

A Comparison of Goal Setting and Reputational Orientations of African Adolescents from  
Refugee Backgrounds in Intensive English Centres and Mainstream Secondary School  
Classrooms

Sashya Gunasekera

Graduate School of Education, The University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009, Perth,  
Western Australia, WA. Email: Sashya.Gunasekera@education.wa.edu.au

Stephen Houghton

Graduate School of Education, The University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009, Perth,  
Western Australia, WA. Email: Stephen.houghton@uwa.edu.au. Visiting Professor, School of  
Psychological and Health Sciences, The University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland.

Ken Glasgow

Graduate School of Education, The University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009, Perth,  
Western Australia, WA. Email: ken.glasgow@uwa.edu.au

Annemaree Carroll

The University of Queensland, School of Education, Brisbane Queensland 4072, Email:  
a.carroll@uq.edu.au

&

Simon C Hunter

School of Psychological Sciences and Health, Strathclyde University, Glasgow, Scotland.  
Honorary Research Fellow, Graduate School of Education, The University of Western  
Australia, Crawley, 6009, Perth, Western Australia, Email: simon.hunter@strath.ac.uk

*In Press: Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.*

**Abstract**

We compared the goals, reputations and behaviours of three groups: African adolescents from refugee backgrounds in Australian Intensive English Centres (IEC), African adolescents who have transitioned from an IEC into mainstream schooling, and Australian mainstream adolescents. We posit that the need for African adolescents from refugee backgrounds to identify with the dominant social group within the IEC and mainstream settings is an important factor in the goals they set, the reputations they choose, and the manner in which they pursue them. To this end, we conducted a cross sectional comparison through Reputation Enhancing Goals Theory, an approach congruent with sociocultural adaptation.

Using multivariate techniques we found African adolescents in the IEC context set academic goals associated with a conforming reputation, whereas African adolescents in mainstream schooling set social goals associated with a non-conforming reputation. Australian mainstream students had an equal split between academic and social goals and conforming/non-conforming reputations. Each of the three groups indulged in behaviours congruent with the goals they set and reputation sought. A series of separate multiple-mediation models revealed significant indirect effects on a number of variables via School Connectedness, Control over most important goal, and to a lesser extent Goals.

It appears African adolescents in mainstream schooling are attempting to adapt to another dominant culture (i.e., mainstream peers) on transitioning from the IEC, but they face confusion about who they are and who they wish to be. The implications for adolescents from African refugee backgrounds is, that while placing them in IECs for up to two years to help them settle into the education system is laudable, further support is needed when they transition to mainstream schooling.

*Keywords:* African adolescents from refugee backgrounds, sociocultural adaptation, Australian High schools

A Comparison of Goal Setting and Reputational Orientations of African Adolescents from Refugee Backgrounds in Intensive English Centres and Mainstream Secondary School Classrooms

**Introduction**

School aged students who arrive in Western Australia from refugee backgrounds are enrolled in Intensive English Centres (IEC) for up to 24 months so that they might successfully settle into the education system prior to transitioning to mainstream schooling. For many students from African refugee backgrounds transition to the mainstream setting is associated with emotional and behavioural problems (Brown, Miller, & Mitchell, 2006; Lloyd, 2006; Milner & Khawaja, 2010; Poppitt & Frey, 2007; Ziaian, Anstiss, Antoniou, Baghurst, & Sawyer, 2012) and subsequent increases in non-conformity and aggressive behaviour (Brown et al., 2006; Gunasekera, Houghton, Glasgow, & Boyle, 2014; Hillier, 2002).

Lacking the necessary skills to successfully engage in the new and more dominant culture (mainstream classes) following transition from the host culture (IEC) may be why these young people experience such difficulties in their everyday social encounters (see the review by Masgoret & Ward, 2006). Indeed, the importance of how well immigrant youth manage their daily lives in personal, social and academic areas, particularly in relation to school adjustment and behavior problems, within their intercultural setting (i.e., sociocultural adaptation) was highlighted by Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder (2006) in a study involving 7,997 adolescents (5,366 immigrants, ages 13-18 years) from 26 different cultural backgrounds (13 immigrant-receiving countries).

Recent empirical research appears to support this. Gunasekera et al. (2014) found that African adolescents from refugee backgrounds underwent significant adjustments to change following their transition from IEC to mainstream schooling. Specifically, while in an IEC, adolescents from African refugee backgrounds set specific academic goals, were highly

committed to attaining these goals, sought a socially conforming reputation, and did not involve themselves in non-conforming activities such as delinquency. Furthermore, they reported high levels of connectedness to teachers and school. However, within six months of transitioning into mainstream classes, the specific academic goals were replaced with social goals commensurate with a non-conforming reputation, greater importance was attached to these social goals, and this was accompanied by significant increases in delinquent and aggressive behaviour. Not surprisingly, significant reductions in connectedness to school and teachers were also evident (see Gunasekera et al., 2014).

The extensive work of Carroll and colleagues which has examined the motivational and social determinants of behaviour in school settings (for a comprehensive review see Carroll, Houghton, Durkin, & Hattie, 2009) and resulted in *Reputation Enhancing Goals Theory* (REG: Carroll, Houghton, Hattie & Durkin, 2001) has provided strong support for the relationship between goals and reputation. Two major types of goals, namely academic and/or social goals, the latter of which can be further divided into conforming or non-conforming social goals were evident among adolescents. The choice of these academic, conforming social, and/or non-conforming social goals are critical in the orientation, development, and management of adolescents' peer reputations (Carroll Houghton, Durkin, & Hattie, 2012). Reputations are collective phenomena and products of social processes, not just the impressions that individuals hold of themselves (Emler, 1990). Individuals deliberately choose the particular reputation they wish to present to their audience and endeavour through attainment of their goals to enhance and sustain this reputation (Emler, 1984).

For most adolescents, goals are congruent with those of school, but for others who are delinquent these types of goals are rejected or devalued. There are also other adolescents, who are in an intermediate transitional state and are "at risk" of delinquent status. For these "at risk" individuals the setting of and commitment to alternative goals (i.e., non-conforming,

delinquency goals) is becoming more attractive. Thus, adolescents are the architects of their own reputations through the way in which they present their desired reputation to others. The reason for this being that acquiring or striving for a reputation has implications for how an adolescent regards himself/herself and for how others perceive him/her (Emler & Reicher, 1995).

This may be applicable to African adolescents from refugee backgrounds as they attempt to integrate within mainstream schooling. For example, those who are connected to school will adopt the school's values, norms and expectations and for this reason will refrain from engaging in behaviours that are inconsistent with the schools expectations (Lopukas & Pasch, 2013). Indeed, school connectedness, which has been defined as students' experiences of belonging and closeness with others at school (Resnick, Bearman, Blum, Bauman, Harris, Jones et al., 1997) may be a protective factor, because those who are connected are likely to have good quality interpersonal relationships with teachers (Whitlock, 2006). Research demonstrates teacher connectedness and school connectedness are positively associated with adolescents' motivated behaviour, prosocial behaviour, academic success, enhanced social and emotional development, mental health and well-being (see Cook, Purdie-Vaughns, Garcia, & Cohen, 2012; Oldfield, Humphrey, & Hebron, 2015; Waters, Cross, & Shaw, 2010; Zhao & Zhao, 2015).

There are others, however, that experience a dissonance between the skills required for their host (IEC) setting and that required for the new dominant social group within the mainstream school (see Sam, 2000). Supportive of the latter, Steele (1997) found that African American adolescents who perceived the academic domain to be not supportive "disidentified" with school and sought other outlets through which to feel positive about themselves. In this instance, there is a lack of school connectedness and this predicts dropout, low academic performance, high risk behaviours, and poor mental health (Bond, Butler,

Thomas, Carlin et al., 2007; Cook et al., 2012; Millings, Buck, Montgomery, Spears et al., 2012).

As clearly demonstrated by Reputation Enhancing Goals Theory (Carroll et al., 2001) mainstream school provides increased and routine contact with like-minded peers and hence the audience necessary to initiate, enhance and maintain the reputation an individual chooses to pursue. For those who wish to claim a delinquent reputation, they must be seen to break rules and regulations and become deliberately nonconforming (Hopkins & Emler, 1990) and in the case of African adolescents from refugee backgrounds there is recent evidence they choose non-conforming goals and reputations following transition from the host IEC setting to the new dominant mainstream school setting (Gunasekera et al., 2014).

