

2015

Self-Control, Self-Efficacy, and Work Ethic as Potential Factors in Entitlement in Adolescents

Janine Shalka
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Janine Shalka

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Maxwell Rainforth, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Vincent Fortunato, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Rolande Murray, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2015

Abstract

Self-Control, Self-Efficacy, and Work Ethic as Potential Factors in Entitlement in
Adolescents

by

Janine R. Shalka

MES, University of Alberta, 2006

BEd, University of Alberta, 1989

BSc, University of Alberta, 1979

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Psychology

Walden University

August 2015

Abstract

Narcissism has increased in the past 3 decades. Entitlement is a component of narcissism, and substantial research indicates that entitlement is associated with negative behaviors such as aggression, relationship conflict, incivility, and unreasonable expectations in the workplace, learning environments, and relationships. Despite such findings, factors such as self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy that might explain the variance in entitlement in adolescents has received little investigation. Social cognitive theory indicates that continuous reciprocal relationships exist between personal, behavioral, and environmental factors. The study employed cross-sectional survey research to gather data from 118 students in Grades 10, 11, and 12 in the United States. A multiple regression was used to investigate whether each of self-control, as measured by the Self-Control Scale; work ethic, as measured by the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile–Short Form; and self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale, explained unique variance in the criterion variable entitlement, as measured by the Psychological Entitlement Scale, and a correlational analysis was used to examine the relationships between the variables. Self-control and work ethic displayed statistically significant negative correlations with entitlement, and each explained unique variance in entitlement. Self-efficacy was not a predictor of entitlement. The findings indicate that parents, teachers, and practitioners should design interventions aimed to increase work ethic and increase self-control to curb entitlement and its negative effects.

Self-Control, Self-Efficacy, and Work Ethic as Potential Factors in Entitlement in

Adolescents

by

Janine R. Shalka

MES, University of Alberta, 2006

BEd, University of Alberta, 1989

BSc, University of Alberta, 1979

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2015

Dedication

I dedicate this project to my family—to my four amazing children, and in memory of my husband who began this journey with me but could not be there to the end.

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my chair Dr. Maxwell Rainforth. Your wisdom, expertise, and unwavering encouragement made this journey possible. To Dr. Vincent Fortunato, thank you for serving as my committee member and for your valuable advice, meticulous editing, and support.

To my children—Tricia, Matthew, Jason, and Drew—I could not have done this without your love and support. For all the times I didn't think I could continue and you pushed me, thank you. You are the loves of my life.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Problem Statement.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions and Hypotheses	8
Conceptual Framework.....	9
Nature of the Study.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
Assumptions.....	12
Limitations	13
Delimitations.....	13
Significance of the Study	13
Summary.....	14
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	15
Introduction.....	15
Literature Search Strategy.....	16
Narcissism and Entitlement	16
Narcissism.....	16
Entitlement.....	24

Etiological Data	27
Research Related to the Hypotheses of the Proposed Study.....	29
Self-control	29
Work Ethic	34
Self-efficacy	36
Conclusion	38
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	40
Introduction.....	40
Research Design and Approach	40
Setting and Sample	41
Population and Sample	41
Instrumentation	42
Self-Control Scale.....	43
General Self-Efficacy Scale.....	43
Work Ethic Scale	44
Psychological Entitlement Scale.....	45
Data Collection	46
Data Analysis	47
Threats to Validity	49
Protection of Human Participants	50
Dissemination of Findings	50
Summary.....	50

Chapter 4: Results	52
Introduction.....	52
Sample Characteristics.....	52
Hypothesis Testing.....	55
Summary	60
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	62
Introduction.....	62
Interpretation of Findings	63
Hypotheses 1	63
Hypothesis 2.....	64
Hypothesis 3.....	64
Hypothesis 4.....	64
Implications.....	65
Methodological Implications	65
Theoretical Implications	67
Practical Implications.....	71
Limitations of the Study.....	73
Recommendations for Future Research	73
Implications for Positive Social Change.....	77
Conclusion	77
References.....	79
Appendix A: Parent Consent	97

Appendix B: Student Consent.....	98
Appendix C:Protecting Human Research Participants	99

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Self-control, Work Ethic, Self-efficacy, and Entitlement	55
Table 2. Intercorrelations for Self-control, Work Ethic, Self-efficacy, and Entitlement Scores	57
Table 3. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Coefficients for Predictor Variables of Entitlement in Adolescents	58

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The construct of narcissism, which appears in clinical, personality, and social psychology, is used to describe a cluster of behaviors characterized by inflated self-importance, unreasonable expectations of others' automatic compliance, and general rudeness or arrogance (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Narcissistic traits in nonclinical populations have been reported to be increasingly prevalent in U.S. society and have negative consequences for both the individual and others (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008). Although the construct of narcissism has garnered more research than the individual components of narcissism have, the component of entitlement has been linked to multiple negative consequences, such as aggression and incivility, in the workplace, colleges, and personal relationships (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004; Harvey & Martinko, 2009; Lippmann, Bulanda, & Wagenaar, 2009). Entitlement is characterized by arrogance, self-grandiosity, unreasonable expectations, and incivility (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002; Lessard, Greenberger, Chen, & Farruggia, 2011). Given that entitlement has been identified as one of only two components of narcissism most closely related to aggression, it is important to understand more about the construct of entitlement (Reidy, Zeichner, Foster, & Martinez, 2008). Although entitlement has been shown to be associated with negative traits and behaviors, researchers do not know the extent to which entitlement is related to self-control, self-efficacy, and work ethic in adolescents.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between self-control, self-efficacy, work ethic, and entitlement in adolescents, and investigate whether each of the predictor variables explained unique variance in entitlement. By investigating predictor variables of entitlement, I sought to provide information to guide the development of interventions to curb the rise of negative behaviors associated with entitlement. Because incivility and aggression have been shown to be associated with entitlement, interventions designed to decrease entitlement by addressing predictive factors could result in positive social change by increasing civility and compassion (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Reidy et al., 2008).

In this chapter, I provide a background for the study and present the problem statement, purpose, and research questions and hypotheses. I summarize the conceptual framework and discuss assumptions, limitations, and delimitations. The chapter closes with a discussion of the significance of the study and its applicability to social change.

Background

The negative nature of narcissism and its numerous associated features and disorders is captured by its classification as a Cluster B personality disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Narcissistic personality disorder is prevalent in less than 1% of the general population, but the behaviors accompanying it are enduring, pervasive, and inflexible, and although the prevalence of a clinical diagnosis is relatively low, an alarming trend in nonclinical narcissism is occurring (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). A meta-analysis based on 85 samples, spanning from 1982 to 2006, indicated that narcissism scores in college students increased 0.33 standard deviations (Twenge et al.,

2008). Twenge and Foster (2010) updated the original meta-analysis by incorporating an additional 22 samples spanning 2006 to 2008 and indicated that narcissism scores in college students had increased by 0.37 standard deviations between 1982 and 2008 after factoring in the additional studies. The trend is disturbing for several reasons. Firstly, according to Twenge and Campbell (2009), narcissism is increasing and “Americans have become inured” (p. 8) to the negative behaviors associated with narcissism. Secondly, narcissism has been linked to numerous negative outcomes for both the individuals who have exhibited increased narcissism traits as well as others who are affected by their behaviors (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Finally, when individuals observe increasing traits of narcissism in others and perceive that there are benefits associated with those behaviors, the possibility exists that they too may engage behaviors consistent with narcissism, thus increasing the overall rate of narcissism in the population (Bandura, 1965; Fisk, 2010).

Entitlement is a component of narcissism that captures the grandiose and arrogant self-view the individual holds, which aligns with their expectation that others should give in to their oftentimes unreasonable demands (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Lessard et al., 2011). The sense of grandiosity and unreasonable expectations that individuals exhibiting entitlement hold has been proposed to be based on an unrealistic view of the self (Hotchkiss, 2002). Fisk (2010) proposed that individuals rated high in entitlement subscribe to an attitude that is summarized by getting what they want, when they want it. Entitlement has been proposed to be a stable construct of personality that has a global influence on behaviors (Campbell et al., 2004; Harvey & Martinko, 2009).

Fisk referred to entitlement as a social issue. Like the broader construct of narcissism, research has indicated that the component of entitlement is accompanied by numerous negative effects, such as aggression and unreasonable expectations, in multiple contexts (Campbell et al., 2004; Harvey & Martinko, 2009; Lippmann et al., 2009).

According to Lippmann et al. (2009), college instructors have experienced an increase in student incivility. Examples include situations in which students use technological devices for entertainment during lectures, arrive late to and leave early from class, and expect high grades for work that is of poor quality. Professors are not viewed as the authority figures they once were, and their students challenge and demand higher marks, displaying confrontational or aggressive behaviors when their demands are not met (Campbell et al., 2004; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Lippmann et al. 2009). The grandiosity and expectation of favorable outcomes is in contrast to actual abilities or efforts, and Twenge, Campbell, and Gentile (2012) found that although students rated themselves above average on ability, objective measures did not support their claims.

In addition to entitlement being linked with negative behaviors in educational environments, entitlement has also been associated with negative behaviors in the workplace and in personal relationships. Research has indicated that in a workplace environment, entitlement has been positively associated with turnover intent and conflict with supervisors, and it has been negatively associated with job satisfaction (Harvey & Martinko, 2009). Fisk (2010) proposed that individuals' increased entitlement would likely predict an increased likelihood for the engagement of counterproductive work behaviors aimed to harm individuals in the workplace or bring harm to the organization

itself. Fisk cautioned that if negative behaviors associated with entitlement are rewarded in the workplace, people could expect an increase in such behaviors. Entitlement has been associated with decreased empathy and perspective taking, less accommodation, less respect for partners, and increased disagreeableness in personal relationships (Campbell et al., 2004; Holtzman, Vazire, & Mehl, 2010).

Self-control encompasses a set of skills that begin to develop in early childhood and refers to control over emotions, behaviors, and attention (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Increased self-control has been associated with numerous benefits and identified as an important factor for personal well-being (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004). Individuals displaying entitlement have been found to react to failure or ego threats with increased emotional reactivity and aggression, indicative of low self-control (Campbell et al., 2004; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Winstok, 2009). Given that delay of gratification can be measured as young as 18 months and is positively correlated with self-control, it is conceptually appealing to investigate a temporal relationship of self-control with entitlement (Sethi, Mischel, Aber, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 2000). An indulgent parenting style overly concerned with raising self-esteem in children has negative effects on the development of self-control, and this coincides with one of the parenting styles thought to encourage entitlement (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Self-control was investigated as a predictor variable for the criterion variable of entitlement.

The rise in narcissism has reportedly been accompanied by a decrease in work ethic in the workplace, in colleges, and in high schools, and the value of hard work being virtuous in itself is declining (Twenge, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Work ethic is

a stable attitude that provides internal motivation to strive for achievement, and adolescence is an important time period for development of work ethic (Story, Stasson, Mahoney, & Hart, 2008; terBogt, Raaijmakers, & van Wel, 2005). Work ethic has historically played a large role in the American Dream, but Twenge and Campbell (2009) proposed that the current ethic of self-admiration is in contrast to the value of hard work. It would seem logical that if individuals are not equating hard work with achieving goals and rewards, they would be inclined to display entitled behaviors, such as bullying, to get what they want. I investigated work ethic as a predictor variable for entitlement in this study.

Self-efficacy is a mechanism of agency and is the belief in one's ability to achieve success in specific domains (Bandura, 2002; Devonport & Lane, 2006; Schunk & Hanson, 1985). Increased self-efficacy has been linked to numerous positive behaviors including initiating behavior, effort expended, persistence, resilience, and high life satisfaction (Proctor, Linley, & Maltby, 2010; Suldo & Huebner, 2006). Self-efficacy has been reported to be a consistent predictor of life satisfaction, as well as a reliable indicator of students dropping out of school, and it is important to investigate its relationships to other variables in adolescents (Devonport & Lane, 2006; Proctor et al., 2010). Experiencing success or mastery is considered the most important means of developing self-efficacy, but if adolescents do not experience success by engaging positive behaviors to realize outcomes and develop self-efficacy, it is plausible they may default to behaviors linked with entitlement, such as demanding or bullying, to get what they want (Washburn & Paskar, 2011). Boswell (2012) reported that self-efficacy

predicted academic entitlement in college students, and concluded that the study provided preliminary evidence that academic entitlement was entrenched in students prior to college. My study extended the research on self-efficacy as a predictor of entitlement to the adolescent population. Along with self-control and work ethic, I investigated self-efficacy as a predictor variable for the criterion variable of entitlement.

This study investigated the relationship between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement. No study has examined whether self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy each explain unique variance in entitlement in nonclinical adolescents.

Problem Statement

Entitlement has been linked with numerous negative outcomes, such as aggression, conduct problems, and incivility (Barry, Frick, Adler, & Grafeman, 2007; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002). Hence, the substantial rise in entitlement since the 1980s reported by Twenge et al. (2008) is a cause for concern, a sentiment captured when Fisk (2010) referred to the rise in entitlement as a social issue. Although previous research has established relationships between several variables in this study, no study has examined whether self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy as predictor variables explain unique variance for the criterion variable of entitlement in nonclinical adolescents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy (predictor variables) and entitlement (the criterion variable) in the population of nonclinical adolescents. A second purpose was to investigate whether

each of the predictor variables explained unique variance in entitlement. Bandura (1999) indicated that it is through the discovery of key mechanisms and determinants of behaviors that personal and social change can be enacted. Determining whether self-control, self-efficacy, and work ethic are predictor variables of entitlement would inform practices of parents and professionals in their efforts to design interventions to curb entitlement.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Quantitative, cross-sectional survey research was conducted to investigate the variables of self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in adolescents.

Research question: Are self-control (predictor variable), work ethic (predictor variable), and self-efficacy (predictor variable) related to entitlement (criterion variable) in adolescents?

H_01 : Among adolescents, self-control (as measured by the Self-Control Scale [SCS]) is not related to entitlement (as measured by the Psychological Entitlement Scale [PES]).

H_A1 : Among adolescents, self-control (as measured by the SCS) will be related to entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_02 : Among adolescents, work ethic (as measured by the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile–Short Form [MWEP-SF]) is not related to entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_A2 : Among adolescents, work ethic (as measured by the MWEP-SF) will be related to entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_03 : Among adolescents, self-efficacy (as measured by the General Self-efficacy Scale [GSE]) is not related to entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_A3 : Among adolescents, self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE) will be related to entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_04 : Among adolescents, self-control (as measured by the SCS), work ethic (as measured by the Multidimensional MWEP-SF), and self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE) will not each explain unique variance in entitlement (as measured by the PES).

