Boice, 1996a) and students have reported these behaviors with more frequency when compared with faculty reports (McKenne, 2008). However, other student identified incivilities have been confirmed as less visible in the classroom (Boice, 1996a). Faculty reported being hurt by anonymous student comments on their evaluations ("she dresses badly") and cuing in on nonverbal student communication during lecture ("he just sits there, arms folded, glaring at me, shaking his head in disapproval") (p. 473). The latter two examples were identified by Boice as being "uncommonly traumatic" for faculty who experienced them (p. 473).

Some of the theories used to explain the origins of AE and incivility actually contradict each other, take for example the social bond and anomie theories. Explaining phenomenon from a lens that is contradictory is difficult; however, understanding the overlap between various sociological explanations for why incivilities occur is important. Another theory that explains why behaviors occur is attribution theory. Creating an explanation for why things happen helps us deal with life's complications (Graham & Weiner, 1996) and research has established a connection between attributions and

academic variables, including AE which can lead to classroom incivility (Achocoso, 2006). The following will discuss attribution theory. Because the sociological explanations for incivility are regarded as logical explanations (Bray & Del Favaro, 2004), they will be addressed in the discussion section in relation to the attributions given in this sample for why classroom incivilities and AE behaviors occurred.

Attribution Theory

Attributions for behavior occur because humans are decision makers. Ultimately, we are little scientists who wander around asking "why" (Weiner, 2000; 2005). Why did a student think it was acceptable to interrupt my class ten minutes into lecture? Why did a student think she should just attend class for 15 minutes after arriving late and then leaving early? And WHY did she interrupt my lecture to give me a note?

Underlying Causal Properties

To explain why events occur, the attribution process involves defining the dimensions of causality. These can include environmental factors such as social norms or personal factors such as prior knowledge or individual difference. From there, the perceived causes will determine the causal dimension of the event. The perceived causes can include the individual's luck, mood, teacher, task difficulty, among others. Depending on the perceived cause, it is categorized in three dimensions of causality: locus, stability, control. Locus refers to if the perceived cause is internal (within the individual) or external (outside the individual). A statement such as, "I am a sickly

person" would be perceived as internal; whereas, a statement such as "The flu bug got me" would be external (Weiner, 1979).

The stability dimension is stable if the event is reoccurring; however, if the event does not regularly occur, it is considered unstable. Ability and typical effort are classified here with ability and typical effort regarded as relatively fixed or stable. A person's general ability for math or the effort they generally expend on various tasks are usually similar from day to day. However, a person's mood and or immediate effort are regarded as unstable as mood can be a temporary state and the immediate effort expended for a dissertation proposal might change from day to day given other life obligations. A person can augment their effort expenditure depending on the task at hand, thus making immediate effort expenditure unstable (Weiner, 1979).

How much perceived control determines the controllability dimension of causality (Weiner, 1979, 1986, 1992). Winning the lottery would be deemed as an external, unstable, uncontrollable event or else we would all be very rich! However, failing an exam could be attributed to external (difficult teacher), unstable (not the norm behavior for the student), and uncontrollable (just unlucky on that exam) for a particular student. In reality, they may not have studied at all (internal), fail exams regularly and not acknowledge the behavior (stable), and not take any steps to improving their performance (controllable). Causes of successes and failures in relation to locus, stability, and controllability are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1

Causes of Successes and Failure According to Locus, Stability, and Controllability

Controllability	Internal		External	
	Stable	Unstable	Stable	Unstable
Uncontrollable	Ability	Mood	Task difficulty	Luck
Controllable	Typical effort	Immediate effort	Teacher bias	Unusual help from others

Table from Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation from some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*(1), p 3- 25.

Figure 1depicts a more updated explanation for intrepersonal attributions for motivation (Weiner, 2000; 2005). The intrapersonal attributions are considered to change depending on how an observer perceives the actor's ability to control the event. For example, when an individual (the actor) is faced with an event such as failing an exam, the underlying causal properties to explain why that event occurred can be internal or external, controllable or uncontrollable. However, an observer's interpretation of the actor's responsibility is what impacts how the observer will respond to the actor.

Event	Cause/Type	Responsibility Antecendent			Behavioral Reaction
Achievement failure	Lack of effort	Causal controllability			Reprimand
Stigmatizing condition	Behavioral/ mental	Causal controllability			Condemnation
Need for help	Drinking; lack of effort	Causal controllability	Responsible → Anger		Neglect
Aggressive act of another		Intentional			Retaliation

Event	Cause/Type	Responsibility Antecendent			Behavioral Reaction
Achievement failure	Lack of aptitude	Causal uncontrollability			Withhold reprimand
Stigmatizing condition	Somatic	Causal uncontrollability	Not Responsible → Sympathy		No Condemnation
Need for help	Illness; Low ability	Causal uncontrollability			Help
Aggressive another		Unintentional			No Retaliation

Figure 1   An Attributional Theory of Interpersonal Motivation

     Weiner (2000) used the analogy of a judge in a courtroom to further explain

Figure 1. The judge (observer) determines the guilt or innocence of the accused (actor)

and passes his/her sentence, in this case a moral conclusion about an individual.

Extrapolated to the classroom, this would mirror students and faculty judging each other's

behavior and acting according to those judgments. With respect to incivilities, if a student

shows aggressive behavior and the faculty attributes the aggression as intentional (controllable) on the student's part, the faculty will react with anger and retaliation, perpetuating both student and faculty incivilities.

Intentionality has been included separate from controllability in some attribution models (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1972). Intentionality as defined earlier is the understanding that a person behaved in a certain manner on purpose. Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) used the example of a person behaving in a certain way because he was mad; whereas, if the behavior was unintentional, the person may have behaved in that way because they were misinformed or just trying to help. Weiner (2000) stated there are only three underlying dimensions of causality; however, because others have included intentionality as a separate underlying dimension in their work (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Rosenbaum, 1972), an intentionality measure was included in the current study to determine any correlations among the dimensions to add to the attribution theory literature.

Attributions for entitlement. Achacoso's (2002) work was designed to examine how self regulation in the classroom and motivation are related to academic entitled behaviors exhibited by students. She created a valid measure of AE (also confirmed in Ciani, et al., 2008) and examined the relationship between AE and attributions. Achacoso (2006) found that when students ($n = 312$) held an external attribution regarding their academic performance, they were more likely to harbor entitlement beliefs ($r = .43$) and entitlement actions ($r = .29$). Students' internal attributions for academic performance

were negatively correlated with entitlement beliefs ($r = -.12$) and entitlement actions ($r = -.18$). Although attributions for AE have been researched, attribution theory as it relates to incivility has yet to be examined.

A limitation to interpreting the relationship between AE and causal attributions with this study was noted by Achacoso (2006). We are still unaware if entitlement is being measured or if students are behaving in a way that looks like entitlement but rather is just a legitimate concern about a grade. Further, faculty and students may differ on their perceptions regarding AE and uncivil behaviors. Therefore, taking individual perception into account is important when discussing classroom incivilities (Alexander-Snow, 2004).

Differing Perceptions

Overview

A student is waiting in a classroom, their first day of class is about to commence. The faculty walks in, seems frazzled, technology does not work properly, several students walk in late, and leave early, and the syllabus was poorly reviewed. Would the student's perception of the faculty change if only the faculty's gender or ethnicity were changed?

The short answer to the question is yes, "cultural perceptions are defined by stereotypes and social power" (Alexander-Snow, 2004, p. 24). Perceptions can change because of gender and ethnicity and give people different behavioral expectations because of how they perceive an individual based on their gender or ethnicity (Aries,

1996). Student incivility literature "embodies the cultural orientations of a white male" (Alexander-Snow, 2004, p. 25 in reference to Boice, 1996a). Ultimately, "the class dynamics and cultural baggage students carry with them will determine the intensity of the classroom incivility that female faculty and faculty of color experience." (Alexander-Snow, 2004, p. 28). According to Alexander-Snow (2004), the idea presented by Boice (1996a) that increasing teacher immediacy will limit incivility is "too simplistic" (p. 22). Cultural perceptions and social power need to be addressed as well. "Who we are, what we desire, and how we view ourselves and others are shaped by the explicit and implicit cultural messages we learn through sustained social discourse" (p. 24). Alexander-Snow would interpret the teacher's uncommon traumatic experience of the male student who glared at her with his arms crossed during lecture as related to his upbringing; he may have been told that women do not belong in higher education, especially at the faculty level. Do faculty and students hold similar perceptions regarding classroom incivilities?

Attribution theory can be used to explain why faculty and student perceive AE and incivility occur in the classroom. However, continuing to explore differences and similarities in faculty and student perceptions regarding frequency and acceptability for AE and classroom incivility should also be examined.

Faculty and Student Perceptions of Incivility in the Classroom

McKenne (2008) examined $n = 197$ students and $n = 52$ faculty perceptions regarding frequency and severity of classroom incivilities. Although his theoretical background including immediacy and choice theory differ from the theoretical

background of the current study; his examination of both faculty and student perceptions is highly related. Using a computer for purposes other than the class was one of the only behaviors faculty identified as more representative of classroom incivility when compared to students. Further, students in his study reported incivilities such as groaning, sarcasm aimed at faculty, students talking during lecture, and inappropriate use of technology occurred with greater frequency than what faculty reported.

McKenne (2008) also collected qualitative data to compliment the survey results. Students indicated that if faculty demand respect in the classroom, respect will occur; however, faculty who are too friendly will be walked all over. Students felt that teachers are responsible for setting the tone of the class and if teachers lack respect, the class will not engage in respectful behaviors either. Faculty felt they should include clear student expectations to avoid any classroom incivilities. Ultimately, both students and faculty felt that classroom civility was a mutual responsibility on the part of both students and faculty.