Nevertheless, it has been shown that for adolescent students from African refugee backgrounds school represents the setting where many of their hopes materialize (Earnest et al., 2007) and that many of these young people place a high priority on education and have high expectations of the education system (Cassity & Gow, 2005). Focus group interviews with 45 adolescent students from African refugee backgrounds from IECs have revealed that career aspirations include being a: journalist, nurse, scientist, doctor, computer expert, pilot, lawyer, engineer, electrician and teacher (Earnest et al., 2007). However, many of the students in these focus groups commented that they became discouraged when they transitioned to mainstream classrooms because it became apparent that their career aspirational outlook was somewhat forlorn. While this research is important, it appears to have focused only on career goals. However, goals are generally organized around matters of social and personal identity, education, career, sport and leisure, and material development (for a comprehensive review see Carroll et al., 2009). Furthermore, adolescents rarely pursue only one goal, rather they have multiple goals (Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2005).

Gunasekera et al. (2014) provided strong support for the link between goals and reputations in explaining the institutional adjustments that African adolescents from refugee backgrounds experience after they have transitioned from IEC to mainstream classes. However, although this appears to support the arguments put forward by researchers regarding changes that occur following transition to mainstream schooling (e.g., see Brown et al., 2006; Lloyd, 2006; Milner & Khawaja, 2010; Poppitt & Frey, 2007; Ziaian et al., 2012), the question remains as to whether the goals and reputations of adolescents from African refugee backgrounds are different to their African and Australian mainstream counterparts when they first arrive in the education system (i.e., in the host IEC).

In summary, during adolescence important processes of reputation formation, decisions about educational opportunities, consolidation of developing social values, and the construction of plans for one's future are all very salient. Directions taken here have long-term implications (Salmela-Aro, Aunola, & Nurmi, 2007). While it is known that similarities and differences exist between the relative importance of different goals and reputations among groups of children and adolescents in the general population (Carroll et al., 2012) little, if anything is known about the goals and reputational orientations of African adolescent students from refugee backgrounds. Given that these young people face a multitude of problems associated with adjusting to institutional change, we hypothesise that there will be differences in the goals and reputations of these young people, along with the behaviours in which they indulge to promote their goals and reputations. Specifically, African adolescents in the IEC will score higher than Australian and African students who are in Mainstream schooling, respectively on goals and reputations associated with conformity. They will also report lower levels of delinquency and aggression and higher levels of connectedness to school and teachers. Conversely, the African adolescents in Mainstream schooling will score higher than the Australian Mainstream and African IEC adolescents, respectively on goals

and reputations associated with non-conformity. They will also report higher levels of delinquency and aggression and lower levels of connectedness to school and teachers. To this end a cross sectional comparative study was conducted.

## Method

### Participants and settings

The total sample comprised 180 high school adolescents aged 12.1 to 16.2 years of age ( $M_{age} = 14.03$ ,  $SD .80$ ). Of these 120 were from an African refugee background, primarily Liberian and Sudanese (Liberian  $n = 60$ , Sudanese  $n = 40$ , Congolese  $n = 12$ , Ethiopian  $n = 8$ ); 60 ( $M_{age} = 14.0$ ,  $SD .88$ , 53% male) attended an Intensive English Centre (IEC) attached to a high school and 60 ( $M_{age} = 14.01$ ,  $SD .82$ , 52% male) had transitioned from an IEC into mainstream high school classes. In addition, 60 ( $M_{age} = 14.1$ ,  $SD .79$ , 51% male) non-African Australian born adolescents were matched as closely as possible to the sex and age (i.e., to within 6 months) composition of the African student groups. An Analysis of Variance performed on Age yielded a non-significant result:  $F(2, 177) = 0.287$ ,  $p = .751$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .003$ , 95% CI [13.91, 14.15], indicating comparability in Age.

The participants were recruited from two high schools, one school situated in a low-middle socio-economic status area (SES) and one in a low SES area as indexed by their postal codes from the Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas within Western Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2008). Both schools included an IEC, in which students from refugee backgrounds enrol for a period of approximately 24 months prior to transitioning into a mainstream school setting. The function of these centres is to enable students (the majority of whom have minimal to no history of formal education) to become more conversant with the English language and become accustomed to general Australian school routines.



## Instrumentation

A description of the instruments administered, along with the internal reliabilities for the present study, is provided. Given the multifaceted nature of the Reputation Enhancement Scale, however, a separate description is presented in Table 1.

The types of goals set by adolescents were measured using *The Goal Types Scale* (Carroll, 1995). This asks participants to list up to eight life goals and then rank them in order of importance. Previous research has identified a variety of goals that are important to many young people (Nurmi, 1991), with some more prominent than others. Depending on the risk or delinquent status of the young person the goals can be educational or career, interpersonal or reputational, and connected to legal or illegal activities (see Carroll et al., 2009 for a review). The Goal Types Scale provides participants with the opportunity to think about a range of goals they may have rather than restricting them to a limited number (e.g., one or two). These goals are subsequently categorised by researchers as educational, career (e.g., to get a job), interpersonal (e.g., to make or keep friends), sporting (e.g., to be good at sports), Traditional/Family (e.g., To get married), freedom/autonomy (e.g., to be able to do whatever I want), delinquency (e.g., to break the rules or law or reputational (e.g., to be a member of the "in" group). In addition, the scale provides data on the number of goals set (ranging from 0 to 8). In the present study, the main goal was the focus of the data analyses because participants set a varying number of goals (range 1 to 8).

To ensure accuracy in the goal classifications the first author and one other person independently assigned 30% of the goals to categories. These assignments were then compared and where there were discrepancies a discussion ensued about the reasons for assigning that goal to a particular category. Consensus was then reached as to the appropriate category. Inter-rater agreement was determined by calculating the frequency of agreement out of the total possible agreement and then converting it to a percentage. There was an overall

83% agreement among the raters in assigning goals to the categories. Specifically, there was 88% agreement for the Education category, 80% for Career, 72% for Interpersonal Goals, 78% for Freedom-Autonomy, 70% for Delinquency, and 86% for Reputational.

*The Importance of Goals Scale* (Carroll, Durkin, Hattie, & Houghton, 1997) involves participants being presented with 43 goals distributed across the goal categories represented in the *Goal Types Scale* and asked to rate how important each goal item is to them. The response format is a 3-point scale, with each point on the scale being anchored with the words *not important*, *sometimes important*, and *very important*. Extensive research (see Carroll et al., 2009) demonstrates *The Importance of Goals Scale* factors reflect a Social Image (Delinquency, Freedom-Autonomy goals) and an Academic Image (Educational, Interpersonal Goals). A similar inter-rater agreement procedure to that used in *The Goal Types Scale* produced a 91% agreement for the Academic Image category and 88% for the Social Image category.

*Goal Commitment* was measured via a nine item self-report scale adapted from Hollenbeck, Williams and Klein (1989). For each of the nine item statements, participants are asked to respond on a four-point pictorial/word Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree to how committed they feel about their most important (main) goal, with five of the nine items requiring reverse scoring. Examples of items include “I really want to get this goal”, “I don’t care if I get this goal” and “I am willing to put a lot of effort beyond what I’d normally do to get this goal”. Responses are subsequently averaged over the nine items to create a mean commitment score for the participant’s primary (main) goal. The measure was found to have satisfactory reliability  $\alpha = .78$

In addition, participants are asked “How long will it take you to achieve your goal?” to which they can respond: one week, one month, one year, more than one year. A second item

then enquires," How much control do you have in achieving this goal? to which participants respond either 'no control at all', 'some control', 'a lot of control', or 'total control'.