H_A4 : Among adolescents self-control (as measured by the SCS), work ethic (as measured by the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile–Short Form: MWEP-SF), and self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE) will each explain unique variance in entitlement (as measured by the PES).

Conceptual Framework

According to social cognitive theory, continuous reciprocal interactions occur between behavioral, personal, and environmental factors (Bandura, 1978, 2002). Bandura (2001) proposed that individuals possess the capacity to control their thoughts, actions, affect, and motivation through exercise of personal agency, and that self-efficacy is a mechanism of agency. According to Bandura (1991, 2002), individuals' level of self-efficacy affects the choices they make, their persistence at tasks, and their goal-setting behaviors. In this study, the relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement was investigated. In social cognitive theory, personal factors encompass cognitive, affective, and biological factors, and in this study self-control, work ethic, and entitlement are

personal factors, with the assumption that they are constantly shaped by environmental interactions and displayed in behaviors (Bandura, 1999).

Bandura (1999) proposed that relatively rapid changes in human behavior can be explained by a potentialist view of nature, in which the environment prompts the trend because genetic changes proceed too slowly. In this study, it was assumed that entitlement has exhibited a relatively rapid change, and Twenge et al. (2008) also proposed that a reciprocal relationship likely existed between personality and culture. Twenge and Foster (2010) concluded that the results of their study supported the notion that cultural changes affect personality. In this study, I assumed that societal conditions have affected cognitive beliefs and attitudes, and I isolated the personal factors of self-control and work ethic, along with self-efficacy as the mechanism of personal agency, and examined their relationship with entitlement. My assumption was based on Bandura's (1965) proposed continuous reciprocal interactions between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental factors. Fisk (2010) proposed that as individuals view entitlement in others and perceive that there are benefits associated with entitlement, they too may adopt similar behaviors. Fisk's proposal aligns with Bandura (1965, 1977), because Bandura proposed that modeling was an important means for learning new behaviors.

The notion of entitlement is based on its conceptualization in the research literature on narcissism. The study of entitlement as an isolated component is relatively recent and sparse in comparison to its inclusion in the lengthy and rich history of narcissism (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Campbell et al. (2004)

made the assumption that entitlement was stable, pervasive, and reflected in behaviors when they developed a measure of entitlement (the PES). The model of narcissism proposed by Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) blends nicely with Bandura's (1978, 2002) social cognitive theory because the model proposed by Morf and Rhodewalt integrates cognitive, social, affective, and motivational processes. Vazire and Funder's (2006) work on narcissism and their proposal that self-control be considered in models of narcissism and given a prominent role served as the impetus for its inclusion as a variable in the study.

My study assumed that individuals exercised agency in the context of the society they live in, and that cognitive beliefs and attitudes predict related behaviors (Bandura, 1978, 1991, 2002). Chapter 2 will provide a more detailed explanation of the variables and the rationale for their inclusion in the study.

Nature of the Study

This quantitative study was guided by the research question and hypotheses based on a review of the literature. A survey design was used. Self-administered, close-ended questionnaires were administered using SurveyMonkey to collect and provide quantitative descriptions of the variables to conduct statistical analyses. Data were collected from Grade 10, 11, and 12 students attending high school from across the United States after Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was received. I computed correlations to examine the relationships between the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, and the criterion variable of entitlement. Further, I used a multiple regression analysis to examine whether each of the predictor variables explained

unique variance in entitlement. The statistical analyses were chosen because the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the variables and investigate whether each of the predictor variables explained unique variance in the criterion variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). A more detailed discussion of the research methods is provided in Chapter 3.

Definition of Terms

Entitlement: Grandiose and arrogant self-views held by an individual that may not be reflective of reality, and the expectation that others will automatically comply with one's demands (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Hotchkiss, 2002).

Self-control: A set of skills that enable an individual to control his or her emotions, behaviors, and attention (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998).

Self-efficacy: A mechanism of agency and the belief an individual holds regarding ability to achieve success in specific domains (Bandura, 2002).

Work ethic: A set of values encompassing beliefs in the benefit and importance of hard work and effort (Smrt & Karau, 2011).

Assumptions

The first assumption of the study was that the sample of adolescents was representative of the adolescent population attending high school in the United States. Secondly, it was assumed that the sample would answer the survey questions honestly, given that anonymity and confidentiality was ensured. The final assumption was that the instruments that used to measure the constructs of the study were valid and reliable.

Limitations

There are several limitations to the study. The sample used was relatively small, and the results may vary from those that would be obtained if a larger sample were utilized. Because the sample was taken from adolescents who are part of the SurveyMonkey Audience, it may not be generalizable or representative of populations with different demographics, such as those with limited Internet access. The study was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, so changes over time will not be known. Finally, the study was limited because it is correlational and inferences as to causality between the predictor variables and the criterion variable are restricted.

Delimitations

The delimitations of the study were that participation was delimited to adolescents in Grades 10, 11, and 12 from across the United States, and generalizability will be restricted to populations with similar characteristics.

Significance of the Study

Entitlement is rising and is accompanied by negative outcomes, including aggression, incivility, bullying behaviors, and weakened relationships (Hotchkiss, 2002; Lippmann et al., 2009; Reidy et al., 2008; Twenge et al., 2008). The study investigated the relationships between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in nonclinical adolescents. By examining these relationships, the information gained could be used by parents and professionals to guide interventions aimed at decreasing entitlement, which in turn could increase civility.

Summary

Entitlement has shown a substantial increase in the general population since the 1980s, and although it has been linked to numerous negative outcomes for individuals and society, its rise has gone relatively unchecked (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2008; Twenge & Foster, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008). This study was designed to isolate entitlement from the more extensively studied construct of narcissism, and investigate the relationships between self-control, self-efficacy, work ethic and entitlement.

In Chapter 2, I will provide an in-depth review of literature related to the variables in the study. In Chapter 3, I will describe the research design, method, procedures, and population. In Chapter 4, I will provide the data analyses, and in Chapter 5, I will discuss the data, summarize the findings, and discuss the limitations of the study. The implications for social change and recommendations for future research will be addressed.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Entitlement is a component of narcissism, and substantial research indicates that both have negative effects for society and the individual in multiple contexts, yet recent trends demonstrate an increase in narcissism and entitlement in nonclinical populations (Trzesniewski et al., 2008; Twenge & Foster, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008). According to Fisk (2010) entitlement is a social issue, yet information regarding predictor variables related to entitlement in adolescents is lacking. Self-control has previously been proposed to play a more prominent role in studies of narcissism, and work ethic has demonstrated correlations with entitlement (Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008; Vazire & Funder, 2006). Bandura (1999) proposed self-efficacy as a mechanism of personal agency, and because it was proposed to influence actions and motivations, self-efficacy seems to be theoretically related to entitlement. Boswell (2012) reported that academic self-efficacy has been shown to predict academic entitlement in college-aged students. In my study self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy were proposed as predictor variables of entitlement in nonclinical adolescents.

This literature review begins with definitions and a discussion of narcissism, given that entitlement has been drawn from the broader construct, followed by a discussion of entitlement in the context of social cognitive theory. The etiology of narcissism is then discussed, followed by sections discussing the adaptive value and relevance to this study of each of the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy.

Literature Search Strategy

I retrieved the literature up to fall 2013 using EBSCOhost databases such as PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, and Academic Search Premier as well as ScienceDirect. The search terms I used to locate the articles were: *narcissism, entitlement, work ethic, self-efficacy, self-control, self-regulation*, and combinations of the terms. Additionally, I conducted searches using the search terms in Google Scholar. As well, I searched for authors referred to in articles by name or article title. I reviewed books by Twenge (2006), Twenge and Campbell (2009), Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), and Baumeister and Tierney (2011) because the authors seemed particularly relevant to the topic, given that they had provided numerous contributions to the research on narcissism and self-control. Books by Cain (2012), Hotchkiss (2002), Barry, Kerig, Stellwagen, and Barry (2011), and Peterson and Seligman (2004) were included because they presented contemporary information on narcissism and related constructs. Statistical references included Field (2009), Mertler and Vannatta (2010), and Trochin (2008).

Narcissism and Entitlement

Narcissism

The construct of narcissism refers to a cluster of behaviors characterized by inflated self-importance, unreasonable expectation of others' automatic compliance, and general rudeness or arrogance (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Individuals who manifest these behaviors to the extent that they form an enduring pattern that deviates from the predominant culture across a range of contexts may be clinically diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder (NPD; American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

According to the DSM-IV-TR, the features of NPD include a grandiose sense of self-importance and entitlement, a general lack of empathy, and behaviors that include exaggerating achievements, expectations of favorable treatment, unquestioning compliance, and recognition beyond what achievements would indicate (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). In nonclinical populations, trait narcissism is measured by the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), and although based on characteristics described in the DSM-IV-TR, it is viewed as a continuous, rather than categorical, construct (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009; Raskin & Terry, 1988).

It has been further proposed that individuals displaying trait narcissism assume superiority despite objective measures indicating otherwise, and in their continuous quest to affirm their grandiosity, they adopt exploitative interpersonal orientations, often prepared to relinquish even their closest relationships (Zuckerman & O'Loughlin, 2009). The unrealistic view they hold of themselves and their constant attempts to bolster it is proposed to lead individuals with narcissistic traits to be overconfident, brag, take credit for others' accomplishments, blame, insult, and react to ego threats aggressively (Hotchkiss, 2002; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Twenge & Campbell, 2009; Vazire & Funder, 2006). Demanding behaviors and rage in response to frustrated entitlement have prompted references to the infantile nature of behaviors displayed by individuals with trait narcissism and the individuals' lack of emotional and moral development (Hotchkiss, 2002; Partridge, 1976). Expectations of favorable treatment and automatic compliance, without concern for others, are proposed to extend beyond personal

relationships to a disregard for social constraints and authority (Hotchkiss, 2002).

Twenge and Campbell (2009) proposed that the symptoms of narcissism are widely present in society and are displayed in increased vanity, materialism, incivility, and cheating.

Conceptual foundation. Narcissism is a construct of clinical, personality, and social psychology. The theoretical construct is attributed to Freud, who captured the egocentric and aggressive nature of the narcissistic individual, a characterization that reflected an individual who was relatively high-functioning (Miller & Campbell, 2008). A divergent conceptualization in the clinical tradition describes narcissistic individuals as employing defensive patterns and displaying fragile self-esteem, and some of the confusion with the construct of narcissism is attributed to the two divergent conceptualizations in their psychodynamic roots: one indicating high functioning and one indicating distress (Miller & Campbell, 2008). In writing on the psychoanalytic tradition, Britton (2004) acknowledged that the term narcissism is used in multiple ways, adding it may also refer to an innate personality tendency that inhibits individuals from developing relationships outside the self.

Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) proposed the dynamic self-regulatory processing model of narcissism, also referred to as the social-cognitive processing model or the cognitive-affective processing model. The dynamic self-regulatory processing model of narcissism seems to apply Bandura's (1978, 1999) broader social cognitive theory to the study of narcissism. Similar to Bandura's proposed continuous reciprocal interactions between behavior, personal, and environmental factors, Morf and Rhodewalt's model

assumed the integration of cognitive, social, affective, and motivational processes, which are employed in the service of the narcissist's insatiable quest for confirmation of grandiosity (Vazire & Funder, 2006; Zuckerman & O'Loughlin, 2009). Borrowing from clinical, social, and personality psychology, the widely accepted model proposed by Morf and Rhodewalt integrates dispositional and processing approaches to narcissism in an attempt to reconcile the paradox whereby narcissists often destroy the relationships they depend on for affirmation of their grandiosity. The model proposes the existence of an internal logic to the seemingly self-defeating actions of narcissists who engage cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to bolster and defend their grandiose self-concept (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).

Although acknowledging the wide acceptance of the dynamic self-regulatory processing model, Vazire and Funder (2006) questioned its reliance on conscious cognitive processes that imply the strategic engagement of behaviors. Instead, Vazire and Funder proposed that the dynamic self-regulatory processing model should include a dispositional lack of self-control, which would offer a more parsimonious explanation for narcissists' self-defeating behaviors than Morf and Rhodewalt's (2001) model. Self-control is often used interchangeably with self-regulation in the psychological literature; however, self-control is not synonymous with the term self-regulation when used in the dynamic self-regulatory processing model. In Morf and Rhodewalt's model, self-regulation is specifically applied to the process of strategic use of social interactions to validate identity or gain self-admiration, and employment of intrapersonal processes such as biased interpretations, selective attention, and selective recall in response to

unfavorable feedback. According to Vazire and Funder (2006), the constructs of impulsivity and self-control are used interchangeably in research and the literature. Vazire and Funder's meta-analysis of clinical, personality, and social psychology research indicated a statistically significant positive correlation between impulsivity and narcissism in 21 of 23 correlations taken from 10 independent samples, and they concluded that impulsivity should be included in narcissism studies.

Early empirical research on narcissism reported that impulsivity was one of the characteristics commonly displayed by narcissists, yet the DSM-IV-TR does not include impulsivity or lack of self-control in the diagnostic criteria for NPD, nor does the dynamic self-regulatory processing model incorporate lack of self-control (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). An early study by the authors of the NPI found a statistically significant negative correlation between narcissism and self-control, which prompted them to propose that narcissism include impulsivity as a defining characteristic, yet this has not been the case (Raskin & Terry, 1988; Vazire & Funder, 2006).

Further support for the consideration and inclusion of self-control in understanding narcissism has come from other studies, such as the finding that individuals displayed an increase in narcissistic responses when their self-regulation resources were depleted (Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005). The results seem consistent with Paulhus and Levitt's (1987) study, which reported that self-control was required to override individuals' natural tendency to self-enhance. If, as these studies indicated, self-enhancement is a natural tendency that is curbed by engaging self-control

mechanisms, then it would seem logical that individuals' development of self-control would be paramount to decreasing their tendency to self-enhance and an important inclusion for studies of narcissism or components of narcissism.