Conclusion

This study was designed to measure students' and faculties' perceptions of and attributions for both academic entitlement and incivility. Students and faculty were asked to describe any experiences they have had with student incivility or entitlement in their classrooms and if the incidents have affected them personally and their class as a whole.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Study Approval

This study was originated by the author in the fall of 2010. Institution approval was granted in January of 2011 from one of the two institutions who received applications to conduct research on human subjects. Online data recruitment and collection methods were employed. The human subject's approved disclosure form for both faculty and students is included in APPENDIX A.

Participants

Participants were college students ($n = 82$) and faculty ($n = 31$) currently attending courses or teaching courses at a university in the southwest. Demographic information including age, level of college completed/or how long employed by the college, ethnicity, and gender were collected for each participant. Participants ranged from 18-71 years old, with a total sample mean of $M = 29$.

The average faculty age was 51 years old and ranged from 34 to 71 years. Fifty-five percent ($n = 17$) of faculty identified as female and 45% ($n = 14$) identified as male. The majority of the sample (93%, $n = 28$) identified as White. All faculty reported teaching at a university only and their average teaching experience was 22 years with a range of four to forty-four years. Only one faculty identified as adjunct faculty, the rest reported being full-time, tenured, or tenure-track faculty. When asked to identify a course

to discuss classroom behavior, 38% ($n = 11$) of faculty who responded identified a large lecture style course, 25% ($n = 7$) identified a lab, 10% ($n = 3$) identified a small lecture, and one identified a combination lecture/lab or hybrid course.

The average student age was 21 years old and ranged from 18 to 32 years old. Seventy-nine percent of the students ($n = 65$) identified as female and 21% ($n = 17$) identified as male. The majority of the sample (69%, $n = 56$) identified as White. Students had slightly more varied ethnicities identified when compared to faculty including Hispanic ($n = 9$) and Asian ($n = 4$). All faculty reported teaching at a university setting only; however, 82% ($n = 67$) of students reported being university students and 16% ($n = 13$) reported community college attendance. Two students did not identify their college setting. Students were primarily upperclassmen: 16% freshman, 21% sophomores, 32% juniors, and 30% seniors. One student identified as 'other'. On average, students reported just under three years of college experience with a range of one semester to eight years.

Materials and Procedures

A mass email to 1,300 students and a mass email to 750 faculty were sent to potential participants. Emails were randomly searched and located from the university's online phonebook. The email contained a link to the participant's respective disclosure form. After reading the disclosure form and clicking a link at the bottom of the page that reads "I agree to participate", participants were redirected to their appropriate survey. Participants were notified that they could discontinue participation at any time by closing

their browser. If they wished to fully participate, they could submit their data by clicking submit at the end of the survey. Other than demographic data, no personally identifying information was collected. The online survey method allowed for anonymity of all participants to the researcher.

Instruments

Although instruments have already been designed to measure the prevalence of AE, the intent was to collect data from the student perspective only (Acochoso, 2006). Surveys used to gather information from both faculty and students do not also focus on attributions for why both AE and incivility occur in the classroom (McKenne, 2008). Given the nature of this study's research design a survey was designed by the author for the purpose of this study.

Faculty Demographics

Like students, faculty were asked about their age, gender, and ethnicity. However, they were asked where they teach (university or community college, neither or both), their teaching title, and how long they've been teaching total, not just their current institution. Faculty were also asked to identify a current course and discuss the class style and size and to keep that class in mind when giving their perceptions on the PSIAE (APPENDIX B).

Student Demographics

Students were asked about their age, gender, ethnicity, if they attend school at a university or community college and their grade level. They were also asked how long they have been attending college. Students were asked to identify one of their current courses and include the course number and title and how many times and for how long the class meets each week. Finally, they were asked the format of the class such as large lecture style or small discussion section and approximately how many students are enrolled. They were also asked to keep their identified class in mind when giving their perceptions on the PSIAE items (APPENDIX C).

Perceptions of Student Incivility and Academic Entitlement (PSIAE)

The survey was designed to determine if students and faculty agree on what constitutes inappropriate classroom behavior. The survey outlined nine examples of student behaviors and asked how unacceptable each behavior would be perceived. Each behavior is an example of varying levels of student incivility defined by Goodyear et al. (2010). Items one and two are examples of student disengagement (Level 1). Items three, four, and five were designed to measure generally disruptive behaviors (Level 2). Items six and seven were designed to measure incivilities directed at the instructor (Level 3A) and items eight and nine were designed to measure incivilities in reaction to instructor behavior (Level 3B).

Each level of behavior included eight sub questions (a-h). The first of the eight questions measured a) unacceptability. The survey was also designed to measure causal

attributions for each behavior including locus: b) internal and c) external; d) stability 1, e) stability 2, f) intentionality, and g) controllability for each item. The eighth sub question asked faculty and students their perceived h) frequency of the behavior. Because the survey was created for the purpose of this study, only reliability estimates from the current results are available. The scale score (SS) reliabilities were as follows: (a) Unacceptable SS (α = .72), (b) Internal SS (α = .77), (c) External (α = .91), (d) Stability 1 (α = .81), (e) Stability 2 (α = .81), (f) Controllability (α = .79), (g) Intentionality (α = .83), and (h) Frequency (α = .83). Two stability measures were included to 1) determine if it is some students who always behave as described or if 2) all students behave this way sometimes (APPENDIX D).

Critical Incident Technique

Faculty and students were asked to identify an incidence of a faculty or student incivility, whether they regarded the incivility as minimal (talking, whispering, texting in class) or more disruptive, and to reflect on one incident they remember during their college experience. They were also asked what the student or students did that they perceived was uncivil, the effect it had on them personally, and the effect the incident had on the class. The sequence of questions are based off of Flanagan's (1954) Critical Incident Technique and was also used in Goodyear et al. (2010) (APPENDIX E).

Recollection of Academic Entitlement

A model of the Critical Incident Technique was adapted to fit a measure of academic entitlement and was also included on the survey. Students were asked if they

had witnessed behaviors such as another student disputing a grade that did not meet the requirements to be an A, to determine more specific attitudes about entitlement behaviors and if they affect the classroom. Faculty and students were also asked why they thought the academic entitlement occurred (APPENDIX F). The qualitative trends revealed in participant narratives are reported below. The codebook created by the author is also included in APPENDIX G.

Management of Data

The data were exported from the online data base using Googledocs.com into an Excel work sheet. Personally identifying information was never collected as participants were only identified by a time stamp indicating when they clicked submit. However, one faculty omitted her course title and reported it would have removed her anonymity. The course titles were never cross listed with any faculty names for the current semester so the researcher is still unaware of the identity of any faculty or students in the survey. The data are considered free from entry errors, as all entries were entered directly by each of the students and faculty. The data were imported from the Excel file and analyzed using SPSS for Windows.

Conclusion

The researcher debated collecting an entitlement or narcissistic measure for participants to compare with their attributions and levels of behavior unacceptability and frequency. However, given the researcher's understanding of the NPI and review of other entitlement assessments, she decided to omit another measure. Additionally, the total

online survey was estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Research

indicates an average of ten percent response rate (Ousley, Cook Francis, Antonellis, &

Basij, 2006) for subjects invited to participate online. Given the limited sample expected

for participation, the researcher did not want to deter participants further by having any

longer of a survey. Fully online methodology was chosen given the anonymity it offered

for both faculty and participants. The topic of the survey is one that higher education has

failed to discuss historically (Boice, 1996a) and although it has received more attention

recently, anonymity is still important to maintain for such a reportedly taboo topic.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Quantitative Analysis

The data were explored using SPSS for Windows. Two independent samples t

tests were conducted to answer 1) Do faculty and students report instances of student

incivility and AE with the same frequency? 2) Do faculty and students report similar

levels of unacceptability with respect to the 9 incivilities measured? Initially, a one way

ANOVA was conducted to determine differences among identity (faculty or student) and

attribution levels (internal, external, stability 1 & 2, controllability, and intentionality);

however, no significant differences were found. The only other demographic variable that

had significant differences was students' gender. Mean differences are discussed below.

To add to the attribution theory literature, a correlation was conducted to determine any

relationships between the underlying causal properties. All analysis assumptions were

met unless indicated otherwise (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009).

Correlations

Several variables were significantly correlated. Age was significantly correlated

with the Stability 1 Scale Score, $r = -.276$ and the Control Scale Score, $r = -.287$ (all $ps <$

.05). The class size was significantly correlated with the frequency of behaviors in

general, $r = .327$, $p < .01$. Table 2 presents the correlations between each scale score. The

Intentionality Scale Score was the only scale lacking significant correlations with any

other scale score.

Table 2

Scale Score Correlations

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. SS1	——							
2. SS2	.604**	——						
3. SS3	.044	.349**	——					
4. SS4	.156	.302*	.430**	——				
5. SS5	-.086	.184	.404**	.614**	——			
6. SS6	.007	.201	.255*	.550**	.551**	——		
7. SS7	-.085	.082	.474**	.501**	.356**	.371**	——	
8. SS8	.040	.137	.028	.222	.130	.196	.045	——

Note. The Scale Score (SS) are as follows: 1) Unacceptable Behavior, 2) Internal Attribution, 3) External Attribution, 4) Stability 1, 5) Stability 2, 6) Controllability, 7) Frequency of Behavior, 8) Intentionality.
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$.