The *Adapted Self-Report Delinquency Scale* (ASDS; Carroll, Durkin, Houghton, & Hattie, 1996) items measure a broad range of frequently reported delinquent activities ranging from minor misdemeanours to more serious offences: Abuse of Property (seven items, e.g., Deliberately damaged things in public places, - telephone boxes, street signs, road lamps, etc;  $\alpha = .87$ ); Hard Drug-Related Offences (five items, e.g., Used amphetamines (such as speed, ecstasy, uppers), LSD - also called acid, or other hallucinogens;  $\alpha = .74$ ); Physical Aggression (three items, e.g., Deliberately hurt or beat up someone;  $\alpha = .88$ ); Stealing Offences (five items, e.g., Stolen money of \$10 or more in one go;  $\alpha = .82$ ); School Misdemeanours (seven items, e.g., Disrupted the class by calling out or by being out of your seat;  $\alpha = .88$ ); Soft Drug (five items, e.g., Used marijuana (also called grass, dope, hash, pot, weed, mull);  $\alpha = .84$ ; and Vehicle-Related Offences (nine items, e.g., Driven an unregistered car)  $\alpha = .88$ . Furthermore, one item reporting police warnings and one item reporting court appearance are included in the scale to gain a measure of self-reported official delinquency status. Additionally, four "lie" items are interspersed among the delinquency items to verify reliability (Mak, 1993). Participant's report the frequency with which they engaged in delinquent acts during the last 12 months using a 6 point scale: *Never*; *1-3 times*; *4-6 times*; *Once a month*; *More than once a month*; and *More than once a week*.

*The Adolescent Scale of Aggression* (ASA: Tan, 2011) measures four distinct dimensions: Physical-Proactive Aggression (six items, e.g., I start physical fights to get what I want;  $\alpha = .84$ ), Verbal-Proactive Aggression (five items, e.g., I verbally encourage others to be aggressive to get what I want;  $\alpha = .83$ ), Verbal-Reactive Aggression (five items, e.g., I become verbally angry when told I cannot have what I want;  $\alpha = .87$ ), and Physical-Reactive Aggression (four items, e.g., I react physically against others when they bump into me;  $\alpha =$

.88). Participants respond on a four point scale ranging from *definitely not true* (score 0) to *definitely true* (score 3).

*School Connectedness* and *Teacher Connectedness* were measured using the five items (e.g., I feel part of this school, I feel close to people at this school;  $\alpha = .88$ ) and the six items (e.g., there is a teacher at the school who: cares about me; tells me when I do a good job; listens when I have something to say;  $\alpha = .84$ ), respectively from the *California Healthy Kids Survey* (CHKS: see Austin & Duerr, 2004; WestEd, 2008). Participants respond on a 5 point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The CHKS has excellent psychometric properties (Gilreath, Astor, Estrada, Johnson, Benbenishty, & Unger, 2014; Sharkey, You, & Schnoebelen, 2008).

The *Reputation Enhancement Scale* (RES; Carroll, Houghton, Hattie, & Durkin, 1999), is a 150-item self-report scale with five major dimensions assessing group affiliation, admiration for law abiding and law-breaking activities, self-perception and ideal public self, self-description and ideal private self, and communication of events. Three dimensions (see Table 1) were used in this present study: (a) the **Social Desirability** scale that examines admiration of law-abiding and law-breaking activities, the underlying value of reputation, and conformity or deviance to social norms. It comprises four sub factors which separately measure male and female perceptions separately: Girls and boys self-perceived social deviance norms (e.g., If a girl/boy steals, I would admire him/her); Girls and boys self-perceived social conformity norms (e.g., If a girl/boy gets good school marks I would admire him/her); Girls and boys evaluative reactions to others social deviance (e.g., If a girl/boy drinks alcohol most kids my age would admire him/her); and Girls and boys evaluative reactions to others social conformity (e.g., If a girl/boy gets good school marks, most kids my age would admire him/her); (b) the 30 item **Social Identity** scale measuring participants' self-perception and how they would ideally like others to view them. It has four sub factors: Non-conforming

self-perception (e.g., My friends think that I break rules); Conforming self-perception (e.g., My friends think that I can be trusted with secrets); Non-conforming ideal public self (e.g., I would like my friends to think that I am a troublemaker.); and Conforming ideal public self (I would like my friends to think that I get along well with other people ); and (c) the **Self-Identity** scale, which measures how participants describe themselves and how they would ideally like to be described in terms of power (i.e., strong-weak; tough-soft) and activity (i.e., mean-kind; nasty-friendly) attributes. It has four sub factors: Activity self-description (e.g., mean-kind; nasty-friendly); Power/evaluation self-description (e.g., strong-weak; leader-follower); Activity ideal private self (e.g., mean-kind; nasty-friendly); and Power/evaluation ideal private self (e.g., strong-weak; leader-follower).

Table 1 here

## **Procedure**

Approval for the research was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committees of the administering institution and the relevant gatekeepers. Two senior metropolitan high schools in Perth, the capital city of Western Australia that enrol all students from refugee backgrounds in host IECs prior to transitioning to mainstream schooling were approached to participate in the research. The principals of both schools agreed to participate and so an information sheet explaining the purpose and nature of the research along with an invitation to participate and consent form and an assurance of confidentiality was sent to the parents of all African students from refugee backgrounds (IEC and mainstream) and all Year 8 to Year 10 Australian mainstream students. In addition, the parents of the African students were invited to attend an information session at which the first author explained the research and answered any questions that they might have. Interpreters were also present at this session so that any language difficulties could be addressed.

From the 150 information letters sent to the parents of African students from refugee backgrounds an affirmative return of 120 (80%) was obtained, while of the 200 to the Australian students a return of 150 (75%) was obtained. From the Australian student returns, 60 were selected that matched as closely as possible to the sex and age (i.e., to within 6 months) composition of the African student groups to form a comparison group. Mutually convenient times were then arranged for the administration of the instruments in each of the schools and IEC's.

All instruments were administered to participants in their regular classrooms by homeroom teachers, with each administration taking between 35 and 60 minutes. The instruments were administered to the non-African Australian students in groups of 15 under examination conditions. Teachers had been asked to observe exam like conditions to ensure the results reflected the thoughts of the individual and not a social consensus. The African mainstream school students were administered the instrument in groups of six to cater for their relatively lower levels of language and literacy skills. During these sessions the instrument instructions were read to the groups verbatim by the teacher. For the African IEC students, the instruments were administered to smaller groups of two or three students and the questions were read verbatim to participants to address any potential language and literacy issues. An interpreter was also present during these sessions for IEC students.

## **Results**

Descriptive statistics are presented for the types of goals, the number of goals, the amount of control over goals and the level of commitment towards goals. Following this, a series of Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVAs) are presented for each of the scales. Each MANOVA investigated participant's goals (7 goal types) and Reputational Orientations (16 Variables), for Group (African IEC, African Mainstream, and Australian Mainstream students) and Sex (male and female). Multivariate and Univariate *F* values were considered as

significant utilising more stringent Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels of .007 (goals), .003 (reputation), .007 delinquency, .0125 (aggression), and .025 (school and teacher connectedness) to control for Type 1 errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Effect sizes and power estimates are reported. Scheffé post-hoc comparisons were also conducted to examine mean differences, and are reported where there were significant differences between means. The significant indirect effects arising from a series of separate multiple-mediation models are then presented.

### **Goals: Types, Control and Commitment**

The IEC African students set goals such as study hard, go to university, be a doctor, be a teacher, be a scientist, whereas the goals of Mainstream African adolescents included be a rap artist, hairdresser, sports star, make friends, and socialise. The Australian Mainstream participants set a mixture of similar goals. Table 2 shows that of the goals in *The Importance of Goals Scale*, almost all IEC African students set Academic goals (and very few Social goals) compared to Mainstream African participants who set predominantly Social goals, and Australian participants who presented an approximate even split between Academic and Social goals. The greatest discrepancy between academic and social goals was for the IEC group (19 and -19) and Mainstream African (-16 and 16), respectively. The differences between the groups was significant ( $\chi^2 = 41.92$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cramers V = .48).

Table 2 here

When asked “How long will it take to achieve your main goal?” 93% of the African IEC adolescents, 100% of African Mainstream adolescents and 91% of Australian Mainstream adolescents respectively, responded “more than one year”. In terms of the amount of control that participants believed they had over achieving their main goal, there were discrepancies between the three groups. Of the 60 African IEC adolescents, 52 believed they had “total

control” over achieving their goal compared to 7 of the African Mainstream and 19 of the Australian Mainstream groups.

The greatest levels of commitment to achieving their main goal came from the African IEC group with  $n = 47$  recording the maximum commitment score (i.e., 24) compared to 13 in the African Mainstream and 9 in the Australian Mainstream groups.