Damaging effects. The negative effects of narcissism to both the individual and others in relationships, the workplace, and society are well documented. Campbell and Campbell (2009) proposed that narcissism takes a negative toll on relationships because individuals involved with narcissists are subjected to interpersonal exploitation, and narcissists themselves suffer in the long term. Holtzman et al. (2010) proposed that individuals displaying narcissistic traits have difficulty maintaining relationships over time, and as the relationships move to the enduring zone where the initial sizzle has worn off, the narcissistic individuals find themselves socially rejected despite initial likeability. Healthy and enduring relationships require reciprocity between individuals, but narcissists are unable to reciprocate due to their exploitative tendencies and instead find themselves constantly searching for new individuals to engage (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Individuals with an inflated self-view are reported to exaggerate their sense of peer acceptance, inflate self-views, and employ self-serving bias in response to social rejection, but there is no indication that they experience well-being or the absence of negative effects (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; Hughes, Cavell, & Grossman, 1997). In romantic relationships, individuals high in narcissism have been reported to be poor long term partners because their game-playing style undermines their commitment to their partner, thereby damaging their relationship, and they oftentimes choose partners

solely because the partner will admire them or make them look good (Campbell et al., 2002; Jonason et al., 2009).

In the workplace, both narcissism and entitlement have been shown to be negatively related to coworker relationships; however, similar to the trend in personal relationships, there is evidence of short-term benefits in the early stages of relationships (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Harvey & Martinko, 2009). Tendencies of narcissists to brag, blame, and take credit for accomplishments are proposed to undermine the collective efforts of others in the workplace (Hotchkiss, 2002). Collins (2001) reported that the greatest companies have been led by individuals described as humble and modest, yet Cain (2012) proposed that companies continue to revere and promote those who unabashedly self-promote, often with negative long-term effects for the companies.

Narcissism has consistently been reported to be positively correlated with anger and aggression, displaying stability by age 8, with earlier development of aggression the most severe and persistent (Ang & Yusof, 2005; Barry, Thompson, et al., 2007; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). The hostile and aggressive manner in which narcissists are proposed to respond to self-perceived ego threats, criticism, and social rejection is well documented (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Bushman and Baumeister (2002) found that narcissism predicted violence and aggression, and that a combination of narcissism and a perceived insult led to the greatest aggression. Narcissism was reported to predict delinquency; exhibitionism, exploitativeness, and entitlement contributed in a statistically significant and unique manner to conduct problems in children and adolescents (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007).

Juneman (2013) proposed that individuals high in narcissism may view the environment from a position of what it can provide to them to further their interests and needs. A path analysis indicated that narcissism predicted environmental apathy through the engagement of a competitive worldview (Juneman, 2013). Twenge, Campbell, and Freeman (2012) concurred, with research indicating that increased narcissism was linked with lower levels of concern about social problems, less interest in efforts to conserve energy, and less interest in green actions.

Sandstrom (2011) proposed that narcissism has been related to aggression, conduct problems, overestimation of competence, and bullying in children. According to Barry, Grafeman, Bader, and Davis (2011), narcissistic traits were associated with risk-taking behaviors, as well as drug use and delinquency in adolescents. It would be logical that engagement in negative behaviors such as drug use, delinquency, and aggression in youth, would have long-term negative consequences for the individuals. Additionally, narcissism's negative effects are proposed to reach far beyond the individual, and others suffer the consequences, oftentimes more so than the individual with narcissism, leading Twenge (2013) to refer to narcissism's consequences as being "almost always negative" (p. 13).

Prevalence. Twenge et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 85 samples from 1982 to 2006 and reported that narcissism scores in nonclinical college students had increased 0.33 standard deviations. Further research by Twenge and Foster (2010) incorporated 22 additional samples that spanned the years 2006 to 2008 and reported narcissism scores had increased 0.37 standard deviations from 1982 to 2008. Not only did

the additional data show a continued increase, but Twenge and Foster demonstrated that had the rate of change in students between 1994 and 2009 been extended back for the entire 25 years, it would have resulted in an increase of 0.62 standard deviations. Twenge and Campbell (2009) proposed that individualistic traits such as agency, assertiveness, and self-esteem have also shown an increase during the same time period as narcissism was shown to increase, and narcissism has been shown to be positively correlated with these individualistic traits. An increase in narcissism is also consistent with behaviors of college students, who according to Lippmann et al. (2009), question everything from prerequisite requirements to marks assigned in an increasingly aggressive manner, and display attitudes that seem to indicate grades assume more importance than learning. Substantial research over the last three decades supports the claim that narcissism rates are increasing (Barry & Wallace, 2010; Barry, Wallace, & Guelker, 2011; Lippmann et al., 2009; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Although challenging the widespread findings that overall measures of narcissism are increasing, Trzesniewski et al. (2008) reported that as measured by the NPI, the subscales of Entitlement, Exploitativeness, and Self-Sufficiency showed an increase. There is, therefore, consensus that entitlement has shown an increase in prevalence. Entitlement was isolated from narcissism for investigation in this study.

Entitlement

Entitlement is a component of narcissism and includes behaviors indicative of self-grandiosity, arrogance, and expectations of compliance to oftentimes unreasonable

demands (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Campbell et al. (2004) stated that they viewed psychological entitlement as stable, pervasive, and reflected in behaviors.

Researchers have shown that entitlement was negatively correlated with measures of agreeableness and conscientiousness, and positively correlated with rage, aggression, conduct problems, and lack of forgiveness (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002; Strelan, 2007). Reidy et al. (2008) reported that the narcissism subscales of Entitlement and Exploitativeness were most strongly associated with aggression when compared to other subscales of the NPI. Entitlement and Exploitativeness were reported to be the only two subscales on the NPI to predict immediate explosive acts of aggression in the presence of an ego threat (Reidy et al., 2008). Individuals with increased entitlement were found to view themselves as more deserving and more privileged than others (Campbell et al., 2004; Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The comparative aspect of entitlement is supported by Krizan and Bushman (2011), who reported that narcissism predicted the use of downward comparison processes and found that narcissists were more likely to perceive themselves as superior on attributes that are associated with status. Holtzman et al. (2010) reported on the daily behaviors of individuals with high levels of narcissism and indicated that those individuals who scored higher on the Entitlement and Exploitativeness components of the NPI exhibited more incidences of disagreeableness with others. Holtzman et al. concluded that the two facets of narcissism, namely Entitlement and Exploitativeness, were the most maladaptive when compared to other facets of the NPI. Moeller, Cracker, and Bushman (2009) found that relationship conflict and hostility were predicted by self-

image goals, which were in turn predicted by elevated scores on the Entitlement subscale of the NPI and the PES. Earlier findings by Bushman and Baumeister (2002) found that entitlement was related to interpersonal conflict and was responsible for maladaptive behavior more than other facets of narcissism. Strelan (2007) reported a negative relationship between narcissistic entitlement and forgiveness of others. Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, and Finkell (2004) proposed that expectations of special treatment and preoccupation with one's rights might account for entitlement being a distinct and robust predictor for unforgiveness.

Whereas nonentitled individuals base their expectations for praise and success on actual performance and results, entitled individuals were reported to expect rewards and preferential treatment even when effort and performance were lacking (Harvey & Martinko, 2009). In college-aged students, entitlement was expressed in expectations for high marks and special treatment even though minimal effort had been expended (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Greenberger et al., 2008). Twenge, Campbell, and Gentile (2012) found that although grades have increased, the amount of time students spent studying has decreased. Twenge, Campbell, and Gentile also reported that college students' objective scores, as reflected in SAT results, have decreased, but that students' self-evaluations of their abilities have increased. Previous research has indicated that entitlement has been identified as playing an important role in personality pathology and depletion of societal resources when investigated as a construct separate from narcissism (Bushman & Baumeister, 2002; Campbell et al., 2004; Chowning & Campbell, 2009). In a study examining academic entitlement in college students, Boswell (2012) concluded

that perceptions of entitlement have stabilized prior to college attendance, and their findings support investigation of entitlement in younger populations.

Etiological Data

Narcissism has been reported to be 59% genetic in origin (Vernon, Villani, Vickers, & Harris, 2008). Vernon et al. (2008) conducted their investigation on both monozygotic and dizygotic twins and used model-fitting analyses to determine the genetic contribution to narcissism. Bandura (1999) claimed that relatively rapid changes in personality are accounted for by non-hereditary factors. The relatively rapid rise in narcissism and entitlement prompted Twenge and Foster (2010) and Twenge et al. (2008) to propose that parenting and cultural influences have played roles in the rise in narcissism.

Researchers have found that permissive, authoritarian, and overindulgent parenting styles contribute to narcissism (Capron, 2004; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Ramsey, Watson, Biderman, & Reeves, 1996; Watson, Little, & Biderman, 1992). Although Barry, Frick, et al. (2007) reported a statistically significant relationship between negative parenting and maladaptive narcissism, they concluded that the developmental sequence by which emerging narcissism is related to negative parenting was not investigated in their study. Hotchkiss (2002) proposed that faulty parenting practices such as parental inconsistency, neglecting to set limits, unresponsiveness to the child's needs, or letting the child assume too much control, were responsible for the rise in narcissism.

Cultural influences have also been identified as contributing to narcissism. The self-esteem movement, with its focus on feeling good and receiving rewards without necessarily doing anything of value, has been proposed as a candidate to account for the rise in narcissism (Hotchkiss, 2002; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). According to Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, and Vohs (2003), the self-esteem movement rose in the 1970s and parents, teachers, and clinicians embraced the movement, because they had expected it would bring positive outcomes, although evidence since that time has shown it does not predict desirable behaviors. A review of studies led Baumeister et al. to propose that boosting students' self-esteem did not improve their academic performance or prevent them from taking drugs or drinking, but that the indiscriminate praise associated with boosting self-esteem might have resulted in promoting narcissism. Twenge and Foster (2004) proposed that other shared cultural influences likely caused the rise in both self-esteem and narcissism. Exposure to reality TV, celebrities, and social networking have also been identified as contributing to the rise in narcissism (Cain, 2012; Twenge et al., 2008). According to Bandura (1978), cultural influences likely affect individuals as they see others modeling behaviors and adopt the behaviors. The obsession with movie personalities, the notion of developing self-promotion skills, and the shift towards glorifying extraversion can be traced back to the 1920s (Cain, 2012). Beginning as early as the 1920s, changes in American culture represented a shift from a culture that valued virtuous character traits, such as honor, manners, and hard work to one that worshipped a gregarious, forceful, and self-selling personality (Cain, 2012).

Much of the developmental trajectory of narcissism remains unknown. As Barry, Thompson, et al. (2007) indicated, even when variables have been shown to relate to narcissism, how they do so has not been determined. Because narcissism consists of several components, it is possible that different components have different etiologies, and research examining the etiology of the components of narcissism is still needed.

Research Related to the Hypotheses of the Proposed Study

The purpose of my study was to determine the relationships between the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, and the criterion variable of entitlement in adolescents. Substantial direct and indirect evidence suggests that the three predictor variables are related to entitlement, but to my knowledge, no study has investigated the relationship between the variables of self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in nonclinical adolescents to determine if each of the predictor variables explains unique variance in entitlement. Examining the relationships of the predictor variables and the criterion variable of entitlement in nonclinical adolescents distinguished this study from past work.

In the following section, each of the variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy will be discussed, and previous research will be presented to support their theoretical inclusion as predictor variables of entitlement in this study.

Self-control

Self-control involves conscious efforts by individuals to alter their responses and refers to their ability to control desires and impulses relating to thoughts, emotions, behaviors, performance, and attention (Baumeister, 2012; Baumeister & Alquist, 2009;

Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Baumeister and Alquist (2009) considered self-control an adaptive and desirable trait, paying homage to its prominent position in the notion of civilized society. Self-control has been reported to be a cross-cultural character strength crucial to well-being, the pursuit of adaptive responses, and the attainment of personal goals (Duckworth, 2009; Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

Adaptive value. Self-control is proposed to override individuals' propensity to entitlement, and statistically significant correlations have been found between self-control and variables associated with entitlement (Baumeister & Tierney, 2011; Mischel, Shoda, & Peake, 1988; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Self-control has been identified as one of only two personal qualities that are shown to consistently predict positive outcomes, the other quality being intelligence (Baumeister & Tierney, 2011). Self-control has been significantly positively correlated with GPA, interpersonal skills, effortful control, school relationships, optimal emotional responses, and significantly negatively correlated with psychopathy and alcohol abuse (Tangney et al., 2004; Valiente, Lemery-Chalfant, Swanson, & Reiser, 2008). Substance use was inversely related to the ability to delay gratification in youth aged 14 to 22, and negatively correlated with behavioral and emotional self-control (Romer, Duckworth, Sznitman, & Park, 2010; Wills, Ainette, Stoolmiller, Givvons, & Shinar, 2008; Wills, Walker, Mendoza, & Ainette, 2006). Self-control has been reported to be positively related to peer affiliations, coping motives, and intimacy (Busch & Hofer, 2012; Wills et al., 2006). Busch and Hofer (2012) concluded that self-control is required for success in coping with challenges or change, and that when self-control is engaged, individuals experience well-being. Low self-control

presented a significant risk for a broad range of social and personal problems including relationship instability, chronic anxiety, financial difficulties, emotional instability, substance abuse, violence, decreased adherence to social norms, and crime (Baumeister & Tierney, 2011; DeBono, Shmueli, & Muraven, 2011; Tangney et al., 2004). Tangney et al. (2004) conducted tests for curvilinearity and reported that the tests failed to discover any negative effects associated with high self-control.

Stability and development. Researchers have investigated the stability of self-control. Sethi et al., (2000) reported that toddlers' (mean age = 17.56 months) ability to engage effective distraction strategies when separated from their mothers was predictive of effective strategies in delaying gratification in preschool (mean age = 4 years 10 months). Delay of gratification time in preschool was in turn positively correlated with social and academic competence, attentiveness, and ability to deal with frustration and stress when the individuals were adolescents a decade later (Mischel et al., 1988). Further testing at decade intervals has indicated that for the participants in the original study, the time for delay-of-gratification has continued to be positively correlated with social, cognitive, and mental health outcomes later in life (Mischel et al., 2011).

Trends. According to Twenge, Zhang, and Im (2004), an external locus of control should be negatively correlated with self-control. Twenge et al. (2004) conducted a meta-analysis and found that scores of locus of control became more external by .82 SD in samples between 1960 and 2002 (Twenge et al., 2004). If external locus of control and self-control are negatively correlated, and scores on external locus of control have reportedly increased, then it would be reasonable to propose generational differences in

self-control. The time period for which Twenge et al. (2004) reported an increase in external locus of control (1960 to 2002) precedes the time period in which Twenge et al. (2008) reported narcissism scores increased (1982 to 2006). This seems to support the investigation of self-control as a predictor variable of entitlement.

Relationship to entitlement. As early as the inception of the NPI, the Entitlement subscale was reported to capture a lack of self-control, a point more recently reiterated by Vazire and Funder (2006) in their argument to consider a prominent role for self-control in narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988).