Although several scale factors are significantly related, it is important to note the

coefficient of determination. A coefficient of determination measures "the proportion of

variability in one variable that can be determined from the relationship with the other

variable" (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009, p. 534), $r^2 = .38$. The most variability that can be

accounted for in any relationship is approximately 38%, which is considered to be a large

coefficient of determination. The total sample size was $N = 113$; however, $n = 77$ was the

highest number of participants to complete the respective portion of the survey. An a

priori power analysis using G power suggested a sample size of $n = 133$.

Mean Differences

In addition to the above relationships, students and faculty differed in their

perceptions of acceptability and frequency levels of behaviors as well as attributions for

the behaviors. Gender differences among students were also found to be significant;

however, there were no gender differences among faculty. With the exception of the code

to identify if participants were faculty or students, and student gender differences, no

other significant differences among demographics including age and ethnicity were found

in the data. Generally, the larger the class, the more frequent the behaviors were reported

by both students and faculty; however, none of these were significant differences. Only

differences in students and faculty perceptions of frequency were significant and they

were not related to class size (see Table 6).

Faculty vs. students. Table 3 reports faculty and student differences with respect

to unacceptability, attribution differences, and frequencies in behavior occurrence.

Table 3

Mean Differences in Faculty and Student Perceptions of and Attributions for Incivility

Scale	Mean difference	t	Effect size	95% CI	Cronbach's alpha
Frequency*	-6.56	$t(102) = -3.71, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .12,$	[-10.35, -2.76]	.83
Unacceptability	4.79	$t(104) = 2.81, p < .006,$	$r^2 = .07,$	[1.41, 8.17]	.72
Stability 1*	-6.05	$t(97) = -2.33, p < .026,$	$r^2 = .05,$	[-11.32, -.78]	.81
Stability 2 *	-8.84	$t(102) = -3.81, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .12,$	[-13.52, -4.16]	.81
Control	-7.95	$t(96) = -3.85, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .13,$	[-12.07, -3.84]	.79

*Levene's test for equality of variance was violated.

Each scale mean difference reflects the difference between faculty mean scores

compared to student mean scores. The frequency score is a scale score respective to all

nine behaviors measured. Unacceptability of the behaviors was interpreted as the higher

the mean, the more they agreed the behavior was unacceptable. The stability scales

measure 1) some students always behave in these ways or 2) all students behave this way

sometimes. Control reflects their agreement with the statement "Nothing seems to stop…" the behavior, or that there is no controlling the behaviors.

The above differences are not specific for each of the nine behaviors, but are a general perception of frequency and attributions for all nine behaviors. Generally, students perceived the behaviors occurring more but faculty felt the behaviors were more unacceptable. Students were more likely to say that some students always behave this way as well as everyone is likely to have these unacceptable behaviors sometimes. Students were also more likely to say the behaviors are not controllable. With the exception of the small effect size for the stability 1 measure, all differences had a medium effect size (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009).

The nine behaviors were also examined independently with respect to their perceived level of appropriateness and frequency in occurrence. The average faculty and student response regarding the appropriateness of each of the behaviors is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Faculty and Student Means for Agreeing if a Behavior was Unacceptable in Class

Behavior	Faculty	Student
Sleeping in class	5.93	5.32
Inappropriate use of technology	6.40	4.30
Talking to others during lecture	5.70	4.50
Answering phone in lecture	6.50	6.70
Leaving without permission	4.50	3.30
Rude behavior, comments	6.45	5.87
Expressing boredom	5.14	5.84
Angry behavior like slamming a book	6.96	6.88
Confronting faculty in class about a grade	4.11	3.81

Each mean is expressed in terms of the 7 point Likert type scale used to measure the behavior with 1: Strongly Disagree and 7: Strongly Agree. Generally, it was agreed that the behaviors are unacceptable; however, leaving without permission and confronting faculty in class about a grade do not appear to be seen as problematic to students on average. Further, students and faculty strongly agreed that angry behaviors are unacceptable. On the whole, faculty were more likely to report all behaviors as unacceptable; however, significantly different perceptions between faculty and students occurred with three of the nine behaviors examined.

Table 5 reports the significant differences for the three behaviors: inappropriate use of technology (like using Facebook or texting in class), talking to other students during lecture, and walking in and out of the classroom without permission. Each scale mean difference reflects the difference between faculty mean scores compared to student

mean scores for three behaviors: inappropriate use of technology, talking to other students during lecture, and leaving the classroom without permission. The significant difference in unacceptability of inappropriate use of technology was found to have a medium effect size; however, talking to other students during lecture and leaving the classroom without permission had small effect sizes (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009).

Table 5

Mean Differences in Faculty and Student Perceptions of Appropriate Classroom Behavior

Behavior	Mean difference	t	Effect size	95% CI	Cronbach's alpha
Technology*	1.76	$t(107) = 6.62, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .18,$	[1.23, 2.29]	.72
Talking	1.15	$t(106) = 3.33, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .09,$	[.46, 1.84]	.72
Leaving	1.24	$t(106) = 3.02, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .08,$	[.42, 2.06]	.72

* Levene's test for equality of variance was violated.

As mentioned, students felt that all nine behaviors occurred more frequently when compared to faculty perceptions of behavior frequency. Specifically, students felt that inappropriate use of technology, students talking during lecture, and students leaving without permission occurred significantly more than faculty reported; although, students did not view these behaviors as unacceptable as faculty reported. Additionally, students felt that rude behavior and confronting faculty about a grade also were more frequent than what faculty reported. Table 6 reports the significant differences in faculty and student perceptions of specific behavior frequencies.

Table 6

Mean Differences in Faculty and Student Perceptions of Frequency of Classroom
Behavior

Behavior	Mean difference	t	Effect size	95% CI	Cronbach's alpha
Technology	-2.02	$t(107) = -5.71, p < .001,$	$r^2 = .23,$	[-2.72, -1.32]	.83
Talking*	-1.02	$t(103) = -2.92, p < .013,$	$r^2 = .08,$	[-1.80, -.23]	.83
Leaving	-1.05	$t(106) = -2.29, p < .005,$	$r^2 = .05,$	[-1.17, -.33]	.83
Rude*	-0.64	$t(106) = -2.00, p < .020,$	$r^2 = .05,$	[-1.18, -.10]	.83
Confrontation	-0.77	$t(104) = -2.04, p < .044,$	$r^2 = .04,$	[-1.52, -.02]	.83

* Levene's test for equality of variance was violated.

Specifically, students felt all of the above five behaviors occur more, there is

nothing that can be done to stop them, and three of the five behaviors are not seen as

unacceptable when compared to faculty perceptions.

Gender differences. There were no significant gender differences among faculty

for any behaviors or attributions. Students, however, did significantly differ with respect

to their opinion about the appropriateness of sleeping in class, their internal, external, and

stable attributions about sleep, their external attributions regarding boredom, and their

internal attributions regarding angry behaviors. Table 7 outlines the significant gender

differences among students.

Table 7

Student Gender Differences in Perceptions of and Attributions for Incivility

Behavior/ Attribution	Mean difference	t	Effect size	95% CI	Cronbach's alpha
Sleep					
Appropriate*	1.10	$t(77) = 2.12, p < .046, r^2 = .05$		[0.13, 2.07]	.72
Internal	1.34	$t(77) = 3.12, p < .003, r^2 = .11$		[0.49, 2.19]	.77
External*	1.24	$t(76) = 2.69, p < .012, r^2 = .09$		[0.24, 2.24]	.91
Stability 1	1.19	$t(76) = 2.27, p < .026, r^2 = .06$		[0.14, 2.23]	.81
Boredom					
External*	1.47	$t(76) = 2.91, p < .007, r^2 = .10$		[0.44, 2.52]	.91
Anger					
Internal*	2.21	$t(77) = 3.83, p < .001, r^2 = .16$		[1.30, 3.11]	.77

* Levene's test for equality of variance was violated.

Each scale mean difference reflects the difference between female and male students. The Appropriate scale measured students' perception of the unacceptability level of the behavior with a higher score indicating strong agreement the behavior was unacceptable. Internal attribution for the behavior was measured with student agreement to the statement "I would wonder if the student cared" and external attribution for the behavior referred to the statement "I would think the material being covered in the class was boring". The stability 1 attributions measured student agreement to the statement "I would think some students do this always".

Female students were more likely to say that sleeping in class was unacceptable. Female students were both more likely to agree with both internal and external attributions for why a student would sleep in class. Females were also more likely to say that some students always sleep. Female students were more likely to attribute students displaying bored behaviors to external reasons such as the class material being boring.

Female students were also more likely to give an internal attribution for why an angry outburst would occur in the classroom.

Conclusion

Faculty and students significantly differed in their perceptions of incivilities with respect to frequency and unacceptability. Students reported incivilities with more frequency and faculty were more likely to agree that the incivilities were unacceptable. Significant gender differences among faculty regarding the frequencies of incivility were not found; however, female students did have significantly different perceptions of and attributions for some of the incivilities measured. To enhance the faculty and student descriptions of AE and classroom incivilities based on the survey results, qualitative data was also collected.

Qualitative Analysis

Faculty and students were asked ten questions regarding academic incivility and academic entitlement. They were asked to describe an uncivil behavior, if they felt the behavior was minimally or very disruptive, if the behavior had an effect on them, and if the behavior had an effect on the class as a whole (see APPENDIX E). Additionally, they were asked to describe an entitled behavior, who displayed the behavior, if the behavior was disruptive, if it had a personal effect on them, if it affected the class, and why they thought the behavior occurred (see APPENDIX F).

After organizing and becoming immersed in the data, and generating categories and themes, the responses were coded using codes defined by the author in relation to definitions of AE and incivility as well as the literature examples for both (see

APPENDIX G). A second rater reviewed and coded faculty and student responses; interrater percent agreement using the original code book was only 74%; however, after revising the codes for clarity and improving their theoretical foundation all coder discrepancies were remedied. Trends in faculty and student responses are discussed below.