### **Importance of Goals**

Participants goals were assigned to one of seven goal categories based on previous work (see Carroll et al., 2009). A  $3 \times 2$  (Group  $\times$  Sex) between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $<.007$  revealed a significant multivariate interaction effect for Sex  $\times$  Group  $F(14, 316) = 2.981, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .12$ . This interaction suggested that in some goal categories African Mainstream group males scored higher than African Mainstream group females, whereas for the Australian Mainstream group females scored higher than the males. When the Univariate  $F$  tests were examined the Sex  $\times$  Group interaction was not evident for any of the goal categories; none reached levels of significance using the adjusted alpha levels.

There were significant multivariate main effects for Group,  $F(14, 316) = 26.39, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .54$  and Sex  $F(7, 158) = 30.04, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .57$ . The Univariate  $F$  tests (using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $p < .007$ ) and observed means for the main effect of Group are shown in Table 3. For Group there were significant main effects in the importance attached to goals in all goal categories. Scheffe post-hoc statistics and follow up means show significant differences ( $p < .007$ ) in the importance attached to these goals by Group in Table 3. As can be seen, all three groups differed on Delinquency and Academic goals. For Delinquency the African Mainstream group scored highest, followed by the Australian Mainstream and IEC groups, respectively. For Academic goals the African IEC group scored highest, followed by the African Mainstream and Australian groups,



respectively. For Freedom and Reputation goals the African Mainstream group scored higher than the African IEC group. No differences were evident between the African IEC and Mainstream Australian groups. For Sex the only main effect was for Sporting goals with males ( $\underline{M} = 3.17, SD .93$ ) scoring higher than females ( $\underline{M} = 2.01, SD .74$ )  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .34$ .

Table 3 here

### Reputation Enhancement

A  $2 \times 3$  (Sex by Group) between-subjects MANOVA was performed on the 16 dependent variables of the *RES*. Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $<.003$ , there was a significant multivariate interaction effect for Sex  $\times$  Group  $F(32, 288) = 3.62, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .29$ . When the Univariate F tests were examined the Sex  $\times$  Group interaction occurred for one of the 16 variables, namely *boys self-perceived social deviance norms* (bspsd:  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .10$ ) with African IEC males ( $\underline{M} = 1.09, SD .08$ ) and African Mainstream males ( $\underline{M} = 2.35, SD .09$ ) scoring higher than their female counterparts ( $\underline{M} = 1.07, SD .08$ ) and ( $\underline{M} = 1.83, SD .07$ ) respectively. However, for the Australian Mainstream group the opposite was true, with females ( $\underline{M} = 1.55, SD .09$ ) scoring higher than the males ( $\underline{M} = 1.33, SD .10$ ).

There were significant multivariate main effects for Group,  $F(32, 288) = 41.590, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .82$  and Sex  $F(16, 144) = 3.27, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .27$ . The Univariate  $F$  and observed means for the main effect of Group are shown in Table 4. Using the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $<.003$ , 15 of the 16 reputation categories reached statistical significance for Group. For Sex none of the reputation categories reached significance using the adjusted alpha levels. Scheffe post-hoc statistics and follow up means are presented for each of the *RES* dimensions in Table 4. As shown in Table 4 the clear differences between the three groups were for the conforming and non-conforming reputation variables. That is for self-conforming reputation the African IEC group scored highest (Bopsc, Gspsc), followed by

the African Mainstream and Australian Mainstream groups, respectively. Conversely, for non-conforming reputation the African Mainstream group scored highest (Bopsd, Gopsd, Gpspd, NConsp), followed by the Australian Mainstream and IEC African groups, respectively.

Table 4 here

### Self-Reported Delinquency

A  $2 \times 3$  (Sex by Group) between-subjects MANOVA on the seven dependent variables of the *ASD* using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .007 revealed a significant multivariate interaction effect for Sex  $\times$  Group  $F(14, 312) = 3.66, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .14$ . Univariate F tests showed the interactions were for soft drug use  $F = 5.21, p = .006$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ , property abuse  $F = 5.85, p = .004$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .07$ , physical aggression  $F = 10.69, p = .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .12$ , and hard drug use  $F = 12.16, p = .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .13$ .

Specifically, for *Soft drug use* African IEC group males and females scored the same ( $\underline{M} = 0.0, SD .04$ ) and African Mainstream group males ( $\underline{M} = 1.48, SD 1.07$ ) scored higher than females ( $\underline{M} = 0.79, SD .67$ ) whereas Australian Mainstream females ( $\underline{M} = .60, SD .86$ ) scored higher than males ( $\underline{M} = 0.56, SD .74$ ). For *Property abuse* African IEC group males and females scored the same ( $\underline{M} = .20, SD .11$ ) and African Mainstream group males ( $\underline{M} = 0.47, SD .52$ ) scored higher than females ( $\underline{M} = 0.13, SD .24$ ) whereas Australian Mainstream females ( $\underline{M} = .33, SD .59$ ) scored higher than males ( $\underline{M} = 0.25, SD .31$ ). For *Physical aggression* African IEC group males and females scored the same ( $\underline{M} = 0.0, SD .10$ ) and African Mainstream group males ( $\underline{M} = .94, SD .90$ ) scored higher than females ( $\underline{M} = 0.30, SD .43$ ) whereas Australian Mainstream females ( $\underline{M} = .32, SD .61$ ) scored higher than males ( $\underline{M} = 0.10, SD .21$ ). For *Hard drug use* African IEC group males and females scored the same ( $\underline{M} = 0.0, SD .09$ ) and African Mainstream group males ( $\underline{M} = .25, SD .30$ ) scored higher than females ( $\underline{M} = 0.03, SD .10$ ) whereas Australian Mainstream females ( $\underline{M} = .03, SD .16$ ) scored higher than males ( $\underline{M} = 0.0, SD 0.05$ ).

There was also a significant multivariate main effect for Group,  $F(14, 312) = 16.902$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .45$ . Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .007, six of the delinquency categories reached statistical significance, two of which were not impacted by the interaction effect (stealing offences and school misdemeanours). The univariate  $F$  tests, Scheffe post-hoc statistics and follow up means for the main effect of Group are shown in Table 5. What is evident is that for stealing offences and school misdemeanours, the Australian Mainstream group scored highest, followed by the African Mainstream and IEC groups respectively. In both delinquent activities, males scored higher than females, except in the IEC group where males and females were the same.

Table 5 here

### **Aggression**

A  $2 \times 3$  (Gender by Group) between-subjects MANOVA was performed on the four dependent variables of the *ASA*. Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of 0.0125, there were no significant interaction effects or main effects of Sex. There was, however, a significant multivariate main effect for Group,  $F(8, 322) = 9.53$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .19$ . All four aggression categories reached statistical significance. The Univariate  $F$  tests, Scheffe post-hoc statistics and follow up means for the main effect of Group are shown in Table 6. What is clear is that the African Mainstream group scored highest on the Physical Proactive, Verbal Reactive and Physical Reactive aggression followed by the Australian Mainstream and African IEC groups respectively. For Verbal Proactive aggression the Australian Mainstream group scored highest, followed by the African Mainstream and African IEC groups, respectively.

Table 6 here

### School and Teacher Connectedness

A 2 x 3 (Gender by Group) between-subjects MANOVA was performed on the two dependent variables of the *Connectedness scale* (i.e., Teacher connectedness and school connectedness). Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $p < 0.025$ , there were no significant interaction effects or main effects of Sex. There was, however, a significant multivariate main effect of Group,  $F(4, 328) = 68.65, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .46$ . Using the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of  $p < 0.025$ , both of the categories reached statistical significance. The univariate  $F$  tests and Scheffe post-hoc statistics and follow up means for the main effect of Group are shown in Table 7. What is evident is that the African IEC group score highest on both school and teacher connectedness, followed by the Australian Mainstream and African Mainstream groups, respectively.

Table 7 here

Using the PROCESS (Hayes, 2008) macro in SPSS 22, a series of 22 separate multiple-mediation models were tested. Using bootstrapping methodology, PROCESS has the capacity to test mediation models with several mediators. Each analysis used PROCESS Model 4, which allows for more than one indirect pathway to be tested at one time. In all analyses, *Goals, Control over achieving main goal, Teacher Connectedness, and School Connectedness* were entered as potential mediators. The first 11 analyses examined the effects of dummy variable *African IEC vs. combined Australian and Mainstream African* (coded 1 and 0 respectively) on each of the outcome variables. The second 11 analyses examined the effects of dummy variable *Mainstream African vs. combined Australian and African IEC* (again, coded 1 and 0 respectively) on each of the outcome variables. Given the number of analyses, significant indirect effects where the mediator did not in fact predict the outcome are not reported. Such effects can occur because the indirect path is testing a product of two paths and

so one strong effect combined with a weak, non-significant, effect can produce a significant product. For more on this issue, see Hayes (2009).