Narcissism, entitlement, and self-control have been shown to be associated with multiple similar variables. Narcissism and entitlement have displayed positive correlations with conduct problems and personality pathology, and self-control has displayed negative correlations with conduct problems and personality pathology (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Karterud, 2010; Pryor, Miller, & Gaughan, 2008). Statistically significant positive correlations were reported among impulsivity, narcissism, and Machiavellianism (Kerig & Stellwagen, 2010; Winstok, 2009). Rose (2007) reported a positive correlation between narcissism and compulsive behavior, and a negative correlation between self-control and compulsive behavior. Campbell and Campbell (2009) proposed that narcissism negatively impacted interpersonal relationships, and Valiente et al. (2008) reported that self-control was positively correlated with relationships.

Researchers conducted studies to investigate aggression, and have indicated that ego threats provoke increased emotional reactivity and anger in narcissistic individuals,

particularly in reactive aggression, suggesting a lack of self-control (Barry, Thompson, et al., 2007; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). DeWall, Baumeister, Stillman, and Gailliot (2007) reported that when the capacity for self-control was depleted, aggression increased, especially when individuals had low trait self-control. The depletion of self-control removed restraints that would prevent aggression, but depletion did not give rise to aggression (DeWall et al., 2007). Spector (2011) concurred and proposed that self-control was a personality construct that played an inhibitory role and that self-control included aspects beyond impulsivity.

Lack of self-control was assigned a prominent role in Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime, in which they claimed that given equal opportunity, individuals with low levels of self-control would be more likely to engage in criminal or deviant behaviors. Gottfredson and Hirschi's definition of crime included an aspect of self-interest, and terms such as self-serving, impulsive, and hedonistic used to describe the character of crime seem to overlap with conceptions of entitlement.

Although correlations exist between narcissism, entitlement, self-control, and similar variables, to my knowledge no study has examined the relationship between self-control as a predictor variable of entitlement in nonclinical adolescents. The early development of behaviors predictive of self-control in individuals, the societal trend of increasing external locus of control and its relationship with self-control, and relationships with similar variables warrants investigating self-control as a predictor variable of entitlement (Sethi et al., 2000; Twenge et al., 2004).

Work Ethic

Work ethic refers to a set of values that encompass individuals' beliefs in the benefit and importance of hard work, persistence, and effort, that provides internal motivation to strive for achievement (Smrt & Karau, 2011; Story et al., 2008).

Predictors and prevalence. Socialization at an early age plays a prominent role in the development of work ethic, particularly between mothers and their children, with evidence of stability across adolescence and young adulthood (Furnham, 1987; terBogt et al., 2005). Furnham (1987) conducted a multiple regression to examine predictors of work ethic and reported that internal locus of control was the best predictor ($\beta = 0.32$), followed by powerful others ($\beta = 0.15$), education ($\beta = -0.13$), conservatism ($\beta = 0.17$), and postponement of gratification ($\beta = 0.10$). Given Furnham's finding that internal locus of control predicted work ethic, and the previous discussion that scores on external locus of control have increased since 1960, it seems logical that work ethic has decreased, and this seems to be the case (Furnham, 1987; Twenge et al., 2004). In fact, Twenge (2010) reviewed studies regarding generational differences in work ethic and concluded that younger generations are less likely to value work for its own sake, and that they consistently express a weaker work ethic. Comparing measures of work values taken in 1974 to those taken in 1999, Smola and Sutton (2002) reported that generational differences in work were statistically significant between individuals born 1965-1977 (Gen X-ers) and those born 1946-1964 (Baby Boomers). Gen X-ers were found to be increasingly oriented to the self, expected promotions more quickly, and were less likely to consider work as an important part of their life (Smola & Sutton, 2002). The

orientation to self and expectation of quicker promotions fits nicely with accepted descriptors of entitlement. Smola and Sutton reported that in 1999, Baby Boomers indicated that work was not as important to their life. Not only did the younger generation view work differently than previous generations, but the findings supported the notion that societal views and culture shape the viewpoints and behaviors of all generations at a specific point in time (Smola & Sutton, 2002).

Relationship to Entitlement. The trend of decreasing work ethic seems to parallel the recent trend of increasing narcissism in college students, and research has indicated that academic entitlement in college students was negatively correlated to work orientation (Greenberger et al., 2008). It seems logical that if work ethic displays stability by adolescence and early adulthood as concluded by terBogt et al. (2005), then a relationship between work ethic and entitlement would likely exist in individuals previous to college attendance. Additionally, associations with locus of control and delay of gratification, as reported by Furnham (1987), and work ethic's seemingly parallel change with narcissism in society, points to the need to investigate work ethic as a predictor variable for entitlement in adolescents (Twenge, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008). It would be logical that high school students have been socialized to place less value on work than previous generations, and entitlement has been reported to be more prevalent, but the question as to whether decreased work ethic predicts entitlement in adolescents remains unanswered (Smola & Sutton, 2002; Twenge et al., 2008). It seems plausible that a low work ethic would be related to the engagement of entitled behaviors, as in the absence of achievements based on effort and hard work, individuals might engage

bullying or demanding behaviors associated with entitlement to get what they feel they deserve.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is assigned a prominent role in social cognitive theory, and is a belief and confidence in the ability to execute behaviors that is considered a mechanism of agency for development, adaptation, and change (Bandura, 2002; Devonport & Lane, 2006; Schunk & Hanson, 1985; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). As a mechanism of agency, self-efficacy is proposed to influence functioning by affecting the processes of cognition, motivation, affect, and choices made (Bandura, 1999, 2002). Individuals high in self-efficacy are proposed to set higher goals, expend more effort, persist at tasks longer, and attribute failure to insufficient effort (Bandura, 1978, 1989, 1991; Devonport & Lane, 2006). Self-efficacy has been prominently deemed the foundation of motivation, well-being, and accomplishment (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, & Regalia, 2001).

Adaptive Value. Extensive research has established the benefits of increased self-efficacy. Richardson, Abraham, and Bond (2012), reviewed studies that investigated correlates of university students' grade point average (GPA) and concluded that of 50 measures, the strongest positive correlation was with performance self-efficacy, with a medium-sized positive correlation reported for academic self-efficacy and effort regulation. Efficacy to manage negative mood and efficacy for positive relationships were reported to positively influence subjective well-being in adults, and were crucial to life satisfaction in young adults (Caprara & Steca, 2005; Steca, Caprara, Tramontano, & Vecchio, 2009). In a path analysis, self-efficacy was reported to display statistically

significant paths to goal progress, and was associated indirectly to domain satisfaction through goal progress (Lent et al., 2005). Strobel, Tumasjan, and Spörrle (2011) reported that general self-efficacy was a mediator of the relationship between personality factors and subjective well-being, and concluded that cognitive beliefs were important in the relationships between personality factors and subjective well-being. Steca et al. (2009) concluded there is evidence to support the analysis of self-efficacy at domain levels, such as affective and interpersonal, rather than task-specific levels.

Development. Bandura's (1989) proposed paths of efficacy development included mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and interpretation of physiological states. Mastery has been shown to be the most influential and consistent factor on which individuals build self-efficacy because of the authentic nature of the information for future performance that it provides (Joët, Usher, & Bressoux, 2011; Schunk & Hanson, 1985; Usher & Pajares, 2008). Vicarious experiences were proposed to lead to weaker self-efficacy beliefs and were more vulnerable to change. According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy beliefs differ in magnitude, strength, and generality, and because mastery is built on the accomplishments of personal performance, it therefore provides more generalized and stronger self-beliefs that are longer lasting.

Bandura (2005) proposed that adolescence is characterized by growing independence, and that according to the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory, adolescents' personal growth is achieved through personal mastery and enabling experiences. Because personal self-efficacy affects motivation and choices, it was

proposed to be required for the successful adaptation and changes required during the transition to adulthood (Bandura, 2005).

Relationship to entitlement. This study investigated the association between self-efficacy and entitlement. Theoretically, increased general self-efficacy should manifest in decreased entitlement, because individuals would set higher goals, persist at tasks, and attribute failure to their own efforts (Bandura, 1991, 2002; Devonport & Lane, 2006). In the absence of self-efficacy, individuals might engage in behaviors associated with entitlement to get what they want instead of equating positive outcomes with persistence at tasks or sufficient effort (Bandura, 1991, 2002; Devonport & Lane, 2006; Joët et al., 2011; Schunk & Hanson, 1985; Usher & Pajares, 2008). Boswell (2012) reported that course self-efficacy was inversely related to academic entitlement in college students, lending support to the theoretical expectation in this study. The differences between this study and Boswell's are that Boswell investigated college students and used course self-efficacy rather than general self-efficacy. In a study examining the relative contributions of self-efficacy and self-control to procrastination, Strunk and Steele (2011) found that self-regulation fully accounted for the predictive power of self-efficacy, so an alternative possibility would be that self-control would account for the predictive power of self-efficacy, or that work ethic and self-control mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although research has indicated that narcissism is 59% heritable, the relatively rapid rise in narcissism supports a notion that cultural differences and

practices are influencing personality (Bandura, 1999; Twenge et al., 2008; Vernon et al., 2007). This study isolated the component of entitlement from the broader construct of narcissism, and investigated the relationship between the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, and entitlement. Vazire and Funder (2006) proposed that narcissists lack self-control, and that it may provide an explanation for behaviors correlated with narcissism. Both work ethic and course self-efficacy have been shown to be correlated with academic entitlement in college students and this study investigated these relationships in adolescents (Bandura, 1999; Boswell, 2012; Greenberger et al., 2008). No study has investigated the relationship between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in nonclinical adolescents to determine if each of the predictor variables explains unique variance in entitlement.

In Chapter 3, I will provide a detailed description of the research design and methodology of the proposed study. In Chapter 4, I will provide the data analyses, and Chapter 5 will include a discussion of the data, a summary of the findings, and a discussion of the limitations of the study. I will address implications for social change and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in adolescents, and determine if any of the predictor variables explained unique variance in entitlement. This chapter begins with a description of the research design and rationale, followed by a discussion of methodology including the population, population size, recruitment, instruments and data collection procedures. Data analysis, threats to validity, and ethical procedures specific to human participants are discussed, and the chapter ends with a summary of the design and methodology before introducing Chapter 4.

Research Design and Approach

The study employed cross-sectional survey research, which provided quantitative data and used a deductive approach to test the study's hypotheses, which were formulated prior to data collection. Cross-sectional data were collected using self-administered, close-ended questionnaires. Because the purpose of a survey design is to make inferences about characteristics or attitudes of a population by generalizing from a sample, a survey design was appropriate for the study, and provided a quantitative description of the variables in order to conduct statistical analyses. The design offered the advantages of cost effectiveness, convenience, relatively rapid data turnaround, and the ability to generalize to the population from a sample to describe relationships (Creswell, 2009). The design choice was consistent with the study, which tested multiple predictor variables to investigate their relationships with a criterion variable.

Setting and Sample

Population and Sample

The target population was nonclinical adolescents in Grades 10, 11, and 12 attending high school in the United States. The sample consisted of approximately 119 male and female adolescents in Grades 10, 11, and 12 attending high school.

Convenience sampling was used after receiving approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB; #10-22-14-0117199) because the SurveyMonkey Audience tool presented an easily accessible and cost effective group.

As a basis for determining the sample size required for this study, it was important to consider the magnitude of the hypothesized correlations that may be anticipated based on previous relevant studies. Vazire and Funder (2006) examined 10 independent studies and reported a weighted mean correlation of 0.34 between narcissism and impulsivity, which has been conceptually related to self-control. Greenberger et al. (2008) reported a correlation of -0.30 between academic entitlement and work ethic in college students, and Boswell (2012) reported a correlation of -0.28 between academic entitlement and course self-efficacy in college students when the alpha level was .05. Therefore, based on the literature, it seemed reasonable to anticipate correlations of approximately 0.30 (in absolute value) of the variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy with entitlement.

The sample size of 119 subjects was determined using the software package G*Power 3.1, as follows for the multiple regression analysis that was performed to examine alternative hypothesis H_{A4} . This alternative hypothesis posited that each of the

predictor variables is correlated with entitlement, independently of the other predictors. For the purpose of the sample size calculation I assumed that correlations among the predictor variables were close to 0. Hence I assumed that the change in multiple R^2 associated with the test on each predictor variable will be at least $(-0.30)^2$ or 0.09. Power was set at .90, to be reasonably assured that a Type II error would not be incurred, while recognizing a reasonable demand on sample size (Cohen, 1992; Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). The alpha level was .05, because it is an accepted level for dealing with Type I errors (Field, 2009). For a multiple regression analysis with three predictor variables, assuming a change in $R^2 = .09$ (as explained above), and alpha level of .05, 119 subjects were calculated to be required to provide 90% power. A sample size of 119 would also provide at least 90% power to test Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, using an alpha level of .05, assuming bivariate correlations of 0.30 in magnitude, or greater. The SurveyMonkey Audience tool provided access to individuals aged 15 years and older, and the target group was accessed across the United States, so recruiting 119 individuals was feasible.

Instrumentation

The sample was administered a close-ended questionnaire consisting of a collection of measures designed to test each of the variables in the study, all of which produced numerical data. Demographic data collected included grade and gender, and students indicated each on the questionnaire. For the purposes of this study, the SCS (Yu, 2010b) was used to measure self-control, the GSE (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) was used to measure general self-efficacy, the MWEP-SF (Meriac, Woehr, Gorrman, &

Thomas, 2013) was used to measure work ethic, and the PES (Campbell et al., 2004) was used to measure entitlement.

Self-Control Scale

Self-control was measured by the 6-item SCS, developed by Yu (2010b). The instrument was available on PsycTESTS, and permission for use in research without express written permission was granted along with the test. Respondents were required to indicate the extent to which they found the statements true or untrue on a five-point scale from 1 = *very untrue* to 5 = *very true*. Items were reverse coded, with scores ranging from 6 to 30, and a higher score reflected higher levels of self-control. The scale demonstrated internal consistency, and Cronbach alphas across three time periods ranged from .64 to .71 (Yu, 2010a). The SCS was used in data collection for the Korean Youth Panel Survey, and each question was based on one of the six traits that Gottfredson and Hirschi identified as being included in the concept of self-control (Yun & Walsh, 2011). The six traits of self-control were identified as impulsivity, risk taking, self-centeredness, volatile temper, a preference for simple tasks, and a preference for physical activities (Yu, 2010a; Yun & Walsh, 2011). The numerical value obtained applied to the predictor variable of self-control.

General Self-Efficacy Scale

Perceived general self-efficacy was measured by the 10-item GSE Scale developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). The GSE Scale is available on the authors' website where a letter granting permission to provide the scale to research participants is also available. Schwarzer and Jerusalem stated that perceived general self-

efficacy was viewed as an operative construct related to subsequent behavior.

