

# The Relationship between Personality and Entitlement: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective

Emilie A. Ney<sup>1</sup> and Priva Fischweicher<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Barry University, United States

## Abstract

By understanding the factors that impact how different people think, feel, or act, psychologists can gain insight that will allow them to predict how individuals are likely to behave in certain situations. One construct that has received recent attention in relation to personality is entitlement. A small number of studies have previously found relationships between specific personality traits and several narrow conceptualizations of entitlement. However, these studies have consistently studied entitlement from the perspective of a maladaptive trait that is closely tied to narcissism. Therefore, the current study examined the relationship between the Big Five Personality Traits and two different conceptualizations of psychological entitlement. A Pearson's product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between each of the Big Five Personality Traits and entitlement as measured by the PES and the three factors of the EAQ (Active Entitlement, Passive Entitlement, and Revenge Entitlement). Extraversion was high for the PES and Active Entitlement but low for Revenge Entitlement, while Agreeableness was high for Passive Entitlement but low for Revenge Entitlement and the PES. Revenge Entitlement and PES show some overlap as maladaptive traits that are characterized by low Agreeableness. Revenge Entitlement emerged as the component of entitlement that was most closely associated with the Big Five Personality Traits, showing negative relationships with all of the personality traits except for Neuroticism.

**Keywords:** entitlement, personality traits, big five, personality psychology, social psychology

## 1. Introduction

The study of personality focuses on describing, predicting, and explaining characteristic patterns in the ways that people think feel and act. Because of the relative stability of these patterns across time and setting, psychologists can draw conclusions about personality differences between individuals and about intra-individual determinants. While a wide array of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors may characterize an individual's personality, several common patterns of personality characteristics have been identified that can typically be described by a discrete set of personality traits. A prominent and enduring model of personality traits is the Five Factor Model, commonly referred to as the Big Five Personality Traits (Baumert et al., 2019).

## **1.1 The Big Five Personality Traits**

The Five Factor Model of personality grew out of the work of many researchers over years of study and became prominent in the 1980s. Through factor analysis, these researchers categorized personality characteristics into five distinct traits (Cattell, 1943, 1956; Costa & McCrae, 1985; Eysenck, 1950, 1970; Goldberg, 1981). These Big Five Personality Traits reflect a shared taxonomy for describing personality dimensions using terms found in natural language. One purpose for synthesizing the multitude of personality characteristics into five traits was to create a standardized vocabulary within which to evaluate empirical research findings (Digman, 1989; John & Srivastava, 1995). Consensual validity of the traits was demonstrated by a convergence between self-reported trait ratings and ratings obtained from others familiar with each individual, particularly those well acquainted with the person (John & Robins, 1993). Another important factor validating this taxonomy was the longitudinal stability of the five personality traits, beginning in young adulthood (Soldz & Vaillant, 1999)

The Big Five Personality Traits are: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. Each trait is displayed along a continuum rather than as a dichotomous type, so that some individuals might display high levels of one trait but more moderate levels of another trait. Extraversion is defined as an energetic approach to the world and is further ascribed to a person with a high energy level who is assertive, sociable, and adventurous. The individual may also demonstrate positive emotionality including confidence, cheerfulness, and optimism (Costa & McCrae, 2008; Digman, 1989). Extraversion may also manifest itself through a person's need to control, their preference to do things their way, and their tendency to be opinionated (Allroggen et al, 2018; Boudreaux et al., 2013). The second trait, Agreeableness describes someone who is cooperative, helpful, trustful, sympathetic, and good natured (Bruck & Allen, 1989; John & Srivastava, 1995). According to Digman (1989), being submissive is another attribute of Agreeableness. People high in this personality trait were more likely to volunteer in their communities (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006). Difficulty in saying no to requests, prioritizing tasks, and experiencing frustration when confronted by schedules and due dates are other dimensions of Agreeableness (Boudreaux et al., 2013).