### **African IEC vs. Combined Australian and Mainstream African**

There were no indirect effects upon *School misdemeanours*, *Soft drug use offences*, *Hard drug use offences*, *Abuse of property*, *Stealing offences*, *Physical aggression*, *Physical-Proactive aggression*, or *Physical-Reactive aggression*.

There was a significant indirect effect via *School Connectedness* upon *Vehicle-related offences*,  $b = -0.19$  (95% CI: 0.00, 0.62). Together, all the predictors accounted for almost 7% of the variance ( $R^2 = .0673$ ). Those in the African IEC group had higher *School Connectedness* scores,  $b = 0.98$  (95% CI: -1.13, -0.83),  $p < .001$ , and *School Connectedness* was negatively associated with the outcome,  $b = -0.20$  (95%CI: -0.35, -0.04),  $p = .015$ .

There were significant indirect effects upon both *Verbal-Reactive aggression* ( $R^2 = .2478$ ) and *Verbal-Proactive aggression* ( $R^2 = .1263$ ), though via different routes. For *Verbal-Reactive aggression*, the negative effect,  $b = -0.21$  (95%CI: 0.03, 0.43), was via *Control*. Those in the African IEC group had higher levels of *Control*,  $b = 0.90$  (95% CI: -1.09, -0.71),  $p < .001$ , which in turn was negatively associated with *Verbal-Reactive aggression*,  $b = -0.24$  (95% CI: -0.42, -0.05),  $p = .014$ . For *Verbal-Proactive aggression*, the positive indirect effect ( $b = 0.09$  (95% CI: -0.19, -0.02)) was via *School Connectedness*. Those in the African IEC group reported higher levels of *School Connectedness*,  $b = 0.98$  (95% CI: -1.13, -0.83),  $p < .001$ , which in turn was positively associated with *Verbal-Proactive aggression*,  $b = 0.10$  (95% CI: 0.01, 0.19),  $p = .038$ .

Thus, young people in the Africa IEC group reported lower levels of *Vehicle-related offences* and *Verbal-Reactive aggression*, with these evidencing indirect effects via *School Connectedness* and *Control* respectively. However, the Africa IEC group also reported higher levels of *Verbal-Proactive aggression*, with an indirect effect via *School Connectedness*.

**Mainstream African vs. Combined Australian and African IEC**

There were no indirect effects upon *School misdemeanours*, *Soft drug use offences*, *Abuse of property*, *Stealing offences*, *Physical aggression*, *Verbal-Proactive aggression*, or *Physical-Proactive aggression*.

There was a significant indirect effect via *School Connectedness* upon *Vehicle-related offences*,  $b = 0.15$  (95% CI: -0.45, -0.00). Together, all the predictors accounted for almost 9% of the variance ( $R^2 = .0856$ ). Those in the Mainstream African group reported lower levels of *School Connectedness*,  $b = -0.81$  (95% CI: 0.64, 0.97),  $p < .001$ , and *School Connectedness* was negatively associated with *Vehicle-related offences*,  $b = -0.18$  (95% CI: -0.33, -0.04),  $p = .016$ .

There was a significant indirect effect via *Control* upon *Verbal-Reactive aggression*,  $b = 0.21$  (95% CI: -0.40, -0.04). Together, all the predictors accounted for almost one-quarter of the variance in this outcome ( $R^2 = .2409$ ). Those in the Mainstream African group reported lower levels of *Control*,  $b = -0.83$  (95% CI: 0.63, 1.02),  $p < .001$ , and *Control* was negatively associated with *Verbal-Reactive aggression*,  $b = -0.25$  (95% CI: -0.44, -0.06),  $p = .009$ .

*Goals* scores were an indirect pathway for *Physical-Reactive aggression*,  $b = -0.06$  (95% CI: 0.00, 0.14). The predictor variables here accounted for more than a fifth of the variance ( $R^2 = .2247$ ). Those in the Mainstream African group reported higher *Goals* scores,  $b = 0.44$  (95% CI: -0.69, -0.20),  $p < .001$ , and *Goals* scores were negatively associated with *Physical-Reactive aggression*,  $b = -0.13$  (95% CI: -0.25, -0.01),  $p = .037$ .

In summary: Young people in the Mainstream African group engage in more *Vehicle-related offences* and part of this effect is accounted for by *School Connectedness*. This group also engage in more *Verbal-Reactive aggression* with an indirect effect via *Control*. Finally, this group engage in less *Physical-Reactive aggression*, and there is an indirect pathway here via their reported *Goals*.

## **Discussion**

To date very little research, if any, has examined the goals of African adolescent school aged students from refugee backgrounds at different stages of their schooling. This is somewhat surprising given the strong relationship between goals and behaviour (i.e., a person's choice of goals, their motivation to achieve the goals, and the likelihood that the goals are achieved: Carroll et al., 2012; Carroll et al., 2001; Li & Wright, 2014; Locke, & Latham, 1990). Furthermore, individuals deliberately choose the particular reputation they wish to present to their audience and endeavour through attainment of their goals to enhance and sustain this (Emler, 1984).

The recent research by Gunasekera et al. (2014) provided answers to what happens to African adolescents when they transition from the host IEC to the new and dominant culture (mainstream classes). Based on this we hypothesized that there would be differences between the African adolescents in IEC and African and Australian Mainstream school students on goals, reputations, delinquency, aggression and connectedness to school and teachers. By carefully matching our samples on age and gender for a cross-sectional comparison our hypotheses were tested and found to be substantiated.

Previous research suggests that young people from African refugee backgrounds place a high priority on education and have high expectations of the education system (Cassity & Gow, 2005). The present empirical findings show that African adolescents from refugee backgrounds on first enrolling in Australian IECs set specific academic conforming goals and exhibit high levels of commitment to achieving these goals, which is supportive of Cassity and Gow's (2005) assertions. Furthermore, the goals (e.g., be a doctor, teacher, an engineer) set by both the male and female African adolescents in IECs are representative of normal developmental tasks of adolescence such as pursuing education and gaining a career (see Chang, Chen, Greenberger, Dooley, & Heckhausen, 2006). These young people also had good

perceptions regarding the control they had over their goals and the time frames for attaining them. What the present findings also seem to demonstrate is that they become discouraged on transitioning to mainstream school settings where they realize their goals are becoming difficult to attain (Earnest et al., 2007). Subsequent, these goals tend to shift towards less academically challenging goals, like becoming a hairdresser (female), a model (male), or musician (male and female). African students in the IEC set over three times as many academic goals and five times fewer social goals as their African mainstream counterparts. By means of comparison, the Australian mainstream students had an equal split between academic and social goals. That the African students who have transitioned to mainstream classrooms are setting predominantly social goals is supportive of Reputation Enhancing Goals theory. That is, they are attempting to adapt to another dominant culture (i.e., mainstream classes) by setting alternative goals while facing confusion about the skills necessary to do so (Amoah, 2014; Carroll et al., 2009). Moreover, because there may be feelings of insecurity as a consequence of leaving the relatively homogeneous context of the IEC and transitioning to mainstream schooling, difficulties in social adaptation occurs (see Berry et al., 2006). The magnitude of the difference between the African IEC and African mainstream students, along with the evenness of spread between academic and social goals portrayed by the Australian mainstream students seem to support this contention.

African students from refugee backgrounds are faced with a dilemma, that is, the need to identify with the culture of the IEC and that of their new social group within the mainstream school (Carroll et al., 2009; Sam, 2000) and this may be an important factor in the development of reputations and the goals that are selected. Social goals have been shown to be the underlying mechanism in an individual's striving to attain a conforming or nonconforming reputation, the latter being driven by the individual's involvement in nonconforming and delinquent activities (see Carroll et al., 2009; Emler & Reicher, 1995). In



the present study, the African IEC students were motivated to attain a conforming academic reputation, whereas their African mainstream counterparts sought to establish a nonconforming and delinquent reputation. This is very much in line with Reputation Enhancing Goals Theory (Carroll et al., 2009), which demonstrates the choice of academic, conforming social, and nonconforming social goals are critical in the orientation, development and management of adolescents' reputations of choice.