Respondents were required to indicate whether they found each statement “1 = *not at all true*” to “4 = *exactly true*” on a four-point scale, and summing the responses yielded a range of 10 to 40, with higher scores reflecting a higher level of general sense of perceived self-efficacy. The statements included items such as, “If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.” Schwarzer and Jerusalem proposed that the GSE has demonstrated appropriate correlations with related constructs such as emotions, depression, and work satisfaction. Scherbaum, Cohen-Charash, and Kern (2006) utilized item response theory and reported that the test items related to GSE, and that items adequately discriminated between individuals with differing levels ($\alpha > 1$). The scale has demonstrated criterion-related validity and reliability, with Cronbach alphas ranging from .76 to .90 (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The numerical value obtained was applied to the predictor variable of self-efficacy.

Work Ethic Scale

The seven dimensions of work ethic were measured by the 28-item MWEP-SF developed by Meriac et al. (2013). Permission to use the scale for this study was received from Meriac. Respondents were required to indicate whether they *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5) on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Scoring required taking the mean of each of the seven subscales and totaling the means to obtain the score, giving a range of scores from 7 to 35, with higher scores indicating higher work ethic. The statements included items such as “People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation”. The MWEP-SF was developed from the widely-used longer version, the MWEP, using

item response theory (Meriac et al., 2013). The MWEP-SF displayed a .92 correlation with the longer version, and all values of coefficient alpha estimates for the MWEP-SF were above .70 (Meriac et al., 2013). Meriac et al. indicated a nomological network approach provided construct validity, because the MWEP-SF correlated in a meaningful manner with external factors such as conscientiousness and locus of control. The numerical value obtained was applied to the predictor variable of work ethic.

Psychological Entitlement Scale

Individuals' sense of entitlement was measured by the 9-item PES developed by Campbell et al. (2004), and permission to use the scale for this study was received from Campbell. Respondents were required to indicate whether they *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (7) on a 7-point scale, and the total score ranged from 9 to 63, with higher scores indicating increased sense of entitlement. The statements included items such as, "I honestly feel I'm just more deserving than others". The scale has demonstrated high correlations with narcissism and the Entitlement subscale of the NPI. In order to demonstrate test-retest reliability, Campbell et al. compared the baseline measure on the PES with those taken at 1-month and 2-month intervals. The results indicated test-retest reliability of the PES, and correlations with the baseline were 0.72 at one month and 0.70 at two months (Campbell et al., 2004). Campbell et al. reported an alpha coefficient of .85 for the 9-item measure. Construct validity was demonstrated because the PES was shown to correlate with narcissism, especially the Entitlement subscale of the NPI. The numerical values obtained by administration of the PES were applied to the criterion variable of entitlement.

Data Collection

The study complied with ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association and Walden University. Firstly, permission to conduct the research was sought from Walden University's IRB. After receiving IRB approval (#10-22-14-0117199), I constructed an online questionnaire using SurveyMonkey. The first page was the parent consent (Appendix A), followed by a page with the student assent (Appendix B). All boxes had to be checked on the first two pages, indicating consent and assent, before the student was taken to the online questionnaire.

As part of the informed consent process, the consent form included assurances of confidentiality, anonymity, the voluntary nature of the study, security, and a discussion of the nature of the study including any risks and benefits. Additionally, I provided information on how the collected data would be used, contact information should questions arise, and assurances that the data would be stored in a secure location with no identifying information. The participants were not coerced, could stop at any point in the questionnaire, and the risks associated with participating in the study were indicated to the participants as minimal.

After constructing the online questionnaire, SurveyMonkey Audience tool was employed to recruit the desired sample size of 119 participants, using SurveyMonkey's established procedures to reach targeted participants from their database. The target was individuals aged 15 to 17. SurveyMonkey's Audience tool is a time and cost effective method to reach a random sample and has been previously used in scholarly research. A standard SurveyMonkey Audience invitation was emailed to parents in the United States

with adolescents aged 15 to 17. The invitation informed the parents that a survey was available to their child, and a link to the survey was included in the email. Participants earned a minimal reward through SurveyMonkey for their participation. The survey was made available until the sample size was reached. Responses from the questionnaire were delivered to me via the Internet.

Data Analysis

I used SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 21.0 to perform the statistical analyses, and reported descriptive statistics, means, and standard deviations for each of the variables. A correlation matrix was reported to show the degree of relationship among the predictor variables and the criterion variable (i.e., self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement).

To examine multicollinearity among predictor variables, I inspected the variance inflation factors (VIF) in the output from the regression analysis. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was also investigated for each predictor variable and any values exceeding 10 would have been further scrutinized (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). If VIF values had indicated multicollinearity, I had decided that a decision whether to delete a variable or combine variables to create a single measure would be made at that time (Field, 2009; Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Data was also pre-screened prior to the multiple regression analysis for accuracy in recording, missing data, outliers, and the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). If there were only a few cases of missing data and it did not result in sample size dropping below 119 individuals, I would delete the cases, otherwise I would replace them with mean values

(Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Studentized residuals greater than 3.0 or Cook's distance of greater than 1.0 were used as criteria to identify outliers; outliers would be removed from the dataset (Field, 2009). I examined the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Histograms for each variable were examined to ensure normality, and skewness and kurtosis were examined to ensure both fell between positive and negative two to fulfill the assumption of normality (Cameron, 2004). I assessed linearity by examining residuals plots to ensure there was no clustering around the zero line curvature (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Residuals plots were also examined for evidence of violation of homoscedasticity, which would be indicated by clustering of the scatterplots on either the left or right side (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). If data screening revealed the assumptions of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity had been breached, then I would apply an accepted data transformation such as a power, logarithmic or square root transformation (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

The research question for the proposed study was: Are self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy related to entitlement in adolescents? The first three null hypotheses state: that self-control is not related to entitlement in adolescents, that work ethic is not related to entitlement in adolescents, and that self-efficacy is not related to entitlement in adolescents. Each of these null hypotheses was tested by examining whether there was a statistically significant correlation between entitlement and the predictor variables (self-control, work ethic, or self-efficacy).

The fourth null hypothesis states that self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy will not each explain unique variance in entitlement. This null hypothesis was

investigated using multiple regression analysis with self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy as the predictor variables, and with entitlement as the criterion variable.

The F statistic was reported as a measure of the regression model fit and significance levels were examined (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). In order to avoid overestimation by R -squared, the adjusted R -squared was reported as a measure of the proportion of the criterion variable variance that can be explained by the predictor variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Standardized regression coefficients (β) indicated the independent contribution of each variable while controlling for the influence of others, and were used to create the multiple regression equation for each analysis, after assuring significance by examining accompanying p-values (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). The square of semipartial correlation coefficients was reported and interpreted as the amount of variance in entitlement that is uniquely associated with each of the predictor variables (Tacq, 2004).

Threats to Validity

The research design and methods incorporated several safeguards to ensure validity. According to Cook, Campbell, and Peracchio (1990), threats to statistical conclusion validity include small sample size, α set too low, using dichotomous variables, and major extraneous sources of variance. The study was designed to ensure statistical validity by employing a sufficient sample size to meet requirements for statistical significance, setting α at .05, using continuous variables, and investigating assumptions prior to conducting the multiple regression analysis. The variables had been conceptually analyzed in the literature review and existing instruments which have been used in

previous studies to investigate the constructs were used to collect data. The possibility exists that hypothesis guessing or evaluation apprehension may have presented a threat to construct validity. External validity was ensured in the study by selecting a sample that was representative of the population being investigated, and providing a description of the sample. The main threat to internal validity was that the study was correlational and inferences as to causality between the predictor variables and the criterion variable are restricted (Cook et al., 1990).

Protection of Human Participants

This study complied with ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association and Walden University. Parental permission was obtained and the participants were in no way coerced. The risks associated with participating in the study were minimal. I have been certified by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research by completing the “Protecting Human Research Participants” web-based course. My certificate of completion is shown in Appendix C.

Dissemination of Findings

Upon completion of the study, I intend to display the results at poster sessions targeted to professionals working with adolescents, as well as provide the information in multiple formats to groups or organizations with an expressed interest in adolescents.

Summary

The study employed cross-sectional, quantitative survey research to test the research question and hypotheses. Correlational analysis and multiple regression analysis were conducted to investigate the relationships between the predictor variables of self-

control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, and the criterion variable of entitlement. In Chapter 4, I will provide the results of the study, and Chapter 5 will include a discussion of the results and limitations of the study. Implications for social change and recommendations for future research will be presented.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in adolescents. A second purpose was to investigate whether each of the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy explained unique variance in the criterion variable of entitlement. The research question was: Are self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy related to entitlement in adolescents? The first three null hypotheses were that self-control would not relate to entitlement in adolescents, that work ethic would not relate to entitlement in adolescents, and that self-efficacy would not relate to entitlement in adolescents. The fourth null hypothesis was that self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy would not each explain unique variance in entitlement.

The chapter begins with a discussion of how I collected and screened the data, followed by the sample demographics and descriptive statistics for each of the predictor variables and the outcome variable. Next, I present the correlation coefficients and the results of the multiple regression analysis used to test the fourth null hypothesis. I conclude the chapter with a summary of my findings.

Sample Characteristics

Data was collected over a three-day period using SurveyMonkey Audience tool to recruit the participants after receiving approval from Walden University's IRB (#10-22-14-0117199). The online questionnaire was completed by 120 adolescents from Grades

10, 11, and 12 from across the United States, from January 12, 2015 to January 14, 2015. Hence the target sample size of 119 was achieved.

There were no missing values in the study dataset. The data were screened for outliers using the regression model used in the analysis for the fourth hypothesis. The a priori criteria outlined in Chapter 3 were to identify and eliminate outliers that exceeded a studentized residual of 3.0 or a Cook's distance greater than 1.0. A preliminary multiple regression analysis was conducted using the 120 participants, and one case exhibited a studentized residual greater than 3.0, therefore it was removed. A second multiple regression analysis was conducted using the remaining 119 participants, and a further case was identified as exceeding a studentized residual greater than 3.0, therefore it was removed from the dataset. A third multiple regression analysis using 118 participants did not reveal further outliers, and 118 participants were retained to test the Hypotheses 1 through 4. In the sample of 118 adolescents, 67 were female and 51 were male. Forty-eight of the participants were in Grade 10, 31 were in Grade 11, and 39 were in Grade 12. Descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 1.

Self-control was measured using the 6-item SCS, developed by Yu (2010b). The range of possible scores was 6 to 30. The SCS was reverse scored to improve the clarity and intuitive connection between the statistics and their interpretation. Therefore, higher scores indicated higher levels of self-control. The scores obtained from the participants ranged from 6 to 28 ($M = 19.52$, $SD = 4.73$) (see Table 1). The data were skewed (-0.68), slightly leptokurtic (0.28), and the histogram sufficiently resembled normality.

The 28-item MWEP-SF, developed by Meriac et al. (2013), was used to obtain scores for work ethic, and scores had a possible range of 7 to 35. Higher scores indicated a higher work ethic. The participants' scores ranged from 11 to 35 ($M = 27.39$, $SD = 4.52$) (see Table 1). The data displayed slight skewness (-0.96) and were leptokurtic (2.03). The histogram for the work ethic variable sufficiently resembled normality.

The 10-item GSE Scale, developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) was used to obtain scores for self-efficacy. The range of possible scores was from 10 to 40, and the participants' scores in the study ranged from 20 to 40 ($M = 31.08$, $SD = 4.84$) (see Table 1). The data displayed a slight skewness (-0.08) and was slightly platykurtic (-0.78). Higher scores reflected a higher level of general sense of perceived self-efficacy. An examination of the histogram for the self-efficacy variable indicated it sufficiently resembled normality.

Entitlement was measured using the 9-item PES developed by Campbell et al. (2004). The range of possible scores was 9 to 63 and higher scores indicated a higher level of entitlement. The participants' scores ranged from 9 to 58 ($M = 30.24$, $SD = 10.87$) (see Table 1). The data were slightly skewed (0.05), slightly platykurtic (-0.30), and the histogram sufficiently resembled a normal distribution.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Self-control, Work Ethic, Self-efficacy, and Entitlement

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Self-control	19.52	4.73	-0.68	0.28
Work Ethic	27.39	4.52	-0.96	2.03
Self-efficacy	31.08	4.84	-0.08	-0.78
Entitlement	30.24	10.87	0.05	-0.30

Notes: N = 118.

Hypothesis Testing

The research question for the study was: Are self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy related to entitlement in adolescents? The first three associated null hypotheses stated that self-control would not relate to entitlement, work ethic would not relate to entitlement, and self-efficacy would not relate to entitlement. All three null hypotheses were tested by examining correlation coefficients between entitlement and each of the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy for statistical significance.

The coefficient alpha estimates of reliability for each of the scales are shown in Table 2. The Cronbach alpha was .53 for the SCS, and .94 for the MWEP-SF. The GSE Scale had a Cronbach alpha of .84, and the PES had a Cronbach alpha of .85.

As displayed in Table 2, the correlation coefficient to test the first null hypothesis, that self-control was not related to entitlement in adolescents, was $r = -.20$ $p = .03$, two-

tailed. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected; self-control was statistically significantly negatively related to entitlement.

The correlation coefficient to test the second null hypothesis, that work ethic was not related to entitlement, was $r = -.27$, $p = .003$, two-tailed (see Table 2). The second null hypothesis was rejected; work ethic was statistically significantly negatively related to entitlement.

The correlation coefficient to test the third null hypothesis, that self-efficacy was not related to entitlement, was $r = -.08$, $p = .40$, two-tailed (see Table 2). The third null hypothesis was accepted; self-efficacy was not statistically significantly related to entitlement in adolescents.

Table 2

Intercorrelations for Self-control, Work Ethic, Self-efficacy, and Entitlement Scores With Cronbach Alpha Scores

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Self-control	(.53)	-.02	-.05	-.20*
2. Work ethic		(.94)	.41**	-.27**
3. Self-efficacy			(.84)	-.08
4. Entitlement				(.85)

Note. $N = 118$ Numbers in parentheses in the diagonal are Cronbach alpha coefficients.

* $p < .05$, two tails; ** $p \leq .01$, two tails

The fourth null hypothesis, that self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy would not each explain unique variance in entitlement was investigated using a multiple regression analysis. The predictor variables were self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, and the outcome variable was entitlement. To check for multicollinearity, I examined the correlation matrix and did not detect any high intercorrelations among the predictor variables (see Table 2).