Faculty Perceptions

Twenty-eight faculty participants responded to at least one of the qualitative questions. Results for faculty perceptions of incivility and academic entitlement are discussed separately. General trends in faculty perception of the most identified disruptive behaviors were also identified.

Incivility. When faculty were asked to identify an uncivil behavior, the misuse of technology was discussed in nine of the 28 faculty responses. Six of the 28 faculty reported students talking during class as the next most common uncivil behavior. Four of the 28 faculty who responded mentioned students leaving the classroom without permission as their uncivil behavior. Four of the 28 faculty responses also identified students who were confrontational in nature regarding their grades as the uncivil behavior. Rude behavior was referenced by three of the 28 faculty responses. Angry and sleeping students were each only referenced once. The sleeping reference also suggested the student may have had narcolepsy and the faculty did not really perceive the behavior as 'uncivil' because "he was a perfectly decent person, he just always fell asleep". Seven of the faculty members listed several of the above factors as examples when asked to identify uncivil behavior in the classroom. One faculty said uncivil behavior does not

occur in class because of the strict policies set on the first day, including deducting course points (1% of their course grade) each time they talk, leave, use a banned electronic device, or come in late.

Faculty reported the above behaviors' disruption levels ranged from minimal to very disruptive. The more rude or confrontational the behavior, the more disruptive it was perceived. Most faculty stated general discussion, technology use, and leaving early were only disruptive immediately following the behavior, but once it was addressed, stopped, or redirected, the class resumed as normal. Faculty's reply about how the behavior affected them ranged from annoyed to surprised, with the majority of responses saying they were annoyed or irritated by the behavior.

Faculty reported that students also appear to be generally annoyed with the behaviors. One faculty said another student actually told the student they "should shut up and pay attention". Another faculty said the class "tried to make up for a student's rudeness" after the student became upset when the faculty accidently called him by the wrong name. The students replied it was "ok" if the faculty did not know their names. The faculty who identified their point deduction system for uncivil behaviors also mentioned the importance in enforcing classroom rules because students indicate the behaviors are distracting; therefore, the faculty reported that creating a conducive learning environment should be a priority for all faculty.

Academic entitlement. When faculty were asked about their experience with academic entitlement, ten responded with an example (approximately one third of the

faculty sample). The examples were all a variation of students who "needed, demanded, or assumed" a higher grade was warranted regardless of the fact that their work was not satisfactory for the higher grade. Nine of the 28 faculty who responded to the qualitative questions said they had never experienced any such behavior (also approximately one third of the faculty sample).

Students were reported to initiate the AE behavior; however, one example stated a student's father was making the case for the higher grade. AE behaviors were generally seen as frustrating, angering, and annoying to the faculty involved. AE behavior was reported to occur mostly out of class, during office hours, or just after class time ended so the class disruptions reported were generally minimal.

Faculty were also asked why they felt the AE behavior occurred. Generally, faculty felt that the students were responsible for the behavior and acted in such a way because of a negative consequence regarding poor grades, financial aid, or failing the course. One faculty noted the student was also an athlete and felt "in the greater spirit of the athletic team" the faculty should hand out good grades. The fact that students do not take control for their grades by following the syllabus or rubric guidelines was another reason mentioned by four of the 28 faculty. Four of the 28 faculty did not respond to the question and one stated they had no idea why the behavior occurred.

General faculty perceptions. Generally, the faculty who responded felt AE behaviors occur more out of the classroom and were minimally disruptive; whereas, incivility occurred in the classroom. The common classroom incivilities faculty identified

were also the same incivilities they felt were significantly more unacceptable than what students agreed: misuse of technology, talking during lecture, and leaving without permission. These behaviors were also generally regarded as moderately to mildly disruptive; whereas the less frequently reported behaviors of rudeness were associated with higher levels of classroom disruption. Four faculty identified incivilities when asked to identify AE behaviors.

Student Perceptions

The qualitative data from students were similar to that of faculty. Seventy-four of the 81 students answered some portion of the open ended survey items for both incivility and AE. Trends for each category are discussed below.

Incivility. When asked to identify an uncivil behavior, sleeping was only mentioned to be uncivil from one student. Fifteen of the 74 students gave multiple examples for the item and the majority of them referenced talking to others during lecture ($n = 28$) and inappropriate use of technology ($n = 11$). Answering the phone during lecture was not as common, but referenced by four students. Leaving class without permission was the uncivil behavior identified by five students. Nineteen students identified rude behavior and in seven of those reports it was a faculty member, not a student who was identified as having the rude behavior. A discussion of faculty incivilities as identified by students is discussed below.

Boredom was only referenced once from the student responses and the student stated "a large group of students [left] class because it was boring". Angry outbursts were

only referenced by two students. One referenced "the slamming down of materials" the other said they had witnessed "angry outbursts in class directed at the instructor or other students". Eight references of confrontational behavior were discussed. The majority of the references identified situations where students "challenged" or "questioned" the faculty about their grade on an assignment; however, the majority of students were confronting/challenging/or questioning faculty about their lecture material, testing materials, and syllabus policies, which were recoded as incivilities in reaction to instructor behavior.

One student did not feel the behaviors listed in the earlier portion of the survey were uncivil. She identified as a junior and wrote:

"I do NOT believe that if a student is on Facebook or texting during class or goes outside to answer a phone call that is uncivil. The student is free to do what they want in class, and if they fail a test that was due to their actions/choices. I may need to take a call due to an emergency and don't want to be restricted in any way from doing what I want to. The only thing in this survey that would be bad is: "If a student expressed angry outbursts in class (like swearing at the instructor or slamming a text book) and "If a student rolled their eyes, sighed, or made a rude comment during class" because those would actually disrupt the class/lecture. However all the rest: "A student confronts his/her instructor in class about his/her grade indicating the grade is lower than what the student deserved" (totally fair,

maybe they deserve the A and the teacher screwed up grading), "If a student overtly expressed boredom or dissatisfaction with the class to the instructor and students"(thank God someone says something, it probably is boring), "If a student walked in and out of the classroom without permission"(DRC students like me have scoliosis and I have to walk to keep my back from hurting), "If a student answered their phone during class" (emergency or work), "If a student was talking to another student during lecture" (what if one student is asking a question to another), "If a student was using Facebook, texting, or some other form of technology during class" (its a free country, everybody does this) and "If a student in my class fell asleep" (maybe they are tired and should sleep). The only example I can think of as bad in this class was when a senior African-American student wanted to look cool in front of his peers by saying "this class is stupid" to the teacher.

This is one student's opinion out of 82 surveyed. This opinion was generally not the norm response from students and may indicate that the majority of students surveyed in this sample do not personally engage in AE and classroom incivility.

Generally, the described behaviors were seen as highly disruptive ($n = 36$). Eighteen of the students said the behaviors were disruptive and four said the behaviors had low levels of disruption. Five students said it was not disruptive at all. Three students

did not identify a level of disruption, instead they identified a specific behavior that was already identified in the first question.

Students reported the behaviors' effect on them and the class varied with how disruptive the behavior was felt to be. For example, misuse of technology was usually regarded as minimally disruptive and therefore may not have affected the class as a whole. In particular, students reported the misuse of technology rarely affected large lectures because usually only a few surrounding students see the behavior occur (one student actually reported seeing porn being viewed by their peer during lecture). Behaviors reported as being more annoying were ones that made it difficult to pay attention in class and included students who leave frequently or talk to one another during lecture. The most disruptive behaviors included angry outbursts and confronting the teacher about their lecture or exam materials as well as a students' grade. Other "very" disruptive behaviors were the ones students attributed to faculty rudeness.

Five of the seven students who identified a faculty incivility described the faculty as reinforcing class policy, or redirecting a student incivility. Two of the five students said their faculty was rude, even yelled at students when trying to acknowledge they were talking to each other during lecture. It was mentioned a faculty member would not let a student hand in an assignment that had not been stapled because it did not follow the syllabus assignment policy. Another faculty was reported for having rude behavior when a student tried to hand in a late paper. The student mentioned their fellow student was negotiating in a reasonable way, then the faculty started yelling at the student, which

began a yelling match between the two about the assignment. A faculty was also

reported to acknowledge a student leaving class and stopped the entire lecture to discuss

the inappropriate behavior as stated in the faculty's syllabus.

The two remaining faculty incivilities were not in response to inappropriate

student behavior. A faculty was reported to tell a student "that is a stupid question and if

you are asking that, you shouldn't even be here…" in a math class, which the participant

interpreted the faculty's message as the student should not be in college if they did not

know basic addition and subtraction.

A student also said:

"An instructor ordered a student to stand up and give her opinion on a

subject in front of the 500 person class. Then when the instructor did not

agree with the student's opinion and ideas she began yelling at the student

and telling her 'you're just a rich white girl what would you know about

this?'. I thought it was very disrespectful and the girl was mortified but

nothing was done to stop it."

Academic entitlement. Thirty-nine students identified some form of AE behavior.

Generally, students felt that at least one of their peers argued for more points, handed in a

poorly written papers but expect an A, claimed an exam was unfair because they failed,

never attended class then wondered why they failed the tests, or a fellow student

automatically assumed the class should be graded on a curve because of the difficult

content (such as organic chemistry). The students said the AE behaviors occurred at least once a semester.