It may be, as shown by the extensive findings of Carroll and colleagues over the past 15 years (see Carroll et al., 2009 for a comprehensive review) that, like Australian students “at risk”, African adolescents from refugee backgrounds are also in an intermediate transitional state whereby high levels of commitment to age-related developmental goals are diminishing and the setting of and commitment towards alternative (delinquent) goals are becoming more attractive as they transition to a more dominant culture in mainstream classes. However, for these young people from African refugee backgrounds there appears to be a dose response relationship in terms of the process of such institutional adjustment. Not only are these young people trying to adapt to another culture in wider society and deal with the threats and insecurities that come with it for themselves and their families (Berry, 2005; Kim & Abreu, 2001), but they are also having to manage these issues as they transit from the relative stability of the host institutional setting (IEC) to the more dominant culture of mainstream classrooms.

Previous research (see Carroll et al., 2009) has shown that nonconformity is a choice and it is well established that individuals wishing to claim a delinquent reputation must be seen to break rules and regulations and become deliberately non-conforming (Hopkins & Emler, 1990). Therefore, the significantly higher rates of school misdemeanours and stealing reported by the African adolescents in mainstream schooling (compared to their African IEC counterparts) could be interpreted as an indicator of their seeking/attaining a nonconforming

reputation (Carroll et al., 2009). However, the Australian mainstream group scored highest of all three groups on delinquency, and had the lowest scores on aspects of conforming reputation enhancement and academic goal importance. Thus, it may be that following transition to mainstream classes from the IEC the African students from refugee backgrounds are making a positive sociocultural adaptation as posited by Berry et al. (2006) in their large scale 13 country study of national and immigrant youth.

There is no doubt that reputations play a central role in the lives of African adolescents from refugee backgrounds (whether in conformity or crime) just as they do in adolescents in general (Buelga et al., 2008; Lopez-Romero & Romero, 2010). Reputation is also a strategy of self-protection and redress (Agnew, 1992; Toro, Urberg, & Heinze, 2004) and this may also apply to students from African refugee backgrounds. Previous research has shown that African students become increasingly aggressive as they transition mainstream schooling (see Brown et al., 2006; Gunasekera et al., 2014; Poppitt & Frey, 2007). In the present study the African mainstream school adolescents scored higher than their IEC counterparts on all aspects of aggression. However, it was only on proactive physical aggression that they scored higher than their Australian mainstream counterparts. This supports the notion of goal directed behaviour in pursuit of a particular reputation and to some extent may be interpreted as successful sociocultural adaptation. Follow up interviews conducted by the first author with some of the African adolescents in mainstream schooling provides some support for this interpretation. For example, as one 13 year old female and one 15 year old male reported:

*It is important to have a good reputation because that is how people judge you. You have to act strong, cool and confident. If you act and look weak and dumb (like you don't know anything and you can't stick up for yourself) then you won't get anywhere (13 year old female)*

*Some African kids try to become leaders by doing things that get them into trouble (like breaking rules, getting suspended, getting into fights). They think that this makes them look cool and other kids will like and respect them (15 year old male).*

The significantly different levels of school and teacher connectedness that were evident clearly show that African mainstream students were less connected to school and teachers than their IEC peers (who reported the highest) and their Australian mainstream peers (who score around midpoint). Research clearly shows that adolescents who are connected to school will adopt the school's values, norms and expectations and for this reason will refrain from engaging in behaviours that are inconsistent with the schools expectations (see Lopukas & Pasch, 2013). Furthermore, students who feel teachers are supportive of them do better (Libbey, 2004). Conversely, as seems to be the case in this present study - a lack of school connectedness predicts high risk behaviours (Bond et al., 2007; Cook et al., 2012; Millings et al., 2012). Support for this comes from other follow up interviews conducted with the African mainstream students. For example, as two 15 year old male African mainstream students reported:

*In the IEC teachers really understood you and care about you so you felt much more connected to them but in mainstream they don't care about you as much and they don't get to know you well because you have many teachers in the mainstream but not in the IEC where you only have one*

*I feel much less connected to the teachers in mainstream than I did in the IEC. In the IEC the teachers took time to get to know you and they cared about who you are and what you were doing but in mainstream most teachers don't have the time to get to know you. They don't seem to care about you; they don't care if you pass or fail*

From our analyses of potential indirect effects, the pattern of results suggests that School connectedness is a particularly important mediator of the effects of group membership on the outcomes assessed. The African IEC group engaged in less vehicle-related crime, and the Mainstream African group engaged in more, and both these effects include indirect effects via School connectedness. For the former group, School connectedness was higher and this led to lower vehicle crime; the opposite was true for the Mainstream African group. Maintaining

and encouraging high levels of School connectedness may therefore play an important role during transition from IEC to Mainstream schooling, at least in terms of reducing vehicle-related crime. The details of these effects may need to be unpicked further though as it was also true that the African IEC group engaged in *more* proactive verbal aggression as a result of their higher levels of School connectedness.

The amount of Control over most important goal showed exactly the same pattern as School connectedness, but with respect to reactive verbal aggression. Again, the African IEC group engaged in less reactive verbal aggression, and the Mainstream African group engaged in more, and both these effects included indirect effects via Control. As Control increased, reactive verbal aggression decreased. The Mainstream African group reported lower control (hence, higher reactive verbal aggression) whereas the IEC group reported higher Control (hence, lower reactive verbal aggression). The critical issue here again seems to be the transition to mainstream schooling, and the question is how schools might maintain the high levels of Control that these young people report during IEC schooling and which is subsequently reduced in mainstream schooling.

As with most research there are limitations which must be acknowledged. For example, the sample size for each group was relatively small and participants were recruited from only one state in Australia. Recruiting samples of adolescents from African refugee backgrounds across a range of Australian states would provide greater diversity, which in turn would enhance grounds for generalization of the findings. Furthermore, the inclusion of students from refugee backgrounds from a range of countries would generate a larger sample of adolescents and also permit a more detailed examination of the goals, behaviours and reputations of young people from a range of disrupted backgrounds. It is also acknowledged that all of the data were generated by self-reports and, while this is powerful by providing the first person perspective, multiple informants such as parents and teachers may be beneficial.

Although the present study did not attempt to construct any longitudinal arguments there are potential cohort effects that need to be considered. For example, although it was important to recruit groups of similar ages for our comparisons, this inevitably meant a disparity in the ‘real developmental ages’ for comparison. That is, the mean age of our Mainstream African refugee adolescents was 11 years when first they arrived in Australia and commenced IEC, which means they were approximately two years developmentally younger than the current IEC students in our sample. It is also conceivable that the cohorts compared in this study had unique experiences in their home country and these may have occurred at different ages thereby producing a confounding cohort effect on goals, reputation, delinquency, aggression and connectedness. Indeed, coping with trauma and stress at 11 or 12 years old is likely to be more disruptive to development than at 14 or 15 years old.

Finally, the research was cross-sectional in design and as such provided information at that point in time. Longitudinal investigations would be helpful in facilitating an understanding of the critical periods of goal formation and in doing so assist in the development of interventions for young people from refugee backgrounds.

Future research should seek to ask adolescents from refugee backgrounds the reasons why they selected the goals they did because it is possible that some goals could be related to other goals categories for personal reasons. Fuligni (1997) argued that some educational goals might in fact be family goals because parental expectations are the underlying motivating mechanism. Interviews or written narrative may clarify any potential ethnic differences in goals and also why such differences exist in different educational settings (i.e., IEC and Mainstream) and this may be an avenue for future investigation.

In conclusion, sociocultural adaptation is a gradual process whereby immigrants change due to contact with the host (in this study IEC) culture and subsequently with their new more dominant culture (mainstream classes) (see Gunasekera et al., 2014), as well as through

interactions with their own culture (Chang, Tracey, & Moore, 2005). For the African adolescents from refugee backgrounds in the school system in the present study there was evidence of successful sociocultural adaptation following transition to mainstream classes. However, there was also evidence of a transitory disaffection with school - a time when goals become more aligned to aspects of psychosocial motivation (delinquent, freedom, reputation) and assume much greater importance in their lives (see Carroll et al., 2009 for a comprehensive summary). Berry et al. (2006) highlighted the importance of schools as organisations along with the teachers within them in facilitating successful transition, not only within school but also in the larger society. School connectedness and the control adolescents had over their goals was important to the young people in the present study. Therefore, as argued by Morrice (2007) it is crucial that schools ensure that interactions are positive so that individuals do not become isolated and disconnected. The challenge for educators is to determine the ideal period of time adolescents from refugee backgrounds should spend in host IEC settings before they transition into mainstream settings, and then to ensure additional support is available for these students so their sociocultural adaptation can be fully optimized. Only then might the academic and career aspirations initially expressed by these young people be realized and not lost in the process.