Table 3

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Coefficients for Predictor Variables of Entitlement in Adolescents

Model Term	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	Semi-partial correlation	<i>t</i>	P-value	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
Self-control	-.47	.20	-.21	-.21	-2.34	.02	1.00
Work ethic	-.69	.23	-.29	-.26	-2.98	.004	1.21
Self-efficacy	.07	.22	.03	.03	.32	.75	1.21
Constant	56.27	8.32			6.76	≤.001	

Regression results indicated an overall model that statistically significantly predicts entitlement in adolescents, $R^2 = .118$, $R^2_{adj} = .094$, $F(3, 114) = 5.063$, $p = .002$. Table 3 shows the coefficients of the multiple regression analysis for the constant of the regression model and each of the predictor variables of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy, for the criterion variable of entitlement scores of adolescents. As shown in Table 3, self-control ($t(114) = -2.34$, $p = .02$), and work ethic ($t(114) = -2.98$, $p = .004$) were each statistically significant predictors having a linear relationship to entitlement scores in adolescents, after controlling for the other predictors in the regression model. Self-efficacy was not a statistically significant predictor of entitlement scores.

Table 3 also shows the semi-partial correlation coefficients for each predictor variable. The semi-partial correlation for self-control is -0.21, and its square is 0.044 or 4.4%. This indicates that self-control is uniquely associated with 4.4% of the variance in

entitlement scores after controlling for the influence of the other predictor variables. The semi-partial correlation for work ethic is -0.26 ; the square of this number is 0.068 or 6.8% , which indicates that work ethic is uniquely associated with 6.8% of the variance in entitlement scores after controlling for the influence of the other predictor variables.

Standardized beta coefficients were analyzed to determine the independent contributions and relative importance of each predictor variable in predicting entitlement scores, after controlling for the influence of the other predictor variables (Field, 2009). As shown in Table 3, the standardized beta coefficient of self-control was -0.21 and indicates that self-control has a negative contribution to the model in predicting entitlement in adolescents when controlling for the other predictor variables. This suggests that entitlement scores of adolescents were higher when adolescents exhibited less self-control, and means that each time the score for self-control increases by one standard deviation, it is predicted the score for entitlement will decrease by 0.21 standard deviations. Cohen (1992) indicated a correlation of $.10$ constitutes a small effect size and a correlation of $.30$ constitutes a medium effect size, and because beta coefficients have a similar interpretation, the standardized beta coefficient -0.21 obtained in this study indicates a small to moderate relationship between self-control and entitlement in adolescents. As shown in Table 3, the standardized beta coefficient of work ethic was -0.29 . This result indicates that work ethic makes a negative contribution to the model in predicting entitlement in adolescents and suggests that entitlement scores of adolescents became higher when adolescents exhibited less work ethic when controlling for the explained variance of the other predictor variables. This means that each time the score

for work ethic increases by one standard deviation, it is predicted the score for entitlement will decrease by 0.29 standard deviations. The standardized beta coefficient obtained indicates a moderately strong relationship between work ethic and entitlement in adolescents (Cohen, 1992).

Variance inflation factors (VIFs) between each of the predictor variables and entitlement are also displayed in Table 3. VIFs were less than 10, so multicollinearity was not an issue. An examination of the residuals plot did not reveal any clustering around the zero line curvature, nor did it reveal significant clustering of the scatterplot to the left or right side, therefore the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were met. The results of the regression indicated an overall model that significantly predicts entitlement in adolescents, and this model accounted for 11.8% of variance in entitlement in adolescents. Although the fourth null hypothesis is not rejected because not all three variables explained statistically significant unique variance in entitlement, both self-control and work ethic were statistically significant predictors of entitlement in adolescents.

Summary

The results from the correlational analysis indicated that the first null hypothesis was rejected; there was a statistically significant negative relationship between self-control and entitlement. The second null hypothesis was rejected because there was a statistically significant negative relationship between work ethic and entitlement. The third null hypothesis was accepted because there was not a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement.

The multiple regression analysis indicated that the fourth null hypothesis, that self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy would not each explain unique variance in entitlement, was accepted. Two of the variables, namely self-control and work ethic, did each explain statistically significant unique variance in entitlement, but self-efficacy did not. In Chapter 5 I will provide an interpretation of the findings, recommendations for future research, and discuss the implications for social change and recommendations for action.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Entitlement is a component of narcissism and is characterized by behaviors indicative of unreasonable expectations, arrogance, and self-grandiosity (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Although entitlement has been linked to multiple negative traits and behaviors, such as aggression and incivility, the extent to which entitlement is related to self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy in nonclinical adolescents has not been examined (Campbell et al., 2004; Harvey & Martinko, 2009; Lippmann et al., 2009). Therefore, the purpose of my study was to examine the relationships between self-control, work ethic, self-efficacy, and entitlement in adolescents. A further purpose of my study was to investigate whether each variable of self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy were independent predictors of entitlement, i.e., they each account for variance independently of the variance in entitlement that is accounted for by the other predictors.

The present study was guided by the research question: Are self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy related to entitlement in adolescents? Grade 10, 11, and 12 students from across the United States completed an online questionnaire. The first null hypothesis, that self-control was not related to entitlement, was rejected because self-control displayed a statistically significant negative relationship with entitlement. Work ethic displayed a statistically significant negative relationship with entitlement, therefore the second null hypothesis, that work ethic was not related to entitlement, was rejected. The third null hypothesis, that self-efficacy was not related to entitlement, was accepted because there was not a statistically significant relationship. The fourth null hypothesis,

that self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy would not each explain unique variance in entitlement was accepted. However, my study partially supported the alternative hypothesis because the contributions of both self-control and work ethic were statistically significant in the multiple regression analysis. Additionally, the overall model significantly predicted entitlement in adolescents.

Interpretation of Findings

Hypotheses 1

Previous researchers have found entitlement and self-control to be associated with conceptually relevant variables such as conduct problems and personality pathology, and statistically significant positive correlations have been reported between impulsivity and narcissism (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Karterud, 2010; Kerig & Stellwagen, 2010; Pryor et al., 2008; Winstok, 2009). Additionally, previous researchers have reported statistically significant negative relationships between narcissism or entitlement and variables indicative of less self-control, such as decreased agreeableness, emotional reactivity in response to ego threats, aggression, and compulsive behavior (Barry, Thompson, et al., 2007; Campbell et al., 2004; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Rose, 2007; Winstok, 2009). Raskin and Terry (1988) reported a statistically significant negative correlation between self-control and the Entitlement subscale of the NPI. Consistent with previous researchers, I found that self-control displayed a statistically significant negative correlation with entitlement in my study. This finding implies that adolescents who exhibit less self-control display higher levels of entitlement.

Hypothesis 2

Consistent with other researchers, I found that work ethic had a statistically significant negative relationship with entitlement. Previous researchers reported that work orientation was significantly negatively correlated to academic entitlement in college students (Greenberger et al., 2008). Additionally, my study was consistent with observations that support parallel changes in work ethic and narcissism between generations, thereby suggesting a relationship between the two variables (Twenge, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008). The results of my study imply that adolescents who exhibit decreased work ethic display increased entitlement.

Hypothesis 3

Although I did not find a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement in my study, previous research reported a statistically significant inverse relationship between course self-efficacy and academic entitlement in college students (Boswell, 2012). Possible explanations for the discrepancy between previous work and my study will be discussed in the next section. The results of my study imply that there is no statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement in adolescents.

Hypothesis 4

My study indicated that the overall model whereby self-control, work ethic, and self-efficacy predicted entitlement in adolescents was significant. The R^2 value obtained in my study was consistent with the value predicted in Chapter 3 based on the extension of hypothesized correlations between the variables in previous studies (Boswell, 2012;

Greenberger et al., 2008; Vazire & Funder, 2006) Both self-control and work ethic were found to account for unique variance in entitlement. Hence self-control and work ethic were significant predictors of entitlement, independently of each other and after statistically controlling for the other predictor variables.

Implications

There are methodological, theoretical, and practical implications that pertain to this study. The methodological implications pertain to measures of self-efficacy and entitlement in my study and those of previous researchers. The theoretical implications involve the relationships of the variables in adolescents and the conceptual framework discussed in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. The practical implications are to inform practices of parents, educators, and others involved in guiding adolescents.

Methodological Implications

In my study, the correlation between self-efficacy and entitlement was not statistically significant in adolescents. This is contrary to the reported finding of an inverse relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic entitlement in college students (Boswell, 2012). It is possible, however, that the measures used to investigate self-efficacy and entitlement may account for the differing results. The study by Boswell (2012) investigated course self-efficacy, which would be task specific and in contrast to the investigation of general self-efficacy in my study. Although the GSE Scale has demonstrated criterion-related validity and reliability, Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) indicated that it does not capture specific behavior. The task specific nature of the scale used by Boswell entailed the inclusion of questions targeted at discovering the students'

belief in their ability to execute specific behaviors associated with success in their courses. In contrast, the GSE Scale does not include specific behaviors associated with a belief in the ability to achieve, rather it investigates participants' overall perception of their ability to achieve, leaving the respondent free to decide the behaviors associated with their belief (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

Alternatively, the measures used in the present study to investigate entitlement may explain the different outcomes obtained in comparison to previous research. Boswell used a measure that specifically targeted academic entitlement, whereas my study used the PES, which was designed to measure a general sense of entitlement not restricted to the academic realm. Whereas the scale used by Boswell incorporated specific behaviors associated with academic entitlement such as "I should never receive a zero on an assignment I handed in" (p. 358), the PES used in the current study probed attitudes that might occur in numerous contexts without mention of specific behaviors. Because of this, participants would be required to formulate their own context and associated behaviors in response to the questions. Whereas Boswell's study was restricted to investigating self-efficacy and entitlement in the academic realm, I chose to broaden the scope of investigation because research has indicated entitlement reaches far beyond the academic realm (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002). A recommendation for future research would be to duplicate my study with measures that incorporate task specific behaviors illustrative of self-efficacy in multiple contexts.

Field (2009) noted that statistically significant findings may be overlooked in a small sample size if the study does not have the power to detect them. As outlined in

Chapter 3, for my study I calculated that 119 participants would be required using power = .90 and $\alpha = .05$ for an effect size of 0.30. For the multiple regression analysis, using power = .90 and $\alpha = .05$, it was determined that 119 participants would be sufficient based on a change in $R^2 = .09$. It is possible that the estimated effect size I hypothesized based on previous research was too large, and perhaps a larger sample size would have resulted in statistically significant results, although the strength of the relationship would remain small.

Theoretical Implications

On theoretical grounds, I proposed that self-efficacy should be related to entitlement because individuals with increased self-efficacy would persist at tasks and attribute failure to their efforts (Bandura, 1991, 2002; Devonport & Lane, 2006). I had predicted self-efficacy would be related to entitlement because it seemed plausible that if individuals were engaging positive behaviors associated with increased self-efficacy, such as initiating behaviors, expending effort, and persisting at tasks, they would refrain from the engagement of negative behaviors associated with entitlement to realize outcomes. My study did not support this relationship. Several possibilities for the discrepancy between my study and both the proposed theoretical inclusion of self-efficacy and the findings of Boswell (2012) were discussed in the Methodological Implications section.

Although it is possible that the difference in age of the groups being investigated could explain the difference, Boswell indicated that preliminary evidence suggested academic entitlement was entrenched prior to college, and the age difference between the

participants in Boswell's study and this study is slight. Perhaps one difference between the two age groups is that high school students represent an educational democracy due to the mandatory nature of the education system, whereas college students are representative of a smaller slice of the population. It is therefore possible that the self-selecting nature of college and the attributes of college students are different on measures of self-efficacy and its relationship to entitlement.

Alternatively, it is possible that self-efficacy, as measured by the GSE Scale, does not have a relationship with entitlement. I had chosen a broader measure of self-efficacy rather than restricting it to academic self-efficacy as Boswell (2012) had, on the theoretical grounds that a person's belief in their ability to achieve success would not be restricted to specific tasks and that an overarching sense of ability to succeed would exist and permeate multiple contexts. The results in this study, that self-efficacy did not have a relationship with entitlement, might be due to the nature of the questions on the GSE Scale and the multiple ways students could interpret them. For example, it is possible that students could answer the question, "I can usually handle whatever comes my way", in a way that would be equated with increased self-efficacy and confidence, but not necessarily in a way that reflects expending more effort or persistence at tasks. Students might indicate that the statement is true, but one of the ways that they might perceive their handling of situations might include their exhibiting entitled behaviors. Although they may have answered in a manner that suggests self-efficacy, the answer may not necessarily capture a sense of effort or persistence, merely confidence in handling a situation. Perhaps handling situations might include the demanding and confrontational

behaviors reported by Lippmann et al. (2009), or reflect the grandiosity and unrealistic view of the self that are attributed to individuals with increased entitlement (Hotchkiss, 2002; Twenge, Campbell, & Gentile, 2012). It is therefore possible that adolescents' beliefs in their ability to achieve success might be based on engaging entitled behaviors to achieve that success. Although this possibility aligns with the definition of self-efficacy, it does not support the apparent singularly positive nature of self-efficacy proposed in the literature, because self-efficacy based on entitled behaviors does not negate the negative outcomes of entitled behaviors for the individual or others in their midst, nor does it imply mastery of experiences deemed important for development (Bandura 1978, 1989, 1991, 2002; Bandura, Caprara, et al., 2001; Devonport & Lane, 2006).

Self-control displayed a statistically significant negative correlation with entitlement and was a significant predictor of entitlement in the multiple regression analysis after controlling for the variance explained by the other predictors. Both my findings and those of Vazire and Funder (2006) suggest that a lack of self-control may account for the behaviors associated with the entitlement component of narcissism, and provide support for a prominent role for self-control in research and descriptions of the construct of narcissism. Vazire and Funder reported a statistically significant positive correlation between impulsivity and narcissism, and Raskin and Terry (1988) reported a statistically significant negative correlation between narcissism and self-control, bringing into question the reliance of the Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) model of narcissism on conscious cognitive processes. My study would support the inclusion of a lack of self-

control in the entitlement component of narcissism as argued by Vazire and Funder (2006), based on my finding that self-control was a significant predictor of entitlement after controlling for the other predictor variables. Baumeister and Tierney (2011) proposed that the natural tendency towards entitlement was curbed by self-control. My study also lends support to Baumeister and Tierney's notion, as increased self-control predicted decreased entitlement in my study after controlling for the variance explained by the other predictor variables.