Conscientiousness aligns with an individual who is purposeful, determined, reliable, organized, careful, and strong willed (McCrae & Costa, 1991). People who show a high level of Neuroticism are often worried, insecure, impulsive, vulnerable to stress, and self-pitying. They may display emotional instability, manifesting in fear, guilt, worry, sadness, anger, embarrassment, and disgust (Allroggen et al. 2018; McCrae & Costa, 1991). In addition, they tend to have difficulty coping with stressful situations and be hyper-sensitive to social threats (Denissen & Penke, 2008). Emotional exhaustion and burnout may be an outcome of Neuroticism (Bakker et al., 2006; Goodard et al., 2004). Openness reflects a tendency to display imaginativeness, independence, and favor variety in terms of experiences (John & Srivastava, 1995). This may lead to increased participation in risky activities (Tok, 2011).

## **1.2 Entitlement**

Entitlement is a construct that has multiple definitions depending on the field of study, and each definition brings with it different instruments for measuring it (Cambell, et al., 2004; Tomlinson, 2013; Zemojtel-Piotrowska et al., 2017). For example, although researchers agree

that a sense of deservingness is a core feature of entitlement, they differ on how it manifests itself (Feather, 2008; Weiner, 1985). One conceptualization of entitlement views deservingness as a right, not specifically based on an individual's actions or behaviors (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). This perspective views entitlement as a socially undesirable trait, as the person has unjustifiable expectations concerning what is deserved.

Another view of entitlement aligns with social norms and obligations. It is premised on the belief that everyone has a right to specific benefits or supports, depending on their situation and position in society (Black, 1990; Lessard et al., 2011). In the field of psychology, entitlement is approached from two main perspectives, the Personality Psychology Approach, focused on a narcissistic view of entitlement and the Social Psychology Approach, that encompasses prosocial traits.

### **1.1.1 Personality Psychology Approach**

The Personality Psychology Approach had its genesis within the Narcissistic Personality Disorder, where entitlement was depicted as an aspect of narcissism (APA, 1980). Conceptualized within this context, entitlement was defined as expecting to be the recipient of special treatment, even when one's behavior does not justify the rewards anticipated. This emphasis on pathological and maladaptive behaviors (Campbell et al., 2004) was incorporated in the Narcissistic Personality Inventory's Entitlement subscale (NPI-E), the first instrument widely used to measure entitlement (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Although Campbell et al. (2004) updated and expanded the NPI-E, leading to the creation of a new instrument, the Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES), entitlement remained a unidimensional construct, continuing to focus on characteristics related to narcissistic behaviors.

### **1.1.2 Social Psychological Approach**

A multidimensional approach to entitlement was developed by other researchers, advancing the definition of entitlement to include positive social traits in addition to the narcissistic characteristics described previously. Entitlement was viewed as a behavioral tendency that can manifest as either beneficial or maladaptive. According to this social psychological conceptualization, the feeling of deservingness associated with entitlement stems from a social justice and fairness focus (Feather, 1994, 1999; Lerner, 1987). According to Fisk (2010) legitimate entitlement, referred to as deservingness, aligns the reward with the action. Premised on this approach, Żemojtel-Piotrowska et al. (2017) developed a three-dimensional model consisting of three entitlement constructs: active entitlement, passive entitlement, and revengefulness.

Active entitlement emphasizes self-promotion for goal attainment without encroaching on anyone else's rights. Passive entitlement focuses on the perception that the community or government is obligated to serve everyone's needs. The revengefulness aspect of entitlement encompasses a maladaptive perspective, focused on an individual's unwillingness to forgive a past wrong and instead focuses on revenge. The Entitlement Attitudes Questionnaire (EAQ) was formulated to measure these three facets of entitlement (Żemojtel-Piotrowska et al., 2017).