## References

- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30, 47-87. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01093.x
- Amoah, J. (2014). The identity question for African youth: Developing the new while maintaining the old. *The Family Journal*, 22, doi: 10.1177/1066480713505068
- Austin, G., & Duerr, M. (2004). *Guidebook for the California Healthy Kids Survey. Part I: Administration. 2004–2005 Edition*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2008). An Introduction to Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), 2006 Canberra: Author.
- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 697-712.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied psychology*, 55(3), 303-332.
- Bond, L., Butler, H., Thomas, L., Carlin, J., Glover, S., Bowes, G. *et al.* (2007). Social and school connectedness in early secondary school as predictors of late teenage substance use, mental health, and academic outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(4) (2007), pp. 357.e9–357.e18
- Brown, J., Miller, J., & Mitchell, J. (2006). Interrupted schooling and the acquisition of literacy: Experiences of Sudanese refugees in Victorian secondary schools. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 29(2), 150-162.
- Buelga, S., Musitu, G., Murgui, S., & Pons, J. (2008). Reputation, loneliness, satisfaction with life and aggressive behavior in adolescence. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11, 192-200.

Carroll, A., Durkin, K., Hattie, J., & Houghton, S. (1997). Goal setting among adolescents: A comparison of delinquent, at risk and not at risk youth. *The Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 441-450.

Carroll, A., Durkin, K., Houghton, S., & Hattie, J. (1996). An adaptation of Mak's Self-reported Delinquency Scale for Western Australian adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 48*(1), 1-7.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Durkin, K., & Hattie, J. (2009). *Adolescent reputations and risk: Developmental trajectories to delinquency*. Springer. ISBN: 978-0-387-79987-2.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Durkin, K., & Hattie, J. (2012). Reputations (pp. 2356-2362). In R. Levesque (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Adolescence*, Vol. 4. New York: Springer. ISBN 978-1-4419-1694-5.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Hattie, J., & Durkin, K. (2001). Reputation enhancing goals: Integrating reputation enhancement and goal setting theory as an explanation of delinquent involvement. In F. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (Vol. 4, pp. 101-129). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Hattie, J., & Durkin, K. (1999). Adolescent reputation enhancement: Differentiating delinquent, nondelinquent, and at-risk youths. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 40*(4), 593-606.

Cassity, E. & Gow, G. (2005). Making up for lost time. The experiences of Southern Sudanese young refugees in high schools. *Youth Studies Australia, 24*(3), 51-55.

Chang, E. S., Chen, C., Greenberger, E., Dooley, D., & Heckhausen, J. (2006). What do they want in life? The life goals of a multi-ethnic, multi-generational sample of high school seniors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(3), 302-313.

Chang, T., Tracey, T. J. G., & Moore, T. L. (2005). The dimensional structure of Asian American acculturation: an examination of prototypes. *Self and Identity, 4*, 25-43.



Cook, J. E., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Garcia, J., & Cohen, G. L. (2012). Chronic threat and contingent belonging: protective benefits of values affirmation on identity development.

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(3), 479-496.

Earnest, J., Housen, T., & Gillieatt, S. (2007). A new cohort of refugee students in Perth: Challenges for students and educators. Paper presented at the 2007 Teaching and Learning Forum, Perth. Australia.

Emler, N. (1984). Differential involvement in delinquency: Toward an interpretation in terms of reputation management. In B. A. Maher & W. B. Maher (Eds.), *Progress in Experimental Personality Research* (Vol. 13, pp. 173-237). New York: Academic Press.

Emler, N. & Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and delinquency: The collective management of reputation*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Fuligni, A. J. (1997). The academic achievement of adolescents from immigrant families: The role of family background, attitudes, and behavior. *Child development*, 68(2), 351-363.

Gilreath, T., Astor, R. A., Estrada, J., Johnson, R., Benbenishty, R., & Unger, J. (2014). Substance use among adolescents in California: A latent class analysis. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 49, 116 – 123.

Gunasekera, S., Houghton, S., Glasgow, K., & Boyle, C. (2014). From stability to mobility: African secondary school aged adolescents' transition to mainstream schooling. *Australian Educational and developmental Psychologist*, 31(1), 1-17.

Hayes, A. F. (2008). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modelling [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>.

Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 408-420.

Hillier, A. (2002). The Southern Sudanese in Western Australia: Worlds apart. Paper presented at AMEP national conference Canberra.

Hollenbeck, J. R., Williams, C. R., & Klein, H. J. (1989). An empirical examination of the antecedents of commitment to difficult goals. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(1), 18-23.

Hopkins, N., & Emler, N. (1990). Social network participation and problem behavior in adolescence. In R. Hurrelmann (Ed.), *Health hazards in adolescence* (pp. 385-407). New York: de Gruyter.

Kerpelman, J. L., & Adcock-Smith, S. (2005). Female adolescents' delinquent activity. The intersection of bonds to parents and reputation enhancement. *Youth & Society, 37*(2), 176-200.

Kim, B. S. K., & Abreu, J. M. (2001). Acculturation measurement: Theory, current instruments, and future directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 394-424). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Li Y. & Wright, M. F. (2014). Adolescents' social status goals: Relationships to social status insecurity, aggression, and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*, 146-160.

Libbey, H. (2004). Measuring student relationships to school: Attachment, bonding connectedness and engagement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 274-283.

Lloyd, G. (2006, February 11th). Worlds apart. *The Courier Mail*. Pp. 20-25.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lopez-Romero, L., & Romero, E. (2010). Goals during adolescence and their relationship with antisocial behavior. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 13*(1), 166-177.

Lopukas, A. & Pasch, K. E. (2013). Does school connectedness buffer the impact of peer victimization on early adolescents' subsequent adjustment problems? *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 33, 245-266.

Louro, M. J., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2005). Negative returns on positive emotions: The influence of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 833–840.

Mak, A. S. (1993). A self-report delinquency scale for Australian adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 45(2), 75-79.

Masgoret, A.-M., & Ward, C. (2006). The cultural learning approach to acculturation. In D.L. Sam & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 58–77). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Millings, A., Buck, R., Montgomery, A., Spears, M., & Stallard, P. (2012). School connectedness, peer attachment, and self-esteem as predictors of adolescent depression. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(4), 1061e1067.

Milner, K. & Khawaja, N. G. (2010) Sudanese refugees in Australia: the impact of acculturation stress. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 4(1), 19-29.

Morrice, L. (2007). Lifelong learning and the social integration of refugees in the UK: the significance of social capital. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 26(2), 155-172.

Nurmi, J. E. (1991). How do adolescents see their future? A review of the development of future orientation and planning. *Developmental review*, 11(1), 1-59.

Oldfield, J., Humphrey, N., & Hebron, J. (2015). The role of parental and peer attachment relationships and school connectedness in predicting adolescent mental health outcomes. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*. Online First DOI: 10.1111/camh.12108

Poppitt, G., & Frey, R. (2007). Sudanese Adolescent Refugees: Acculturation and Acculturative Stress. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 17(2), 160-177.

Resnick, M. D., Bearman, P., Blum, R. W., Bauman, K. E., Harris, K. M., Jones, J. et al., (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278, 823-832.

Salmela-Aro, K., Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2007). Personal goals during emerging adulthood: A 10-year follow up. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(6), 690-715.

Sam, D. (2000). Psychological adaptation of adolescents with immigrant backgrounds. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(1), 5-25.

Sharkey, J. D., You, S., & Schnoebelen, K. (2008). Relations among school assets, individual resilience, and student engagement for youth grouped by level of family functioning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45, 408-420.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American psychologist*, 52(6), 613.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5 ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tan, C. (2011). The Adolescent Scale of Aggression. In *Delinquency, Reputational Orientations, Psychopathic Like Traits, and Aggression: Extending Reputation Enhancement Theory to Adolescent Loners*. Unpublished PhD thesis. The University of Western Australia.