Four of the student responses identified the entitled behavior with respect to group work. They all said they have worked with students who expected them to complete all the work while those who do nothing still earn the same "A" grade. One student said a TA was a "pushover" and the class eventually "milk" the quiz answers out of the TA and complain if they did not receive 100% until the TA adjusted all of their quiz grades to reflect perfect scores. Another student gave their experience as a preceptor and said students would come and ask for the "answers" to the homework. The preceptor offered to help them with the homework, not just give answers and the students complained about her and said "she wasn't interested in helping students". Two students identified behaviors typically defined as uncivil such as misuse of technology.

Students who reported academic entitlement behaviors generally felt the behaviors were not disruptive because they usually happened outside of the classroom, mainly during office hours. However, even though the academic entitlement behaviors were not regarded as overwhelmingly disruptive, they did affect the students. Students said entitled behaviors were annoying, frustrating, and irritating. Mostly because they felt other students gain higher grades for entitlement behaviors and now they are being compared to these other students. On paper both groups appear similar, but in reality they are not nearly the same level with respect to grades and transcripts. Frustration was also

reported because the students who feel they rightfully earned the higher graded said they worked for it and other students who do nothing still receive the same grade!

General student perceptions. Students attributed entitled behaviors to internal reasons for the student behaving in the entitled manner. Most said the students displaying the behavior were lazy, unmotivated, or my personal favorite, "poor losers". External attributions were noted as the TA or faculty "allowing" the behavior to occur. One student said faculty were too willing to give second chances. Three students also identified incivilities when asked to identify AE behaviors.

Conclusion

Students perceived similar incivilities and examples of AE behavior as faculty. Students were generally angered and annoyed by incivilities, found them to be distracting. Misuse of technology was reported to be particularly distracting for students in close proximity to the individual participating in the behavior. However, students said that misuse of technology was not distracting in large lectures if they were not near (in particular, directly behind) the student engaging in the behavior. Students talking during lecture and other rude behaviors such as interrupting faculty or sighing and expressing boredom were generally perceived as the most disruptive.

AE behaviors were also reported as frustrating, particularly when they were identified in group work situations. Students did not feel the entitled behaviors were "fair". Students generally attributed AE behaviors to internal attributions of the entitled student, including the student being a "poor looser", not prepared, and not caring.

External attributions reported included TAs and faculty being too lenient and giving too many second chances to entitled students.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Comments on the Sample and Method

Although the sample mirrored the university with majority white and female students, the sample did lack ethnic diversity and does not generalize to many other R1 universities with more racial diversity. Further, it was a small sample for both students and faculty. The response rate was 6% for students and 4% for faculty; nowhere near the anticipated 10% reported in the literature (Ousley et al., 2006; Mellor, 2009a).

The survey designed for this study had reliable subscales and served as a good initial instrument to measure differences in faculty and student perceptions of various uncivil and entitlement behaviors. Several of the subscales correlated with each other, with the exception of intentionality. The lack of relationship between intentionality and other underlying causal properties suggests Weiner's (2005) claim that there are "three, and indeed only three" underlying causal properties is true (p. 4). The data indicate that intentionality is possibly reflected in the controllability underlying causal property rather than a separate underlying causal property.

Limitations

The small sample and lack of ethnic variability does not allow for the data to generalize to a larger population of faculty and college students. Faculty and students were also unable to be matched to the same course content so interpreting these differences for the same class was not possible with this data set. Even so, results are informative for future research.

Quantitative Discussion

Faculty agreed the nine behaviors measured are generally unacceptable, least of which included being confronted about a grade. The most unacceptable student behavior according to faculty was student displays of rude behavior or comments. Faculty were significantly more likely than students to rate misuse of technology, leaving class without permission, and students talking during lecture as unacceptable. However, faculty were less likely than students to report these behaviors as frequently as students reported. In addition to students reporting incivility with more frequency, they were more likely to give stable attributions and say there is less control over the uncivil behaviors when compared to faculty. Because of the close ended nature of the survey data collection method, it is difficult to speculate what other sociological explanations could be impacting the differences in student and faculty perceptions regarding their attributions for classroom incivility. The qualitative data from both faculty and students, however, did further explain their thinking.

Qualitative Discussion

Faculty and student comments regarding classroom incivilities were detailed and comprehensive. The majority of both faculty and students who completed the quantitative portion of the survey also completed some aspect of the qualitative portion. The results for both classroom incivilities and AE are discussed below.

Incivility

The qualitative data from faculty indicated the most common student classroom incivilities were also the three uncivil behaviors that faculty regarded as more

unacceptable than students: talking during lecture, misuse of technology, and leaving class without permission. Although, faculty said these were only moderately disruptive, particularly immediately following the behavior, faculty were annoyed by the student incivilities none the less. According to faculty, students in their class appeared generally annoyed with these behaviors as well. This faculty perception was confirmed in the student qualitative data. Thirty-six of the 74 students who identified classroom incivilities also said the behaviors were disruptive. Generally, student responses to misuse of technology were that the behavior was minimally disruptive and really only a distraction to other students sitting directly next to or behind the student misusing the technology. Only 5 of the 74 students said these behaviors were not disruptive at all. However, the student quantitative data indicated they do not find these behaviors unacceptable. Therefore, it appears that students are actually contradicting themselves. These behaviors are disruptive, but students participate in them regardless and when asked, say the behaviors are not that unacceptable.

According to students, faculty also displayed uncivil behaviors. A handful of students stated that their faculty member was rude towards students. However, when faculty were reported displaying rude behavior, it was in response to a student's uncivil behavior. Usually the faculty responded to students talking in class, using technology inappropriately, or leaving without permission. These are the three behaviors that students were significantly less likely to report as being problematic behaviors. When faculty acknowledged the behaviors, students reported the faculty as being rude. Not only is there a discrepancy between faculty and students on what constitutes appropriate

classroom behavior, but when incivility arises and is then reprimanded by faculty, it changes the incivility from the students' perspective from fellow student to a faculty incivility. Therefore, if faculty ignore the behavior, students are upset because "nothing is ever done about it", but when faculty address the behavior, students perceive them as being rude. According to the data, it appears faculty are in a no win situation when it comes to classroom incivility. Ignoring the incivilities is interpreted by some students as doing nothing, but addressing the incivilities is considered rude by other students.

Relating the classroom incivilities back to the interpersonal attributional model explains further why faculty are in a no win situation. Faculty could perceive the student's incivility as controllable. Therefore, the student incivility was intentional and faculty were annoyed and responded with retaliation. This scenario was described by the student who identified a conversation between student and faculty that turned into a yelling match over the assignment. This faculty retaliation as explained by Weiner's (2000) interpersonal attributional model also explains my reaction to student incivility. I told the student to have a seat, which could very well be interpreted by other students' as rude. I also asked the girl who "didn't want to interrupt my class" during her 15 minute visit, "why did you even come". Arguably, many students would find my comment rude; however, according to Weiner (2000) my anger was because I perceived the student's behavior as a controllable lack of effort.

In my opinion, the most extreme example of faculty incivility was that of the student who was humiliated in front of a class of 500 for giving her opinion when the faculty asked her to. The faculty's retaliation to the student's answer could also be related

to the faculty's attribution that the student's stigmatizing condition (rich, white) lead to her behavior (answer to the faculty's question) and if the faculty somehow thought this condition was controllable, it generated the anger response of condemnation. This example suggests that not only does the attributional theory of interpersonal motivation fit the incivility literature, but also that Alexander-Snow was correct in postulating that we do bring our beliefs about gender and cultural differences. These differences also appear to impact classroom incivility in varying degrees.

Academic Entitlement

Ten of the 28 faculty who answered the qualitative questions also identified AE behaviors and nine of the 28 faculty said they had never experienced AE behaviors. The faculty generally felt annoyed or frustrated with the students displaying the AE behavior and attributed the AE behavior as a student issue. Internal student attributions included students failing to take control over their own grades.

Generally, students who identified AE behaviors reported the behaviors as frustrating and unfair. AE behaviors were also identified in group work situations where students expect to earn the same grade even if they do not complete any work. Students also gave internal reasons for why AE behaviors occur that included the students as "lazy, unmotivated, or poor losers". If external attributions were mentioned, it was because a TA or faculty "allowed" the behavior to occur. These results are not in alignment with Achacoso (2006) who found that students who have entitlement beliefs are more likely to have external attributions; whereas, internal attributions for entitlement behavior was inversely correlated with student levels of entitlement beliefs. The reason for this

discrepancy could be that the current sample generally does not harbor entitlement beliefs as reported in the qualitative results. Only one student appeared to truly meet the criteria of academic entitlement ("the student is free to do what they want in class….I don't want to be restricted in any way from doing what I want…maybe they deserve the A").

I was extremely stressed with my lack of participation from both students and faculty. In a personal correspondence with one of my advisors, I was reminded that I am concerned that a group of entitled students does not want to take my survey. Now, it is difficult not to laugh at the absence of data; in fact, the absence of data is data in itself. I believe the students and faculty who participated in this study differ in their attributions for why AE occurs because they do not display the same level of entitlement beliefs that may have been present had I obtained a larger sample from the university.

Other explanations for why AE behaviors occurred can be related to the sociological theories addressed briefly in the review of literature. For example, both students and faculty reported internal attributions for AE (lack of student ability, failure to follow the syllabus guidelines); however, these explanations could also be explained with deterrence theory. Students who engage in the AE behaviors could believe that there are no consequences for failure to follow instructions, they have talked their way out of the situation before, and they can talk their way out of it again.

The example of the push-over TA who raised the entire class' quiz scores to 100 is an example of social bond theory. The class was described as having unity, working together for a common goal of a good grade and with that commitment, came persistence. Students who participated in the coercion may not normally engage in that behavior but

because it was a group norm, they felt their participation was justified. Future research on the topic of AE and classroom incivility should incorporate both sociological explanations and underlying causal attributions to determine stronger evidence for why the behaviors occur. Qualitative data from both faculty and students fit either a sociological explanation or identified underlying causal attributions for the AE or incivility. However, the sociological explanations fit better for explaining student incivilities and AE behaviors and the attributional theory of interpersonal motivation better explained faculty incivilities.