### **1.3 The Big Five Personality Traits and Entitlement**

A small body of research has directly or indirectly examined the relationship between the Big Five Personality Traits and entitlement. Much of this research has had its primary focus on narcissism and inferred conclusions about entitlement. For example, in a study of adolescents and young adults, researchers investigated the relationship between personality traits and narcissistic behavior. They used two indicators of narcissism, grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism. Grandiose narcissism was defined as arrogant and exploitive behavior and included increased levels of entitlement. Vulnerable narcissism was described as hidden grandiose fantasies, high levels of vulnerability when experiencing rejection and criticism, leading to social retreat and symptoms of depression (Levy, 2012). While grandiose narcissism is a broader construct than entitlement, this form of narcissism includes entitlement as a characteristic. The researchers found a positive relationship between grandiose entitlement and Extraversion, but a negative relationship with Agreeableness (Allroggen et al., 2018). Similarly, a study using the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) and the Big Five Inventory (BFI), found a positive association between narcissism and two personality types, Extraversion and Openness, and a negative relationship with Agreeableness (Paulhaus & Williams, 2002). Other researchers have found similar positive associations between narcissism and Extraversion and negative associations between narcissism and Agreeableness (Back et al., 2013; Glover et al., 2012; Lynam et al., 2011; Miller et al., 2010).

Other researchers directly isolated entitlement as a correlate of the Big Five; however, the focus remained specifically on the unidimensional Personality Psychology Approach to entitlement, whose focus is narcissistic behavior. As part of their research to validate the Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES), Campbell et al. (2004) investigated correlations between the PES, the NPI Entitlement subscale, and elements of the Big Five Personality Types. They found the PES and NPI-E had negative correlations with Agreeableness. They also found a correlation between the PES and Neuroticism. Pryor et al. (2008) also compared the PES and the NPI, specifically looking at how the scales related to general personality traits and personality disorders. Using the NEO-PI-R to measure the Big Five Personality Types, the results indicated a negative relationship between entitlement and Agreeableness, specifically in three of six facets, trust, altruism, and compliance.

Relatedly, other research has focused specifically on academic entitlement and its relationship with personality. An article by Chowning and Campbell (2009) described the development of an instrument to measure academic entitlement through combining aspects of entitlement and relevant academic variables to predict inappropriate student behaviors. They then examined the relationship with the Big Five; results showed a positive correlation with Neuroticism on the externalized responsibility subscale, while Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion were negatively correlated. Externalized responsibility consists of an inability to accept responsibility along with high expectations of others. McLellan et al. (2017) also investigated academic entitlement which they similarly defined as a tendency to have unearned or undeserved academic achievement including unrealistic accommodations. They found academic entitlement to have a negative correlation with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

Across the studies of narcissism, psychological entitlement, and academic entitlement discussed above, the most consistent finding was a negative correlation with Agreeableness.

Another recurrent finding was a positive correlation with Extraversion. However, these studies have consistently studied entitlement from the perspective of a maladaptive trait that is closely tied to narcissism. There has yet to be a study examining the more broad conceptualization of psychological entitlement that includes the multidimensional social psychology approach in addition to the personality psychology approach. To fill this gap, the current study extends knowledge of these variables using quantitative research methodology to examine the relationship between entitlement and the Big Five Personality Traits. This exploratory study will examine the following research questions:

What is the relationship between the Personality Psychology definition of Entitlement and the Big Five Personality Traits?

What is a relationship between the Social Psychology Approach to entitlement and the Big Five Personality Traits?

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Participants**

For the current study, 316 participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a crowdsourcing marketplace that connects researchers with workers interested in participating in research surveys. MTurk workers who were born between the years of 1946 and 2000 and reside in the United States were invited to participate in this study. Participants were compensated \$1.00 upon completion of the survey. Stratified sampling was utilized to ensure that an even distribution of participants was obtained across the age span, resulting in 105 participants born 1946-1964, 106 born 1965-1980, and 105 born 1981-2000. Detailed demographic information is reported in Tab. 1.