Similar to my study, Greenberger et al. (2008) reported that work ethic was correlated with entitlement. In my study, work ethic displayed a statistically significant negative correlation with entitlement in adolescents and was also a statistically significant predictor of entitlement after controlling for the other predictor variables. If one posits that individuals feel they are entitled to rewards without necessarily earning them, they would be less motivated to work to achieve success. Alternatively, individuals may not develop a work ethic, but in order to reap the rewards they see others receiving, they might engage in behaviors indicative of entitlement such as demanding or bullying, because they lack more effective means for achievement. My study seems to support this supposition because decreased work ethic predicted increased entitlement, although further studies would be required to clarify cause and effect of the relationship. The results of my study also align with the seemingly parallel trends of work ethic and narcissism in the past three decades (Twenge, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008).

According to Bandura's (1978, 2002) social cognitive theory, continuous reciprocal interactions occur between personal, behavioral, and environmental factors.

The personal factors of self-control and work ethic demonstrated statistically significant relationships with the personal factor of entitlement, and both self-control and work ethic were statistically significant predictors of entitlement. The assumption in social cognitive theory is that personal factors are shaped by the environment, and in my study it is concluded that societal conditions have affected the cognitive beliefs and attitudes associated with self-control, work ethic, and entitlement.

Practical Implications

The findings of the present study may have implications for parents, educators, and professionals who are involved in guiding adolescents in their development. Unfortunately, increased entitlement has been linked to numerous negative behaviors and consequences, and curbing the prevalence of entitlement is crucial. Entitlement has been linked to multiple behaviors with negative outcomes including aggression, incivility, conduct disorder, disagreeableness, drug use, and a sense of superiority (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Barry, Grafeman, et al., 2011; Krizan & Bushman, 2011; Lippmann et al., 2009; Reidy et al., 2008). Given the relatively recent and rapid increase in entitlement and its related negative behaviors, it would seem that targeting social practices will be necessary to curb the rise (Bandura, 1999; Twenge & Foster, 2010; Twenge et al., 2008). Bandura (1999) indicated that it is through the discovery of behavioral mechanisms and determinants that change can be enacted. In the present study, I found that both self-control and work ethic were statistically significant predictors of entitlement in adolescents and offer parents, educators, and professionals a starting point to begin tackling entitlement.

Baumeister and Tierney (2011) proposed that self-control overrides the tendency to self-enhance and the finding in my study that self-control was a statistically significant negative predictor of entitlement after controlling for the variance explained by the other predictor variables supports this notion. Research has indicated that self-control is stable and can be traced to development in toddlers (Mischel et al., 1988; Seth et al., 2000). Therefore, parents should play an important role in helping children to develop the ability to delay gratification at younger ages prior to entering school (Mischel et al., 1988; Seth et al., 2000). Throughout the school years, it would seem advisable to include practices that continue to target the development of delay of gratification and self-control. The virtuous character trait of manners that Cain (2012) indicated was of more importance in the American culture prior to the focus on self would be a good place for both parents and schools to begin training. By targeting self-control, it seems logical that entitlement will decrease and with it the reported negative outcomes for individuals who display increased entitlement.

The second variable that predicted entitlement in my study was work ethic. Previous research has concluded that work ethic is stable by adolescence (terBogt et al., 2005). Therefore the evidence from the present study suggests that it would be desirable to encourage a strong work ethic in children through socialization at an early age (ter Bogt et al., 2005). Predictors of work ethic, such as increased internal locus of control and postponement of gratification, have been identified by Furnham (1987) and could serve as areas to target interventions. Parents, educators, and practitioners should pay attention to these factors in the course of their endeavors to socialize children. Practices

associated with the self-esteem movement, such as giving rewards that are not based on actual performance, should be discouraged (Hotchkiss, 2002; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Baumeister et al. (2003) have argued that there is no evidence that the movement produced desirable behaviors, but it is logical that if children are rewarded and given the illusion of success without actually accomplishing anything, they will begin to feel entitled to rewards in the absence of work, effort, or any real results. Educators in the school system are ideally situated to ensure that students receive rewards for real accomplishments. When students begin to equate real and objectively measured outcomes with rewards and success, they will regain a more realistic sense of self-appraisal (Hotchkiss, 2002).

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are those discussed in Chapter 1. The sample was taken from adolescents whose parents were participants in SurveyMonkey Audience Tool and it is possible that they may not be representative of populations whose parents are not members of online survey communities. A further limitation is that the study is cross-sectional, so it is not known whether the relationships among variables found in this study may vary over time. Finally, because the study is correlational, caution must be exercised in regard to inferences concerning cause-effect relationships between the predictor variables and the criterion variable of entitlement.

Recommendations for Future Research

The first recommendation for further research pertains to the absence of a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement in my study.

Because Boswell (2012) obtained a statistically significant relationship between course self-efficacy (i.e., belief in ability to engage behaviors associated with success in college courses) and academic entitlement in college students, a recommendation for future research would be to investigate the constructs of the present study utilizing measures that probe behavioral expressions of self-efficacy and entitlement in multiple contexts, rather than examining broad attitudes for which participants are left to supply the context and behaviors.

In this study, the SCS developed by Yu (2010b) was used to provide a quantitative measure for self-control. Although Yu reported Cronbach alphas that ranged from .64 to .71 across 3 time periods, the Cronbach alpha in this study for the SCS was .53. This is a concern, because Field (2009) indicated that alphas exceeding .7 are desirable to ensure scale reliability. Therefore, a second recommendation for future research would be to replicate the study using a different measure for self-control.

A third recommendation would be to conduct research to determine if general self-efficacy captures the essence of expending effort and persistence at tasks, or whether it could be based on the engagement of entitled behaviors. Increased self-efficacy has traditionally been cast in a positive manner and individuals with increased self-efficacy have been proposed to set higher goals, persist longer at tasks, and attribute failure to lack of effort (Bandura, 1978, 1989, 1991). If however, self-efficacy could reflect the engagement of entitled behaviors to achieve success, it would follow that self-efficacy may not capture the positive nature traditionally associated with it. It is also possible that because overconfidence is a trait associated with narcissism, entitled individuals may

believe they can achieve rewards without there being a basis for their expectations in reality (Hotchkiss, 2002; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Future research that is qualitative in nature might better determine perceptions of the 'how' associated with increased self-efficacy.

Work ethic was found to have a statistically significant negative relationship with entitlement and was a statistically significant predictor of entitlement after controlling for the variance explained by the other predictor variables. The MWEP-SF measure used to assess work ethic in my study has seven subscales: self-reliance, morality/ethics, leisure, centrality of work, hard work, wasted time, and delay of gratification (Meriac et al., 2013). A fourth recommendation for future research would be to further investigate the relationships of each of the subscales of work ethic with entitlement. I conducted a follow-up multiple regression analysis using the 7 subscales of the MWEP-SF as predictor variables of entitlement. Only self-reliance ($t(110) = 2.14, p = .03$), morality/ethics ($t(110) = -2.03, p = .05$), and centrality of work ($t(110) = -2.63, p = .01$) were statistically significant predictors having a linear relationship to entitlement scores in adolescents. Future research is needed using full-length scales to examine the relationships between the subscales of the MWEP-SF and entitlement in adolescents in order to better target interventions. A fifth recommendation for future research would be to examine longitudinal relationships between work ethic and entitlement.

A further recommendation based on the finding that self-reliance was a statistically significant predictor of entitlement in the follow-up multiple regression analysis, would be to investigate the relationship between self-reliance and achievement

motivation in nonclinical adolescents. Bandura (1999, 2002) proposed that self-efficacy influenced functioning by affecting motivation, therefore the relationships between self-reliance, self-efficacy, and achievement motivation warrant investigation and might help explain the lack of a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and entitlement in the current study.

A further recommendation is that future research should examine the relationship of locus of control with entitlement. Both of the variables that were statistically significant predictors of entitlement in my study have been associated with locus of control in previous research. Researchers indicated that external locus of control was negatively correlated with self-control, and internal locus of control was reported to be the best predictor for work ethic (Furnham, 1987; Twenge et al., 2004). Future research could investigate what role, if any, locus of control plays in the relationships of self-control and work ethic with entitlement.

Finally, future research should focus on examining other predictors of entitlement in adolescents. Much of the variance in entitlement remains unexplained. Bandura (1999) indicated relatively rapid changes in personality, such as those displayed by entitlement, are accounted for by non-hereditary factors. Therefore, future research should focus on cultural influences, embracing the assumption of social cognitive theory that the cognitive beliefs and attitudes associated with personal factors, such as self-control, work ethic, and entitlement, are shaped by the environment.

Implications for Positive Social Change

Entitlement is characterized by negative behaviors associated with arrogance, self-grandiosity, unreasonable expectations, and a sense of superiority (Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002; Lessard et al., 2011). Fisk (2010) indicated entitlement was a social issue, and numerous negative outcomes are associated with increased entitlement. Incivility, aggression, disagreeableness, conduct problems, drug use, and lack of forgiveness have all been shown to be related to entitlement (Barry, Frick, et al., 2007; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Hotchkiss, 2002; Strelan, 2007). By discovering the mechanisms and determinants of behaviors, social change can be enacted (Bandura, 1999). My study sought to identify predictors of entitlement in adolescents so that parents, educators, and practitioners could begin to design interventions to curb the rise of entitlement. Both self-control and work ethic were statistically significant predictors of entitlement in my study when controlling for the variance explained by other predictors, and interventions to increase self-control and work ethic in children and adolescents could produce the changes necessary to curb the negative behaviors associated with entitlement.

Conclusion

This study found that work ethic and self-control both had statistically significant negative relationships with entitlement in adolescents. Further, this study also found that self-control and work ethic were each statistically significant predictors of entitlement in adolescents when the variance of other predictor variables was controlled. Therefore, my study provides parents, educators, and practitioners who work with adolescents, guidance

as to what variables to target when designing interventions to curb the rising trend of entitlement and its associated negative outcomes.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.
- Ang., R. P., & Yusof, N. (2005). The relationship between aggression, narcissism, and self-esteem in Asian children and adolescents. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, 24*(2), 113–122. doi:10.1007/s12144-005-1010-0
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(16), 589–595. doi:10.1037/h0022070
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215. doi:10.1016/0146-6402(78)90002-4
- Bandura, A. (1978). The self system in reciprocal determinism. *American Psychologist, 33*(4), 344–358. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.33.4.344
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist, 44*(9), 1175–1184. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.9.1175
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 248–287. Retrieved from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1991OBHDP.pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1999). A social cognitive theory of personality. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (2nd ed., pp. 154–196). New York, NY: Guilford Publications. Retrieved from

<http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1999HP.pdf>

- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *51*(2), 269–290. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00092
- Bandura, A. (2005). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–43). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/001-BanduraAdoEd2006.pdf>
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., & Regalia, C. (2001). Sociocognitive self-regulatory mechanisms governing transgressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 125–135. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.125
- Barry, C. T., Frick, P. J., Adler, K. K., & Grafeman, S. J. (2007). The predictive utility of narcissism among children and adolescents: Evidence for a distinction between adaptive and maladaptive narcissism. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *16*(4), 508–521. doi:10.1007/s10826-006-9102-5
- Barry, C. T., & Wallace, M. T. (2010). Current considerations in the assessment of youth narcissism: Indicators of pathological and normative development. *Journal of Psychopathological Behavior Assessment*, *32*, 479–489. doi:10.1007/s10862-010-9188-3
- Barry, C. T., Wallace, M. T., & Guelker, M. D. (2011). Developmental and theoretical influences on the conceptualization and assessment of youth narcissism. In C. T. Barry, P. K. Kerig, K. K. Stellwagen, & T. D. Barry (Eds.), *Narcissism and*

Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior (pp.71–88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Barry, T. D., Grafeman, S. J., Bader, S. H., & Davis, S. E. (2011). Narcissism, positive illusory bias, and externalizing behaviors. In C. T. Barry, P. K. Kerig, K. K. Stellwagen, & T. D. Barry (Eds), *Narcissism and Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior* (pp.71–88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Barry, T. D., Thompson, A., Barry, C. T., Lochman, J. E., Adler, K., & Hill, K. (2007). The importance of narcissism in predicting proactive and reactive aggression in moderately to highly aggressive children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 185–197. doi:10.1002/ab.20198

Baumeister, R. F. (2012). Self-control—The moral muscle. *Psychologist*, 25(2), 112–115. Retrieved from http://www.thepsychologist.org.uk/archive/archive_home.cfm?ArticleID=1997&editionID=210&volumeID=25

Baumeister, R. F.. & Alquist, J. L. (2009). Is there a downside to good self-control? *Self and Identity*, 8, 115–130. doi:10.1080/15298860802501474

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4(1), 1–44. doi:10.1111/1529-1006.01431

- Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the greatest human strength*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Boswell, S. S. (2012). "I deserve success": Academic entitlement attitudes and their relationships with course self-efficacy, social networking, and demographic variables. *Social Psychology of Education, 15*(3), 353–365. doi:10.1007/s11218-012-9184-4
- Britton, R. (2004). Narcissistic disorders in clinical practice. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 49*, 477–490. doi:10.1111/j.0021-8774.2004.00479.x
- Busch, H., & Hofer, J. (2012). Self-regulation and milestones of adult development: Intimacy and generativity. *Developmental Psychology, 48*(1), 282–293. doi:10.1037/a0025521
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 543–545.
- Cain, S. (2012). *Quiet: The power of introverts in a world that can't stop talking*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers.
- Cameron, A. C. (2004). Kurtosis. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao (Eds.). *The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods* (2004). doi:10.4135/9781412950589.n601
- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83*(1), 29–45. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

- Campbell, W. K., & Campbell, S. M. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. *Self and Identity, 8*, 214–232.
doi:10.1080/15298860802505129
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(2), 340–354. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.2.340
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2005). Affective and social self-regulatory efficacy beliefs as determinants of positive thinking and happiness. *European Psychologist, 10*(4), 275–286. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.10.4.275
- Capron, E. W. (2004). Types of pampering and the narcissistic personality trait. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 60*(1), 76–93.
- Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(4), 982–997. doi:10.1037/a0016351
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159. Retrieved from <http://web.vu.lt/fsf/d.noreika/files/2011/10/Cohen-J-1992-A-power-primer-kokio-reikia-imtys-dyd%C5%BEio.pdf>
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap—and others don't*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness
- Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T., & Peracchio, L. (1990). Quasi Experimentation. In M. D.

- Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- DeBono, A., Shmueli, D., & Muraven, M. (2011). Rude and inappropriate: The role of self-control in following social norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 136–146. doi:10.1177/014616720391478
- Devonport, T. J., & Lane, A. M. (2006). Relationships between self-efficacy, coping, and student retention. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(2), 127–138.
- DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., Stillman, T. F., & Gailliot, M. T. (2007). Violence restrained: Effects of self-regulation and its depletion on aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(1), 62–76. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.005
- Duckworth, A. L. (2009). Backtalk: Self-discipline is empowering. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(07), 536. Retrieved from <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~duckwort/images/self-discipline%20is%20empowering.pdf>
- Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 291–300.
- Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2004). Too proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 894–912. doi:10.1037/0022.3514.87.6.894
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Publications Inc.

- Fisk, G. M. (2010). "I want it all and I want it now!" An examination of the etiology, expression, and escalation of excessive employee entitlement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 102–114. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.11.001
- Furnham, A. (1987). Predicting protestant work ethic beliefs. *European Journal of Personality*, 1, 93–106.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. P. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 37, 1193–1204. doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9284-9
- Harvey, P., & Martinko, M. J. (2009). An empirical examination of the role of attributions in psychological entitlement and its outcome. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 459–476. doi:10.1002/job.549
- Holtzman, N. S., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Sounds like a narcissist: Behavioral manifestations of narcissism in everyday life. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 478–484. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.001
- Hotchkiss, S. (2002). *Why is it always about you? The seven deadly sins of narcissism*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Grossman, P. B. (1997). A positive view of self: Risk or protection for aggressive children? *Development and Psychopathology*, 1, 75–94.
- Retrieved from

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=4343>

1

- Joët, G., Usher, E. L., & Bressoux, P. (2011). Sources of self-efficacy: An investigation of elementary school students in France. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 649–663. doi:10.1037/a0024048
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. D., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality, 23*, 5–18. doi:10.1002/per.698
- Juneman, P. M. M. (2013). Apathy towards environmental issues, narcissism, and competitive view of the world. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 101*(8), 44–52. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.177
- Karterud, S. (2010). On narcissism, evolution, and group dynamics: A tribute to Malcolm Pines. *Group Analysis, 43*(3), 301–310. doi:10.1177/0533316410372247
- Kerig, P. K., & Stellwagen, K. K. (2010). Roles of callous-unemotional traits, narcissism, and Machiavellianism in childhood aggression. *Journal of Psychopathology & Behavioral Assessment, 32*(3), 343–352. doi:10.1007/s10862-009-9168-7
- Krizan, Z., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Better than my loved ones: Social comparison tendencies among narcissists. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 212–216. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.031
- Lent, R. W., Singley, E., Sheu, H., Gainor, K. A., Brenner, B. R., Treistman, D., & Ades, L. (2005). Social cognitive predictors of domain and life satisfaction: Exploring the theoretical precursors of subjective well-being. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 52(3), 429–442. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.3.429

Lessard, J., Greenberger, E., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. P. (2011). Are youths' feelings of entitlement always "bad"? Evidence for a distinction between exploitive and non-exploitive dimensions of entitlement. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 521–529.
doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.05.014

Lippmann, S., Bulanda, R. E., & Wagenaar, T. C. (2009). Student entitlement: Issues and strategies for confronting entitlement in the classroom and beyond. *College Teaching*, 57(4), 197–204.

Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments. *American Psychologist*, 53(2), 205–220. Retrieved from
http://nortonsafe.search.ask.com/web?q=masten%20and%20coatsworth%20development%20of%20competence&o=15527&prt=360&chn=retail&geo=US&ver=20&locale=en_US&tpr=111

Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., Gorman, C. A., & Thomas, A. L. E. (2013). Development and validation of a short form for the multidimensional work ethic profile. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 155–164. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2013.01.007

Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, 76(3), 449–476.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x

- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). The case for using research on trait narcissism as a building block for understanding narcissistic personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*(3), 180–191.
doi:10.1037/a0018229
- Mischel, W., Ayduk, O., Berman, M. G., Casey, B. J., Gotlib, I. H., Honides, H., Kross, E., Teslovich, T., Wilson, N. L., Zayas, V., & Shoda, Y. (2011). ‘Willpower’ over the life span: decomposing self-regulation. *SCAN, 6*, 252–256.
doi:10.1093/scan/nsq081
- Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Peake, P. K. (1988). The nature of adolescent competencies predicted by preschool delay of gratification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(4), 687–696. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.687
- Moeller, S. J., Crocker, J., & Bushman, B. J. (2009). Creating hostility and conflict: Effects of entitlement and self-image goals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(2), 448–452. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.11.005
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*(4), 177–196.
doi:10.1207/S15327965PL11204_1
- Partridge, C. R. (1976). Immature character development: A new look at etiology and remediation of character disorders in children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 5*(1), 45–47. doi:10.1080/15374417609532694.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Levitt, K. (1987). Desirable responding triggered by affect: Automatic egotism? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(2), 245–259.

doi:10.1037/0022-3514.52.2.245

- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Proctor, C., Linley, P. A., & Maltby, J. (2010). Very happy youths: Benefits of very high life satisfaction among adolescents. *Social indicators research*, 98, 519–532.
doi:10.1007/s11205-009-9562-2
- Pryor, L. R., Miller, J. D., & Gaughan, E. T. (2008). A comparison of the psychological entitlement scale and the narcissistic personality inventory's entitlement scale: Relations with general personality traits and personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(5), 517–520. doi:10.1080/00223890802248893
- Ramsey, A., Watson, P. J., Biderman, M. D., & Reeves, A. L. (1996). Self-reported narcissism and perceived parental permissiveness and authoritarianism. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 157(2), 227–238.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 890–902.
- Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., Foster, J. D., & Martinez, M. A. (2008). Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(4), 865–875. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.015
- Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 672–685.

- Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(2), 353–387. doi:10.1037/a0026838
- Romer, D., Duckworth, A. L., Sznitman, S., & Park, S. (2010). Can adolescents learn self-control? Delay of gratification in the development of control over risk taking. *Prevention Science, 11*, 319–330. doi:10.1007/s11121-010-0171-8
- Rose, P. (2007). Mediators of the association between narcissism and compulsive buying: The roles of materialism and impulse control. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 21*(4), 576–581. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.21.4.576
- Sandstrom, M. (2011). Defensive egotism and aggression in childhood: A new lens on the self-esteem paradox. In C. T. Barry, P. K. Kerig, K. K. Stellwagen, & T. D. Barry (Eds.), *Narcissism and Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior* (pp.71–88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Scherbaum, C. A., Cohen-Charash, Y., & Kern, M. J. (2006). Measuring general self-efficacy: A comparison of three measures using item response theory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(6), 1047–1063. doi:10.1177/0013164406288171
- Schunk, D. H., & Hanson, A. R. (1985). Peer models: Influence on children's self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(3), 313–322.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio*.

Causal and control beliefs (pp. 35–37). Windsor, England: NFER-NELSON.

http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/faq_gse.pdf

- Sethi, A., Mischel, W., Aber, J. L., Shoda, Y., & Rodriguez, M. L. (2000). The role of strategic attention deployment in development of self-regulation: Predicting preschoolers' delay of gratification from mother-toddler interactions. *Developmental Psychology, 36*(6), 767–777. doi:10.1037//0012-1649.36.6.767
- Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 363–382. doi:10.1002/job.147
- Smrt, D. L., & Karau, S. J. (2011). Protestant work ethic moderates social loafing. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1*–8. doi:10.1037/a0024484
- Spector, P. E. (2011). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(4), 342–352. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.002
- Steca, P., Caprara, G. V., Tramontano, C., & Vecchio, B. M. (2009). Young adults' life satisfaction: The role of self-regulatory efficacy beliefs in managing affects and relationships across time and across cultures. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 28*(7), 824–861. doi:10.1521/jscp.2009.28.7.824
- Story, P., Stasson, M. F., Mahoney, J. M., & Hart, J. W. (2008). A two-factor model of achievement motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(5), 707–708. doi:10.2224/sbp.2008.36.5.707
- Strelan, P. (2007). Who forgives others, themselves, and situations? The roles of

- narcissism, guilt, self-esteem, and agreeableness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(2), 259–269. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.06.017
- Strobel, M., Tumasjan, A., & Spörrle, M. (2011). Be yourself, believe in yourself, and be happy: Self-efficacy as a mediator between personality factors and subjective well-being. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 43–48. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00826.x
- Strunk, K. K., & Steele, M. R. (2011). Relative contributions of self-efficacy, self-regulation, and self-handicapping in predicting student procrastination. *Psychological Reports*, 109(3), 983–989. doi:10.2466/07.09.20.PRO.109.6.983-989
- Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Is extremely high life satisfaction during adolescence advantageous? *Social Indicators Research*, 78, 179–203. doi:10.1007/s11205-005-8208-2
- Tacq, J. (2004). Part correlation. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao(Ed.). *The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods* (2004). doi:10.4135/9781412950589.n688
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 272–322. doi:10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x
- terBogt, T., Raaijmakers, Q., & van Wel, F. (2005). Socialization and development of the work ethic among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 420–437. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2003.12.003

- Trochim, W. M. K., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M. B., & Robins, R. W. (2008). Do today's young people really think they are so extraordinary? An examination of secular trends in narcissism and self-enhancement. *Psychological Science, 19*(2), 191–188.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02065.x
- Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled – and more miserable than ever before*. New York: NY: Free Press.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 25*, 201–210.
doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6
- Twenge, J. M. (2013). The evidence for generation me and against generation we. *Emerging Adulthood, 1*(1), 11–16. doi:10.1177/2167696812466548
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966–2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(5), 1045–1062.
doi:10.1037/a0027408
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Gentile, B. (2012). Generational increases in agentic self-evaluations among American college students, 1966–2009. *Self and Identity,*

11(4), 409–427. doi:10.1080/15298868.2011.576820

Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982–2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(1), 99–106. doi:10.1177/1948550609355719

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality*, 76(4), 875–901.

doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00507.x

Twenge, J. M., Zhang, L., & Im, C. (2004). It's beyond my control: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of increasing externality in locus of control, 1960–2002.

Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8(3), 308–319.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research* 2008, 78(4), 751–797. doi:10.3102/0034654308321456

Valiente, C., Lemery-Chalfant, K., Swanson, J., & Reiser, M. (2008). Prediction of children's academic competence from their effortful control, relationship, and classroom participation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(1), 67–77.

doi:10.1037/0022-0663.100.1.67

Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(2), 154–165.

doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_4

Vernon, P. A., Villani, V. C., Vickers, L. C., & Harris, J. A. (2008). A behavioral genetic

- investigation of the dark triad and the Big 5. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 445–452. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.09.007
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(4), 632–657. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.632
- Washburn, J. J., & Paskar, L. D. (2011). Moving beyond parents in the etiology of narcissistic traits. In C. T. Barry, P. K. Kerig, K. K. Stellwagen, & T. D. Barry (Eds.), *Narcissism and Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior* (pp.71–88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Watson, P. J., Little, T., & Biderman, M. D. (1992). Narcissism and parenting styles. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 9(2), 231–244.
- Wills, T. A., Ainette, M. G., Stoolmiller, M., Gibbons, F. X., & Shinar, O. (2008). Good self-control as a buffering agent for adolescent substance use: An investigation in early adolescence with time-varying covariates. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 22(4), 459–471. doi:10.1037/a0012965
- Wills, T. A., Walker, C., Mendoza, D., & Ainette, M. G. (2006). Behavioral and emotional self-control: Relations to substance use in samples of middle and high school students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 20(3), 265–278.
doi:10.1037/0893-164X.20.3.265
- Winstok, Z. (2009). From self-control capabilities and the need to control others to

- proactive and reactive aggression among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 455–466. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.08.006
- Yu, J. J. (2010a). Reciprocal influences between parental knowledge and adolescent self-control: A cross-sequential nationwide study of Korean youth. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(4), 458–467. doi:10.1037/a0020425
- Yu, J. J. (2010b). Self-Control Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi:10.1037/t03590-000
- Yun, I., & Walsh, A. (2011). The stability of self-control among South Korean adolescents. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(3), 445–459. doi:10.1177/0306624X09358072
- Zuckerman, M., & O'Loughlin, R. E. (2009). Narcissism and well-being: A longitudinal perspective. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(6), 957–972. doi:10.1002/ejsp.594

Appendix A: Parent Consent

Your child in Grade 10, 11, or 12 is invited to complete a survey that is part of a university research study designed to solicit their beliefs regarding work, self-control, what they feel entitled to, and how they view their ability to deal with situations. The purpose of the study is to increase what we know about how adolescents' beliefs and attitudes might affect their behaviors. The potential benefits of the study are to inform practices of parents or educators working with adolescents by providing guidance for policies or practices that help them avoid behaviors with negative effects. If you consent to your child participating in the study, please check the boxes and click next at the bottom of the page to access the questionnaire.

I understand that some sample questions are: If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution/People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation. My child will be asked to indicate to what level they agree or disagree with the statements.

I understand this is a voluntary survey that will take approximately 15 to 30 minutes, that my child may stop at any time without penalty, and that the sole minimal compensation will be by SurveyMonkey as previously arranged with SurveyMonkey Audience. I understand my child may experience minor discomfort, such as fatigue or stress, but that the study would not pose a risk to my child's safety or wellbeing.

I understand all information will be kept confidential and my child's name will not appear on the questionnaire, that the information will be used solely for this research project by the researcher, and that the data will be kept on a password protected computer for a period of 5 years, as required by the university. I understand that SurveyMonkey has access to the data and may use it to invite me to future surveys.

I understand I may contact the doctoral student researcher at XXX or call XXX to discuss my child's rights as a participant. Walden University's approval number for this study is 10-22-14-0117199 and it expires on October 20, 2015. Please keep a copy this consent form.

Appendix B: Student Consent

You have been invited to participate in a survey because you are a student in Grade 10, 11, or 12. Please complete the following to show your agreement to completing the survey.

I understand that I will complete a questionnaire about my beliefs and attitudes that will be used in a university research project to find out how beliefs and attitudes could affect how we behave. This project might help others by providing more information on certain beliefs that might predict behaviors with negative effects.

I understand the questionnaire will take approximately 15 to 30 minutes, that I may feel fatigued or tired, and that I am able to stop at any time. I will be asked to agree or disagree with statements like: If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution/People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.

I understand my information will be kept private and my name will not be on the survey. I understand the information will be used only for this research project by the researcher, and that the data will be kept on a password protected computer for a period of 5 years, as required by the university. I understand that SurveyMonkey has access to the data and may use it to invite my parent to future surveys.

I understand I may contact the researcher, who is a doctoral student, at XXX or call XXX. Please keep a copy of this form.

Appendix C: Protecting Human Research Participants

Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Janine Shalka** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 04/21/2013

Certification Number: 1167011