Future research should focus on using these theories to create a better understanding for what I call the student perception paradox: incivilities are disruptive, yet students do them anyway; AE is annoying and frustrating, yet students display AE behaviors anyway, and students claim nothing is done to stop incivilities or AE, yet when faculty do impose restrictions on the behavior, it is seen as a faculty incivility.

The paradox could be because teaching is viewed as more of a service industry in our country; students pay for a service and regardless of their performance, they should get what they pay for, an A. However, students pay for their class, not the grade; therefore, future research should focus on if this is an acceptable explanation for the student perception paradox. Finally, the literature compartmentalizes AE and incivility (Achacoso, 2006; McKenne, 2008); however, a small portion of both faculty and students relate the two as similar in this study. Therefore, future research should continue to examine these together to further investigate interrelationships among the constructs. If

student incivility is thought to be a result from AE behaviors (Chowning & Campbell, 2009), the two should no longer be studied separately.

Informing Policy

Many of the behaviors measured with the survey correspond with recent classroom behavioral concerns of a southwestern university (deanofstudents.arizona.edu). The university's pamphlet outlined six disruptive behaviors: 1) students being persistently tardy or leaving early to class, 2) students who talk incessantly during lecture, 3) students who loudly and frequently interrupt the flow of class, 4) belligerent students after being confronted about their inappropriate behavior, 5) Cell phones ringing, text messaging, or chatting online, and 6) a student's persistent and unreasonable demands for time and attention both in and out of the classroom. The survey used in this study examined nine behaviors: 1) sleeping, 2) inappropriate use of technology, 3) talking during lecture, 4) answering the phone during lecture, 5) leaving class without permission, 6) rude behavior or comments, 7) expressing boredom, 8) angry behaviors, 9) confronting faculty about a grade.

Pamphlet items 3, 4, and 6 were interpreted as rude behavior or comments in relation to the current study's survey. The remaining three pamphlet items match the remaining behaviors measured in the current study. Interestingly, faculty perceived all six of the pamphlet identified disruptive behaviors as unacceptable. Although students agreed to some extent the behaviors are unacceptable, they did not feel that inappropriate use of technology, talking during lecture, and leaving without permission were as unacceptable as faculty reported. Ultimately, half of the time, students and faculty do not

agree on the unacceptability of the identified disruptive behavior according to current

university guidelines created for faculty and staff.

Issues with Agreement

Faculty generally considered inappropriate use of technology the least disruptive,

talking during lecture moderately disruptive, and instructor directed behaviors (anger and

confrontation) the most disruptive (Goodyear et al., 2010) and reflect Boice's (1996a)

findings from a faculty perspective. However, students did not discuss inappropriate use

of technology as a major classroom disruption in the current study.

Even more compelling is the fact that students who participated in this study

agree on some level that texting in class is disruptive yet over 50% of students reported

they like texting because they can do it while in lecture (Mellor, 2009b). Faculty

participants in this study indicated students complain about disruptive behaviors that

involve misuse of technology, suggesting students find the behavior distracting. The

irony is that although students claim the behaviors are disruptive, they are still

participating in the behaviors more often than not. Faculty and students do not agree on

definitions of disruptive behavior. When policy for what constitutes inappropriate

behavior as defined by an institution's student code of conduct is not seen as

inappropriate behavior by the students who attend that institution, reports of behavioral

problems are inevitable.

Directions for Enhancing the Classroom Experience

Debating if narcissistic behaviors, academic incivility, and entitlement are

occurring more now than previously is no longer the issue. Understanding how to define

and *agree* on what is considered disruptive or unacceptable classroom behavior is where research should focus.

Defining Incivility with Agreement

The original study model included examining several large and small lectures at both a community college and university to obtain access to both faculty and students in the same course and then measure any differences in perception, similar to the work of Boice (1996a) and McKenne (2008). That design would permit a better understanding of what the classroom environment looks like when a faculty and their students disagree about what defines appropriate behavior. That design should also be conducted at both a community college and university level to determine any differences based on institution. Unfortunately, because of unforeseen circumstances and rejection from the community college, comparing two institutions in this study was not possible.

The researcher used the data available and was still able to detect differences in faculty and student perception, even with a limited sample. The current study found that faculty and students do not agree on their definitions of disruptive behavior. Because no two students, faculty, or institutions are alike, we may *never* agree on our definitions of disruptive behavior. However, by clearly identifying student and faculty responsibilities in the classroom, regardless of our disagreements, we can still foster positive learning environments with minimal levels of incivility and AE behaviors.

Proactive Behaviors in the Classroom

Nilson and Jackson (2004) discuss the importance of the first day of class. Taking steps to ensure that students are aware of their responsibilities in the classroom (like

turning off cell phones, arriving on time, not leaving until class is over, etc) is important to ensure everyone is on the same page. However, faculty need to model desired behaviors, not just demand them. As research has found, if faculty demand respect, they will get it (McKenne, 2008) and they can do this with positive interpersonal interactions with their students from day one (Boice, 1996a). According to Nilson and Jackson (2004), if students participate in creating their own code of conduct, they are more likely to adhere to the behaviors and they suggest taking time to create this contract on the first day of class. Faculty should then create a contract of the agreed upon behaviors and have both faculty and students sign the contract.

One of the disagreements between student and faculty regarding unacceptable behavior was with inappropriate use of technology. Faculty could address this issue from a multitasking standpoint. It is arguable that today's youth are multitaskers and they can handle the various learning tasks while using their multitude of technological items all at once. However, an examination of what multitasking entails reports it is actually maladaptive for the multitasker's memory and hinders their ability to effectively move from one task to another (Ophir, Nass, & Wagner, 2009). Faculty could remind students of the results reported from Stanford as another reason why they should be paying full attention in class. Finally, the faculty in the current study who reportedly never experienced AE or incivility attributed their preparation and deterrence with thoughtful syllabi, consequences for incivilities, and vigilance with their policy enforcement. However, since students report incivilities with significantly more frequency than faculty, it is a possibility that the faculty just *thinks* the behaviors do not occur, when in reality

they might. This further supports the need for future research to collect data from both faculty and students in the same classroom.

The strategies outlined are not new to the literature and mirror the suggestions voiced in the classroom management literature (Perlmutter, 2011; Thorndike, 1923). I have followed the literature suggestions and have had my students sign a contract of expectations for 4 years. I clearly outline all student and faculty expectations and responsibilities on my first day in each class and in my syllabi. My student evaluations indicate that I am a respectful, kind, knowledgeable instructor with patience and I am easily approachable. According to the research and suggestions given to deter classroom incivility, it should not be experienced in my classroom. I was unable to collect data from my current students; however, classroom incivilities occur daily and I have shared two of my most recent student examples as well as my own examples of incivility. The suggestions outlined to prevent incivilities are a good start; however, even when they are implemented, incivilities still occur. Perhaps there are no solutions for classroom incivilities, although I would like to hope we find at least one. I would prefer my teaching career to be less exhausting and miserable as some faculty feel (Clift, 2011) and therefore, this dissertation is not really dedicated to just me. Solutions for my classroom may not fit other disciplines or faculty teaching styles. Maybe there is not one simple solution because no two of us (faculty, students, institutions) are like. The best solution might be to observe classrooms regularly and implement various combinations of the suggested strategies from the literature and find the combination that best fits the faculty, students, and dynamics of each classroom.

Conclusion

This sample suggests that a discrepancy between faculty and students' definition of appropriate classroom behavior exists. Future research needs to continue to explore the existence of this discrepancy and keep it in mind when implementing college policy regarding appropriate classroom behavior. If students do not feel their behavior is inappropriate, will they stop engaging in that behavior? As the data from this small sample indicate, even when students agree the behavior is inappropriate, they do not agree to the extent that faculty think the behavior is inappropriate. Students think the behavior is uncontrollable, and even though their school policy recognizes their behavior as disruptive, students generally disagree with current policy.

APPENDIX A

APPROVED DISCLOSURE FORM

The University of Arizona Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title: The Student and Faculty College Experience
Principal Investigator: Jessie Kosorok Mellor, M.A.
Sponsor: Mary McCaslin, Ph.D.

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate. Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate.

You may or may not benefit as a result of participating in this study. Also, as explained below, your participation may result in unintended or harmful effects for you that may be minor or may be serious, depending on the nature of the research.

1. **Why is this study being done?**

   To determine what the student and faculty college experience is like.

2. **How many people will take part in this study?**

   Approximately 500 students and faculty are anticipated to participate in this study.

3. **What will happen if I take part in this study?**

   You will take an online survey and be given contact information of how to request a summary of results after May 2011.

4. **How long will I be in the study?**

   The only participation involves your completion of the survey. You will participate as long as it takes you to finish the survey (approximately 15 minutes).

5. **Can I stop being in the study?**

You may stop your participation at any time by closing your browser. Once you hit submit on the survey, all data is collected and sent to the researcher but no identifying information is associated with your survey. The researcher has no idea if you participated or not.

Your participation is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part in the study, you may leave the study at any time. No matter what decision you make, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any of your usual benefits. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The University of Arizona. If you are a student or employee at the University of Arizona, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

6. **What risks, side effects or discomforts can I expect from being in the study? There are no expected risks or side effects or discomforts expected from your participation; however, if you feel you do need assistance during or after participation please contact:**

> Jessie Kosorok Mellor, M.A.
> Doctoral Candidate
> University of Arizona
> Department of Educational Psychology
> kosorok@email.arizona.edu
> (520) 621 - 7828

7. **What benefits can I expect from being in the study?**

There are no direct benefits from your participation; however, your honest answers can help researchers improve the classroom experience for both students and faculty.