*Table 1: Demographic variables*

	Total	Baby Boomers	Generation X	Millennials
<b>Total Participants</b>	316	105	106	105
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	154 (48.7%)	44 (41.9)	56 (52.8)	54 (51.4)
Female	161 (50.9%)	60 (57.1)	50 (47.2)	51 (48.6)
Not Reported	1 (3%)	1 (1)	0	0
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Caucasian	252 (80.4%)	92 (87.6)	82 (77.4)	80 (76.2)
African American	26 (8.2%)	5 (4.8)	12 (11.3)	9 (8.6)
Asian	16 (5.1%)	4 (3.8)	3 (2.8)	9 (8.6)
Hispanic	9 (2.8%)	1 (1)	1	4 (3.8)
Multi-Racial	6 (1.9%)	1 (1)	1	3 (2.8)
Native American	3 (.9%)	1 (1)	1	2 (1.9)
Not Reported	2 (.6%)	1 (1)	1	0
<b>Geographic Region</b>				
Northeast	81 (25.6)	28 (26.7)	25 (23.6)	28 (26.7)
South	99 (31.3)	28 (26.7)	36 (34)	35 (33.3)
Midwest	59 (18.7)	20 (19)	22 (20.8)	17 (16.2)
Southwest	25 (7.9)	13 (12.4)	8 (7.5)	4 (3.8)
West	49 (15.5)	14 (13.3)	15 (14.2)	20 (19)
Not Reported	3 (.9)	2 (1.9)	2	0
<b>Setting</b>				
Urban	89 (28.2)	25 (23.8)	32 (30.2)	32 (30.5)
Suburban	162 (51.3)	59 (56.2)	50 (47.2)	53 (50.5)
Rural	64 (20.3)	21 (20)	24 (22.6)	19 (18.1)
Not Reported	1 (.3)	0	0	1 (1)
<b>Education Level</b>				
< high school degree	3 (.9)	0	1 (.9)	2 (1.9)
High school degree	25 (7.9)	11 (10.5)	7 (6.6)	7 (6.7)
Some college	80 (25.3)	22 (21)	25 (23.6)	33 (31.4)
Associate degree	42 (13.3)	13 (12.4)	18 (17)	11 (10.5)
Bachelor's degree	105 (33.2)	38 (36.2)	31 (29.2)	36 (34.3)
Master's degree	59 (18.7)	20 (19)	24 (22.6)	15 (14.3)
Doctoral degree	2 (.6)	1 (1)	1	0
<b>Household Income</b>				
Less than \$25,000	42 (13.3%)	9 (8.6)	12 (11.3)	21 (20)
\$25,000-\$34,999	57 (18%)	23 (21.9)	17 (16)	17 (16.2)
\$35,000-\$49,999	48 (15.2%)	17 (16.2)	13 (12.3)	18 (17.1)
\$50,000-\$74,999	83 (26.3%)	28 (26.7)	29 (27.4)	26 (24.8)
\$75,000-\$99,999	44 (13.9%)	19 (18.1)	13 (12.3)	12 (11.4)
\$100,000-\$149,999	30 (9.5%)	4 (3.8)	17 (16)	9 (8.6)
\$150,000 or more	11 (3.5%)	4 (3.8)	5 (4.7)	2 (1.9)
Not Reported	1 (.3%)	1 (1)	1	0

Note.

## 2.2 Materials

### 2.2.1 Demographic Information

Demographic information was collected in survey format and included gender, race/ethnicity, age, region of the country, urban/suburban/rural living, education level, occupation, and income level.

### 2.2.2 Psychological Entitlement

Psychological entitlement was measured by two instruments, each of which measures a different conceptualization of entitlement. The Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES; Campbell et al., 2004) conceptualizes psychological entitlement as a pervasive sense of deserving more and being entitled to more than other individuals. It is based on the belief that psychological entitlement is a unifactorial personality characteristic that emphasizes maladaptive, pathological, narcissistic characteristics. The PES consists of nine items scored on a 7-point Likert scale with a Cronbach's alpha of .84 (Campbell et al., 2004).

The Entitlement Attitudes Questionnaire (EAQ; Żemojtel-Piotrowka et al., 2017) measures psychological entitlement as a multi-factorial construct that encompasses three types of entitlement: active entitlement, passive entitlement, and revengefulness. The three components are defined by the relationship between self-interest and other people or institutions. Active entitlement is focused on self-promotion and self-reliance in goal attainment. The defining feature of passive entitlement is the individual's focus on social groups that serve to promote the person's interests. Finally, revengefulness involves the need to protect one's self-interest when a situation may cause it to be violated, leading to a tendency to take revenge and be unforgiving of perceived wrongs. This instrument consists of 15 items, with 5 items per entitlement type and was validated in 28 countries. The Cronbach's alphas for each entitlement type were .77 (active), .88 (passive), and .80 (revenge) respectively (Żemojtel-Piotrowka et al., 2017).

### 2.2.3 Personality Traits

Personality traits are measured using the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John et al., 1991). The BFI is a 44 item self-report survey that measures the Big Five Personality Traits: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. Participants respond to each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). The BFI shows a mean test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 and self-peer convergent validity correlations of .56. Structural validity was tested with intercorrelations among items and showed an overall mean intercorrelation of .21. Correlations were conducted with the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) to determine convergent validity, and showed an average correlation .78 (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

### 2.3 Procedures

Participants completed an anonymous survey through SurveyMonkey. Upon completion of the survey, participants received \$1.00 compensation, which was credited to their MTurk accounts. Data was analyzed using SPSS Version 26.

## 3. Results

A Pearson's product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between each of the Big Five Personality Traits and entitlement as measured by the PES and the three factors of the EAQ (Active Entitlement, Passive Entitlement, and Revenge Entitlement). Inspection of scatterplots suggested that the relationships between variables were linear and that there were no outliers of concern. Tests of skewness and kurtosis and examination of Normal Q-Q Plots suggest all variables are approximately normally distributed. Active Entitlement had a statistically significant small positive correlation with Extraversion,  $r(314) = .267, p < .01$ , with 7% of the variance accounted for. Passive Entitlement had statistically significant small positive correlations with Agreeableness,  $r(314) = .224, p < .01$ , with 5% of the variance accounted for, and Openness,  $r(314) = .275, p < .01$ , with 7.5% of the variance accounted for. Revenge Entitlement had statistically significant small negative relationships with Extraversion,  $r(314) = -.208, p < .01$ , with 4% of the variance accounted for, Openness,  $r(314) = -.260, p < .01$ , with 7% of the variance accounted for, and Conscientiousness,  $r(314) = -.214, p < .01$ , with 5% of the variance accounted for; a moderate negative relationship with Agreeableness,  $r(314) = -.451, p < .01$ , with 20% of the variance accounted for; and a small

positive correlation with Neuroticism,  $r(314) = .302, p < .01$ , with 9% of the variance accounted for. The PES had a statistically significant small positive correlation with Extraversion,  $r(314) = -.196, p < .01$ , with 4% of the variance accounted for and a small negative correlation with Agreeableness,  $r(314) = .140, p < .05$ , with 2% of the variance accounted for.

Table 2: Pearson correlations for main study variables

	AE	PE	RE	PES
Extraversion	.267**	-.015	-.208**	.196**
Agreeableness	-.077	.224**	-.451**	-.140*
Openness	.040	.275**	-.260**	-.054
Conscientiousness	.001	.050	-.214**	-.036
Neuroticism	-.020	.038	.302**	-.030

*Note.* PES=Psychological Entitlement Scale, AE=Active Entitlement, PE=Passive Entitlement, RE=Revenge Entitlement, \*\*=statistically significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*= statistically significant at  $p < .05$  level

#### 4. Discussion

The current study sought to examine the relationship between the Big Five Personality Traits and two different conceptualizations of psychological entitlement. A small number of studies have previously found relationships between specific personality traits and several narrow conceptualizations of entitlement. For example, academic entitlement was negatively correlated with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (McLellan & Jackson, 2017) and grandiose narcissism, which includes arrogant and exploitative behavior and an attitude of entitlement, was positively correlated with Extraversion and negatively correlated with Agreeableness (Allroggen et al., 2018). Similarly, the personality psychology conceptualization of entitlement, which has its roots in Narcissistic Personality Disorder, was positively correlated with Extraversion and negatively correlated with Agreeableness (Campbell et al., 2004 & Pryor et al., 2008). The personality psychology conceptualization of entitlement is the one that has received the most attention in the psychological literature and defines entitlement as a sense that one deserves more than others, without having to earn the reward. This is also the conceptualization of entitlement that is measured by the PES in this study. Results of the current study show a similar pattern of associations as those noted by Campbell et al. (2004) and Pryor et al. (2008), with individuals scoring high on the PES showing higher levels of Extraversion and lower levels of Agreeableness.