8. **What other choices do I have if I do not take part in the study?**

You may choose not to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

9. **Will my study-related information be kept confidential?**

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. However, no personally identifying information is collected in this study, so your answers will remain anonymous.

Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies
- The University of Arizona Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices

10. What are the costs of taking part in this study?

There are no costs to you for taking part in this study except for the time you spend (estimated 15 minutes).

11. Will I be paid for taking part in this study?

You will receive no compensation for your participation.

12. What are my rights if I take part in this study?

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By clicking "I AGREE" below, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

You will be provided with any new information that develops during the course of the research that may affect your decision whether or not to continue participation in the study.

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

13. Who can answer my questions about the study?

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact

> Jessie Kosorok Mellor, M.A.
> Doctoral Candidate
> University of Arizona
> Department of Educational Psychology
> kosorok@email.arizona.edu

(520) 621 - 7828

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Human Subjects Protection Program at 520-626-6721 or orcr.vpr.arizona.edu/irb.

Agreeing to the disclosure form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form, and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I can print a copy of this form**.**

<u>I agree to participate in this study</u>

APPENDIX B

FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The following items were open ended questions with no force choice response, unless indicated otherwise:

1. How old are you?

2. What is your gender?

3. What is your ethnicity?

4. Where do you teach?
    University
    Community College
    Both
    Neither

5. What is your teaching title (faculty, adjunct faculty, tenure track, teaching assistant, etc)?

6. How long have you been teaching total (not just at one institution but in your entire career)?

7. Think about one of your current courses and identify the title of the course (ex. PSY 216 Psychology of Gender)

8. What format is the class (ex. large lecture, small lecture, lab)?

9. Approximately how many students are enrolled (ex. 150)?

10. Approximately how many times a week and for how long does the class meet (ex. twice a week for 75 minutes)?

APPENDIX C

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The following items were open ended questions with no force choice response, unless indicated otherwise:

1. How old are you?

2. What is your gender?

3. What is your ethnicity?

4. Where do you attend school?
    University
    Community College
    Both
    Neither

5. What is your grade level?
    Freshman
    Sophomore
    Junior
    Senior
    Graduate
    Other

6. How long have you been attending college (i.e. two years)?

7. Think about one of your current courses and identify the title of the course (ex. PSY 216 Psychology of Gender)

8. What format is the class (ex. large lecture, small lecture, lab)?

9. Approximately how many students are enrolled (ex. 150)?

10. Approximately how many times a week and for how long does the class meet (ex. twice a week for 75 minutes)?

APPENDIX D

PSIAE

Directional prompt for both students and faculty that followed the last item on their

respective demographic portion:

Keeping that class in mind, please answer the following questions with respect to your
chosen course and indicate how you would react to the following scenarios:

1. If a student in my class fell asleep…

    a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

    b) I would wonder if the student cared….

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

    c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

    d) Some students do this always…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

    e) Everyone does this sometimes…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

    f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
Disagree						Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never

Always

2. If a student was using Facebook, texting, or some other form of technology during class…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

d) Some students do this always…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly
Disagree

Strongly
Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never   Always

3. If a student was talking to another student during a lecture….

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Never   Always

4. If a student answered their phone in class during lecture…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Never   Always

5. If a student walked in and out of the classroom without permission…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Strongly   Strongly

Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never   Always

6. If a student rolled their eyes, sighed, or made a rude comment during class…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never   Always

7. If a student overtly expressed boredom with the class to the instructor and students…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never   Always

8. If a student expressed angry outbursts in class (like searing at the instructor or slamming a text book)…

  a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  b) I would wonder if the student cared….
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  d) Some students do this always…
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  e) Everyone does this sometimes…
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  f) Nothing seems to stop it…..
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  g) The student was doing this on purpose…
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Strongly   Strongly
  Disagree   Agree

  h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7
  Never   Always

9. A student confronts his/her instructor in class about his/her grade indicating the grade is lower than what the student deserved…

a) I would think the student's behavior was unacceptable for class…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

b) I would wonder if the student cared….

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

c) I would think the material being covered in the class was boring…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

d) Some students do this always…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

e) Everyone does this sometimes…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

f) Nothing seems to stop it…..

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

g) The student was doing this on purpose…

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

h) How often would you say this behavior occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Never   Always

APPENDIX E

CRITICAL INCIDENT TECHNIQUE

Please answer the following in your own words:

Classroom incivilities differ in degree and form, ranging from students whispering with each other to more overt and even aggressive behaviors by either a student or an instructor. Given your experience in college please identify an incident of either student or faculty incivility that you witnessed:

What behavior was done that you perceive as uncivil?
Do you think this behavior was minimal or very disruptive?
What effect did it have on you?
What effect did it have on the class?

APPENDIX F

RECOLLECTION OF ACADEMIC ENTITLEMENT

Please answer the following in your own words:

Some students expect classroom success without actually being personally responsible for that success (like expecting an A on a paper that was turned in even though it did not meet the criteria for an A grade). Please identify an incident of this type or related that you witnessed:

What behavior was it?
Who participated in the behavior (you or another student)?
Do you think the behavior was minimal or disruptive?
What effect did it have on you?
What effect did it have on the class?
Why do you think this behavior occurred?

APPENDIX G

QUALITATIVE DATA CODE BOOK

Critical Incident Technique Codes:
The critical incident technique is used in many fields of study and was originally used for Air Force examination of military behaviors (Flanagan, 1954); due to the variety of fields who can use the technique, the coding system is vague. Codes for items one through four were adapted from the Goodyear et al. (2010) results. Codes for items 5-10 were created for the purposes of this study using themes from AE literature.

1. Describe the behavior that you perceived as uncivil?
      0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
      1) No incivilities experienced
      2) Student Disengagement: sleeping, inappropriate use of technology
      3) Disruptive Behavior: talking to other students during lecture, ringing phones, answering phones, leaving or entering class without permission, disruptive eating, arrogant slurs, rude language, or general rude behavior toward other students
      4) Incivilities Directed at the Instructor: equalizing power, rolling eyes, expressions of boredom, comments about the instructor, ignoring directives from the instructor, arguing course content or instructor knowledge of course content, arrogant slurs, rude language, or general rude behavior directed at the instructor
      5) Incivilities in Reaction to Instructor Behavior: angry responses to a grade, classroom rule, course assignment; aggressive behaviors such as slamming books or doors
      6) Faculty Incivility: any rude behavior, disruptions, inappropriate use of technology identified on the part of a faculty or TA

      *if there are multiple behaviors listed, indicate all examples given in each answer (ie. 1, 3, and 4)

2. Do you think the behavior was minimal or very disruptive?
      Code as a likert type scale:
      0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
      1) No disruption
      2) Low disruption
      3) Disruptive
      4) Highly disruptive

3. What effect did the behavior have one you?
  0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
  1) Never occurs, has no effect
  2) Unsure
  3) Identified a response to the behavior such as redirection, education for prevention
  4) Identified witness(es) reaction such as remorse, extra kind, feeling bad
  5) Identified a feeling of being threatened, worried, or concerned
  6) Distracted or disrupted
  7) Emotional response of annoyed, angered, frustrated, confused
  8) Retaliation behavior such as telling the person to stop, reporting the behavior to others, or arguing about the behavior

4. What effect did the behavior have on the class?
  0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
  1) Never occurs, has no effect
  2) Unsure
  3) Identified a response to the behavior such as redirection, education for prevention
  4) Identified witness(es) reaction such as remorse, extra kind, feeling bad
  5) Identified a feeling of being threatened, worried, or concerned
  6) Distracted or disrupted
  7) Emotional response of annoyed, angered, frustrated, confused
  8) Retaliation behavior such as telling the person to stop, reporting the behavior to others, or arguing about the behavior

Recollection of Academic Entitlement Codes:
5. What specific entitled behavior occurred? (AE is defined as a student expecting success without being personally responsible for that success, such as expecting a passing grade for work that does not constitute 'passing')
  0) Not able to code (N/A) or left blank
  1) AE behavior of bargaining, pleading, deserving, disgruntled
  2) Identified an incivility (sleeping, talking, texting, leaving early, rude behavior)
  3) Does not occur

6. Who participated in the behavior?
  0) Not able to code (N/A) or left blank
  1) Another student (not the study participant)
  2) Self (if student)
  3) Self (if faculty)
  4) TA or preceptor, another faculty, or a parent
  5) Both students or faculty/TA/preceptor
  6) No one
  7) Administration

7. Do you think the behavior was minimal or very disruptive?
      Code as a likert type scale:
      0) Not able to code (N/A) or left blank
      1) No disruption
      2) Low disruption
      3) Disruptive
      4) Highly disruptive

8. What effect did it have on you?
      0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
      1) Never occurs, has no effect
      2) Unsure
      3) Identified a response to the behavior such as redirection, education for
          prevention
      4) Identified witness(es) reaction such as remorse, extra kind, feeling bad
      5) Identified a feeling of being threatened, worried, or concerned
      6) Distracted or disrupted
      7) Emotional response of annoyed, angered, frustrated, confused
      8) Retaliation behavior such as telling the person to stop, reporting the behavior to
          others, or arguing about the behavior

9. What effect did it have on the class?
      0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
      1) Never occurs, has no effect
      2) Unsure
      3) Identified a response to the behavior such as redirection, education for
          prevention
      4) Identified witness(es) reaction such as remorse, extra kind, feeling bad
      5) Identified a feeling of being threatened, worried, or concerned
      6) Distracted or disrupted
      7) Emotional response of annoyed, angered, frustrated, confused
      8) Retaliation behavior such as telling the person to stop, reporting the behavior to
          others, or arguing about the behavior

10. Why do you think the behavior occurred? (Given the literature suggests students participate in AE behaviors, internal reasons for the behavior are regarded as being internal to the *student displaying the AE behavior* and external reasons are regarded as behaviors that are external to the *student displaying the AE behavior*)

     0) Not able to code (N/A), or left blank
     1) Participant was not sure
     2) Internal (within student displaying AE: lazy, doesn't care, afraid of failing)
     3) External (example of faculty/TA being too easy; class material boring or too hard)
     4) Stability (implication the behavior is a regularly occurring behavior)
     5) Instability (implication that the behavior rarely occurs)
     6) Controllability (implication the event could have been controlled by the student displaying AE)
     7) Uncontrollable (implication the student displaying AE had no control over the event)
     8) Intentionality (implication the AE behavior was intentional)
     9) Unintentional (implication the AE behavior was not intentional)

     *if multiple underlying causal properties are indentified, indicate all given in each example (ie. 1, 4, 6)

REFERENCES

Achacoso, M.V. (2006). What do you mean my grade is not an A? An investigation of academic entitlement, causal attributions, and self regulation in college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, *67*(6-A), 2048.