However, the multidimensional components of entitlement described by the social psychology approach to entitlement have not been considered in relation to personality traits. To further understand the unique relationships each dimension of entitlement has with the Big Five Personality Traits, the three dimensions of the social psychological approach to entitlement (active entitlement, passive entitlement, and revenge entitlement) were examined in relation to the personality traits. Active entitlement, which includes promoting one's own personal goal attainment without harming others, was positively related to Extraversion and did not show a relationship with any of the other personality traits. That is, individuals who are optimistic, sociable, and assertive (Extraversion) are more likely to prioritize achieving



their goals without harming others. The association between Extraversion and active entitlement is consistent with the relationships that have previously been observed with other forms of entitlement, which suggests that Extraversion may be a salient characteristic of individuals who exhibit entitlement.

Passive entitlement, which reflects a belief that the community is responsible for meeting the needs of members of the community, was positively related to both Agreeableness and Openness, but was unrelated to any of the other personality traits. This suggests that people who are cooperative, good natured, and trustful (Agreeableness) and those who are imaginative and independent (Openness) are more likely to believe that the community or government is responsible for meeting the needs of all members of the community. Unlike the personality psychology conceptualization of entitlement that is closely tied to narcissism and is generally seen as a maladaptive characteristic, Passive Entitlement reflects a more prosocial and adaptive component. Therefore, it is not surprising that, while Agreeableness is also associated with the personality psychology conceptualization of entitlement, the direction of the relationship is reversed. That is, people who display the narcissistic characteristics of entitlement are less agreeable, while those who display a sense of responsibility for caring for their community exhibit a higher level of Agreeableness.

Finally, the third component of the social psychology conceptualization of entitlement, revenge entitlement, showed the strongest association with the Big Five Personality Traits. This form of entitlement is generally considered maladaptive and is characterized by seeking revenge on those who have done harm. Unlike the PES and active entitlement, revenge entitlement showed a negative relationship with Extraversion, suggesting that those who are unforgiving and vengeful are less likely to be optimistic, sociable, and assertive. The inverse relationship between revenge entitlement and Agreeableness was the strongest relationship found among the study variables, with 20% of the variance accounted for. This finding suggests that individuals who demonstrate revenge entitlement are less likely to be cooperative, good natured, and trustful. This is consistent with prior research focused on the personality psychology conceptualization of entitlement and with the results for the PES in the current study. This suggests some alignment between revenge entitlement and the characteristics of those who demonstrate narcissistic characteristics of entitlement. In contrast to the more prosocial passive entitlement, revenge entitlement was inversely associated with the tendency to be imaginative and independent (Openness), and determined and strong willed (Conscientiousness) but more likely to occur in individuals who are worried, insecure, and self-pitying (Neuroticism).

Some limitations should be noted, which may have impacted the results in the current study. Ratings of entitlement and personality traits were obtained through a self-report survey, which can be influenced by participants' lack of insight, self-perceptions, or attempts to respond in a socially desirable way. In addition, participants were recruited using Amazon Mechanical Turk, so the sample was limited to individuals who registered with that program and chose to complete the survey in exchange for a small financial compensation. Therefore, the responses obtained from this sample of participants may not be representative of the population at large.

## 5. Conclusion

Overall, when considering the two conceptualizations of entitlement, Extraversion and Agreeableness emerged as the personality traits that were most consistently associated with entitlement, though the nature of the relationships varied from one component of entitlement to another. Namely, Extraversion was high for the PES and active entitlement but low for revenge entitlement, while Agreeableness was high for passive entitlement but low for revenge entitlement and the PES. Revenge entitlement and PES show some overlap as maladaptive traits that are characterized by low Agreeableness. Revenge entitlement emerged as the component of entitlement that was most closely associated with the Big Five Personality Traits, showing negative relationships with all of the personality traits except for Neuroticism. These results serve as a springboard for further research into how an individual's personality traits might impact their beliefs about deservingness of certain rights, supports, or benefits.

## References

- Allrogen, M. Rehmann, P., Schürch, E., Morf, C. C., Kölch, M. (2018). The relationship between narcissism and personality traits of the five-factor model in adolescents and young adults: A comparative study. *Zeitschrift für Kinder- und Jugendpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie* 46(6), 516-522. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1024/1422-4917/a000588>
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(6), 1013–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034431>
- Bakker, A. B., Van Der Zee, K., Lewig, K. A., & Dollard, M. F. (2006). The relationship between the big five personality factors and burnout: A study among volunteer counselors. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 146(1). <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.146.1.31-50>
- Baumert, A., Schmitt, M., & Perugini, M. (2019). Towards an explanatory personality psychology: Integrating personality structure, personality process, and personality development. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 147, 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.04.016>
- Black, H. C. (1990). *Black's law dictionary*. West Publishing.
- Boudreaux, M. J., Piedmont, R. L., Sherman, M. F., & Ozer, D. J. (2013). Identifying personality-related problems in living: the multi-context problems checklist. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(1), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.717149>
- Bruck, C. S., & Allen, T. D. (2003). The relationship between big five personality traits, negative affectivity, type A behavior, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63, 457-472.

- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83, 29-45. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04)
- Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 982-997. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016351>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO-PI-R Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2008). The revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R). In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment, Vol. 2. Personality measurement and testing* (pp. 179-198). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200479.n9>
- Denissen, J. J. A., & Penke, L. (2008). Neuroticism predicts reactions to cues of social inclusion. *European Journal of Personality*, 22(6), 497-517. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.682>
- Digman, J. M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality* 57(2), 195-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1989.tb00480.x>
- Feather, N. T. (2008). Perceived legitimacy of a promotion decision in relation to deservingness, entitlement, and resentment in the context of affirmative action and performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 1230-1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00346.x>
- Glover, N., Miller, J., Lynam, D., Crego, C., & Widiger, T. (2012). The Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory: A Five-Factor Measure of Narcissistic Personality Traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94(5), 500-512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.670680>
- Goddard, R., Patton, W., & Creed, P. (2004). The importance and place of neuroticism in predicting burnout in employment service case managers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 282-296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02548.x>
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory--Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1993). Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The Big Five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique

- perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality* 61(4). 521-551.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00781.x>
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1995). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 102-138). Guilford Press.
- Lessard, J., Greenberger, E., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2011). Are youths' feelings of entitlement always "bad"? Evidence for a distinction between exploitive and non-exploitive dimensions of entitlement. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 522–529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.05.014>
- Levy, K. N. (2012). Subtypes, dimensions, levels, and mental states in narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 68(8), 886-897. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21893>
- Lynam, D. R., Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Miller, D. J., Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Widiger, T. A. (2011). Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: Development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 23(1), 108–124. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021146>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). The NEO Personality Inventory: Using the five-factor model in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 69(4), 367-372. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01524.x>
- McLellan, C. K., & Jackson, D. L. (2017). Personality, self-regulated learning, and academic entitlement. *Social Psychology of Education* 20, 159-178.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9357-7>
- Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality* 78(5), 1529-1564.
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57(1), 401–421. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190127>
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality* 36(6), 556-563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890802248893>
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(1), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.001>

- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890>
- Soldz, S., & Vaillant, G. E. (1999). The big five personality traits and the life course: A 45-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality* 33(2), 208-232. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1999.2243>
- Tok, S. (2011). The Big five personality traits and risky sport participation. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 39(8), 1105–1111. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2011.39.8.1105>
- Thomlinson, E. C. (2013). An integrative model of entitlement beliefs. *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, 25(2), 67-87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-012-9208-4>
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. Simon & Schuster. <https://www.simonandschuster.com/books/The-Narcissism-Epidemic/Jean-M-Twenge/9781416575993>
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional model of motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548-573. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.92.4.548>
- Žemojtel-Piotrowska, M. A., Piotrowska, J. P., Ciecuch, J., Calogero, R. M., Van Hiel, A., Argentero, P., Baran, T., Bardhwaj, G., Bukowski, M., Chargazia, M., Clinton, A., Halik, M. H. J., Illisko, D., Khachatryan, N., Klicperova-Baker, M., Kostal, J., Kovacs, M., Letovancova, E., Liik, K., Marganski, A.,...Wills-Herrera, E. Measurement of psychological entitlement in 28 countries. (2017). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33(3), 207-217. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000286>