Akers, R.L. (1997). *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaltuation (2ⁿᵈ ed.).* Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Alexander-Snow, M. (2004). Dynamics of gender, ethnicity, and race in understanding classroom incivility. *New directions for teaching and learning, 99,* 21-31.

Amada, G. (1994). *Coping with the disruptive student.* Asheville, N.C.: College Administration Publications.

American Psychiatric Association, (2000). *Quick reference to the diagnostic criteria from DSM-IV-TR.* Arlington, VA: APA.

Appleby, D.C. (1990). Faculty and student perceptions of irritating behaviors in the college classroom. *Journal of staff, program and organizational development, 8*, 41-46.

Aries, E. (1996). *Men and women in interaction: reconsidering the differences.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bentler, P.M. (1993). *EQS structural equations program manual.* Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.

Boice, R. (1996a). Classroom incivilities. *Research in higher education, 37*, 453-485.

Boice, R. (1996b). *First order principles for college teachers: Ten basic ways to improve the teaching process.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Bray, N.J. and Del Favero, M. (2004). Sociological explanations for faculty and student classroom incivilities. *New directions for teaching and learning, 99*, 9-19.

Braxton, J.M., and Bayer, A.E. (2004). Introduction: Faculty and student classroom improperties. *New direction for teaching and learning, 99*, 3-7.

Braxton J.M. & Mann, M.R. (2004). Incidence and student response to faculty teaching norm violations. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99.* 35-40.

Brophy, J.E., and Rohrkemper, M.M. (1981). The influence of problem ownership on teacher's perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73*(3), 295-311.

Brubacher, J. S. & Rudy, S. W. (1976). *Higher education in transition.* (3rd ed.) New York: Harper & Row.

Chowning, K. and Campbell, N.J. (2009). Development and Validation of Measures of Acadmeic Entitlement: Individual Differences in Students' Externalized Responsibility and Entitles Expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101,4, 928-997.*

Ciani, K., Summers, J., Easter, M. (2008). Gender Differences in Academic Entitlement Among College Students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology. 169, 4, 332-344.*

Clift, E. (2011). From students, a misplaced sense of entitlement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* retrieved March 30, 2011 from http://chronicle.com/article/Students-Should-Check-Their/126890/.

Dorn, R.M. (1988). Entitlement: Some developmental perspectives. In V.D. Volkan & T.C. Rodgers (Eds.), *Attitudes of entitlement: Theoretical and clinical issues*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Emmons, R.A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11-17.

Fassinger, P.A. (1995). Understanding classroom interaction: students' and professors' contributions to students' silence. *The Journal of Higher Education, 66*(1), 82-96.

Feldmann, L.J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College teaching, 49*(4), 137-140.

Flanagan, (1954). Critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 1-33.

Freud. S. (1914). On narcissism: An introduction. *Standard Edition, 12*, 213-226.

Foster, J.D., Campbell, W.K., & Twenge, J.M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 469-486.

Gravetter, F.J., & Wallnau, L.B. (2009). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences, 8th ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., Farruggua, S. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational forces. *Youth Adolescence, 37,* 1193-1204.

Graham, S., & Weiner, B. (1996). Theories and principles of motivation. In D.C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Goodyear, R, Reynolds, P., & Gragg, J.B. (2010, May). *University faculty experiences of classroom incivilities: a critical incident study.* Paper presented at the annual American Education Research Association, Denver, CO.

Hirschy, A.S. and Braxton, J.M. (2004). Effects of student classroom incivilities on students. *New directions for teaching and learning, 99*, 67-76.

Hirshi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Homans, G.C. (1974). *Social behavior: its elementary forms (revised ed.).* Orlando: Harcourt.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.

Indiana University Center for Survey Research (2000). A survey on academic incivility at

    Indiana University: Preliminary Report.

    http://www.indiana.edu/~csr/civilityPreReport.pdf (accessed March 13, 2011).

Kelln, B. R. (1997). Construction and validation of a self-report measure of exaggerated

    deservingness: The XD21. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The*

    Sciences and Engineering, Vol 59(12-B), p. 6510.

Kearny & Plax (1992). In Richmand and McCrosky (eds) Power in the Classroom.

Kerr, N. J. (1985). *Behavioral manifestations of misguided entitlement. Perspectives*

    in Psychiatric Care, 1, 5-15.

Kohut, H. (1966). Forms and transformations of narcissism. *Journal of the American*

    Psychoanalytic Association, 14, 243-272. Raskin, R.N., & Hall, C.S. (1979). A

    narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.

Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social

    comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group memberships. In M.P. Zanna

    (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 26*, (pp. 293-355). San Diego,

    CA: Academic Press.

McKinne, M. (2008). A quantitative and qualitative inquiry into classroom incivility in

    higher education. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, United

    States -- Missouri. Retrieved April 25, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full

    Text.(Publication No. AAT 3371082).

Mellor, J.K. (2009a). *The relationship between narcissism and sensitivity to criticism among college students*. Unpublished manuscript.

Mellor, J.K. (2009b). *College students and their use of technology: is cyberbullying an issue?* Unpublished manuscript.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social Structure and anomie. *American Sociological review, 3*, 672-682.

Michaels, J.W., and Miethe, T.D. (1989). Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating. *Social Science Quarterly, 70*(4), 870-885.

Nilson, L.B., and Jackson, N.S. (June, 2004). Combating classroom misconduct (incivility) with bills of rights. Paper presented at the International Consortium for Educational Development Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Ophir, E., Nass, C., & Wagner, A.D. (2009). Cognitive control in media multitaskers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(37), p. 15583-15587. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0903620106

Ousley, M., Cook Francis, L., Antonellis, J., & Basij, S. (2006, January). *Postmodernism orDiversity Diluted? Findings from the Millennial Student Project*. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Conference of ASHE, Anaheim, CA.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2011). Overcoming the 'rattle effect'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(26).

Raskin, R.N., & Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890-902.

Rosenbaum, R.M. (1972). *A dimensional analysis of the perceived causes of success and failure*. Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 33(10-B), 5040.

Siedman, A. (2005). The learning killer: disruptive student behavior in the classroom. *Reading Improvement, 42*, 40-46.

Spiegel, R. (1987). Reflections on entitlement and idealization. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 23(2)*, 272-277.

SPSS for Windows, Rel. 16.0. 2007. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Twale, D.J., & DeLuca, B.M. (2008). *Faculty Incivility. The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to do About It.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Thorndike, E.L. (1923). *Education: A First Book*. New York: Macmillan Co.

Trzensiewski, K.H, Donnellan, M.B, Robins, R.W. (2008). Do today's young people really think they are so extraordinary? *Psychological Science, 19*(2), 181-188.

Twale, D.J., & DeLuca, B.M. (2008). *Faculty Incivility. The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to do About It.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Twenge, J.M. (2000). The age of anxiety? Birth cohort change in anxiety and

    neuroticism, 1952-1993. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 1007-

    1021.

Twenge, J.M. (2006). *Generation Me: Why today's young Americans are more confident,*

    assertive, entitled-and more miserable than ever before. New York: Free Press.

Twenge, J.M., & Campbell, W.K. (2001). Age and birth cohort differences in self-

    esteem: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology*

    Review, 5, 321-344.

Twenge, J.M., Konrath, S., Foster, J.D., Campbell, W.K., & Bushman, B.J. (in press).

    Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic

    Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality*

Volkan, V. D., & Rodgers, T. C. (Eds.). (1988). *Attitudes of entitlement:*

    Theoretical and clinical issues. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Watson, P.J., Little, T., & Biderman, M.D. (1992). Narcissism and Parenting Styles.

    Psychoanalytic Psychology, 9, 231-244.

Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of*

    Educational Psychology, 71, 3-25.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York:

    Springer-Verlag.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research.* Newbury

    Park, CA: Sage.

Weiner, B (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an

    attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 12*(1), 1-13.

Weiner, B (2005). Motivation from an attribution perspective and the social psychology

    of perceived competence. In A.J. Elliot & C.S. Dweck (Eds), *Handbook of*

    competence and motivation (pp. 73-84). New York: Guilford Press.

White, J.M, & Klein, D.M. (2002). The social exchange and choice framework. In J.M.

    White & D.M. Kein (Eds.), *Family theories* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

    61(4), 590-597.