Toro, P. A., Urberg, K. A., & Heinze, H. J. (2004). Antisocial behavior and affiliation with deviant peers. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33(2), 336-346.

Waters, S. K., Cross, D., & Shaw, T. (2010). How important are school and interpersonal student characteristics in determining later adolescent school connectedness, by school sector? *Australian Journal of Education*, 54(2), 223-243.

Whitlock, J. L. (2006). Youth perceptions of life in school: Contextual correlates of school connectedness in adolescence. *Applied Developmental Science*, 10, 13-29.

Zhao, Y., & Zhao, G. (2015). Emotion regulation and depressive symptoms: Examining the mediation effects of school connectedness in Chinese late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 40*, 14-23.

Ziaian, T., de Anstiss, H., Antoniou, G., Baghurst, & Sawyer, M. (2012). Resilience and its association with depression, emotional and behavioural problems and mental health service utilization among refugee adolescents living in South Australia. *International Journal of Population Research*. doi: 10.1155/2012/485956.

Table 1. Reputation enhancement variables

Reputation Variables	Alpha	Description	Items	Response Options
<b>Social Desirability Scale (Affective Evaluative Reactions)</b>		How much they, their friends and most kids their age admire boys/girls who engage in activities (e.g., using drugs, stealing, drinking alcohol, obeying parents, good at sport, getting good school marks).	32	6-point: Not at all; Very little; Somewhat; Quite a bit; Very much; and Completely.
Girls self perceived social deviance & social conformity	.85 .81			
Girls evaluative reactions to others social deviance & social conformity	.88 .83			
Boys self perceived social deviance & social conformity	.90 .86			
Boys evaluative reactions to others social deviance & social conformity	.88 .87			
<b>Social Identity Scale</b>		How participants want peers to view them and would ideally like to be viewed in terms of reputational status.	30	6-point: Never; Hardly ever; Occasionally; Sometimes; Often, and Always.
Conforming self-perception	.86	Person believes: friends think they perform conforming behaviour;		
Nonconforming self-perception	.88	non-conforming behaviour.		
Conforming ideal public self	.83	Person ideally wants friends to think they perform conforming behaviour;		
Nonconforming ideal public self	.85	non-conforming behaviour.		
<b>Self-Identity Scale</b>		Measures ideal-self/present-self discrepancies according to how participants describe themselves in terms of power attributes.	24	6 point semantic differential anchors ranging from one extreme of a relevant variable (e.g., I think I am a leader) to the other (e.g., I think I am a follower)
Power evaluation self description	.78	Person thinks they have certain powerful attributes e.g., a leader-follower.		
Power evaluation ideal private self	.79	Person thinks they would really like to have certain powerful attributes e.g., would like to be a leader-follower.		
Activity self description	.86	Person thinks that they have certain activity attributes e.g., they break rules – don't break rules.		
Activity ideal private self	.83	Person thinks they would really like to have certain activity attributes e.g., break rules – don't break rules.		

Table 2

## Frequency of Academic and Social Goals by Group

Goal Category	African IEC	African Mainstream	Australian Mainstream	Total
Academic	51 85%	16 27%	29 48%	96 53%
Social	9 15%	44 73%	31 52%	84 47%

Table 3

Univariate F Statistics, Observed Means, and Standard Deviations for the Importance of Goals Categories with Group as the Independent Variable

Goal Category	Mean Square	<i>F</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	Partial $\eta^2$	Power	<u>African IEC</u> Mean ( <i>SD</i> )	<u>African Mainstream</u> Mean ( <i>SD</i> )	<u>Australian Mainstream</u> Mean ( <i>SD</i> )
Delinquency	12.60	47.196	<.001*	.36	1.00	0.98 (0.21) <sup>a</sup>	1.90 (0.60) <sup>b</sup>	1.42 (0.67) <sup>c</sup>
Freedom	13.798	61.440	<.001*	.43	1.00	3.53 (0.17) <sup>a</sup>	4.43 (0.33) <sup>b</sup>	3.69 (0.77) <sup>ca</sup>
Reputation	4.82	18.260	<.001*	.18	1.00	2.89 (0.22) <sup>a</sup>	3.45 (0.26) <sup>b</sup>	3.10 (0.87) <sup>ca</sup>
Interpersonal	6.91	44.760	<.001*	.35	1.00	4.91 (0.05) <sup>a</sup>	4.90 (0.06) <sup>ba</sup>	4.30 (0.72) <sup>c</sup>
Traditional	6.91	44.757	<.001*	.36	1.00	4.77 (0.35) <sup>a</sup>	4.53 (0.46) <sup>ba</sup>	3.44 (1.77) <sup>c</sup>
Sport	16.07	31.604	<.001*	.28	1.00	2.04 (0.71) <sup>a</sup>	2.96 (0.88) <sup>bc</sup>	2.91 (1.19) <sup>cb</sup>
Academic	19.83	67.939	<.001*	.45	1.00	4.99 (0.04) <sup>a</sup>	4.34 (0.58) <sup>b</sup>	3.79 (0.78) <sup>c</sup>

*Note.* Means within rows having no common subscripts differ at  $p < .01$ .



Table 4. Univariate F Statistics, Observed Means, and Standard Deviations for Reputation Variables with Group as the Independent Variable

Dependent variable	Mean square	F-value	p-value	Partial $\eta^2$	Power	African IEC Mean (SD)	African Mainstream Mean (SD)	Australian Mainstream Mean (SD)
Bspsc	36.81	158.68	<.001*	.66	1.00	4.64 (.19) <sup>a</sup>	4.42 (.27) <sup>b</sup>	3.05 (.87) <sup>ca</sup>
Bopsc	36.808	186.35	<.001*	.70	1.00	4.66 (.18) <sup>a</sup>	4.42 (.27) <sup>b</sup>	3.06 (.77) <sup>c</sup>
Gspsc	26.84	114.15	<.001*	.59	1.00	4.58 (.22) <sup>a</sup>	4.33 (.27) <sup>b</sup>	3.20 (.86) <sup>c</sup>
Gopsc	25.84	136.10	<.001*	.63	1.00	4.58 (.23) <sup>a</sup>	4.34 (.27) <sup>b</sup>	3.23 (.73) <sup>c</sup>
Bspsd	15.65	76.87	.001	.49	1.00	1.08 (.07)	2.1 (.65)	1.44 (.50)
Bopsd	54.60	172.87	<.001*	.68	1.00	1.21 (.16) <sup>a</sup>	3.10 (.59) <sup>b</sup>	2.52 (.81) <sup>c</sup>
Gopsd	40.74	175.33	<.001*	.69	1.00	1.00 (.01) <sup>a</sup>	2.61 (.55) <sup>b</sup>	2.17 (.67) <sup>c</sup>
Gpsd	8.98	40.33	<.001*	.34	1.00	1.00 (.02) <sup>a</sup>	1.78 (.66) <sup>b</sup>	1.35 (.49) <sup>c</sup>
Consp	9.62	71.08	<.001*	.47	1.00	5.09 (.16) <sup>a</sup>	4.35 (.28) <sup>b</sup>	4.40 (.60) <sup>cb</sup>
Conips	4.197	18.53	<.001*	.19	1.00	5.91 (.07) <sup>a</sup>	5.93 (.12) <sup>ba</sup>	5.42 (.89) <sup>c</sup>
Nconsp	21.33	25.48	<.001*	.24	1.00	1.29 (.08) <sup>a</sup>	2.49(1.29) <sup>b</sup>	1.87 (.91) <sup>c</sup>
Nconips	8.19	19.29	<.001*	.19	1.00	1.59 (.05) <sup>a</sup>	2.33 (.74) <sup>b</sup>	1.92 (.89) <sup>ca</sup>
Activsd	12.04	47.58	<.001*	.37	1.00	4.99 (.22) <sup>a</sup>	4.10 (.54) <sup>b</sup>	4.71 (.68) <sup>ca</sup>
Powesd	1.85	8.49	<.001*	.09	0.96	3.61 (.28) <sup>a</sup>	3.93 (.49) <sup>bc</sup>	3.92 (.61) <sup>cb</sup>
Activips	3.78	54.33	<.001*	.41	1.00	6.00 (0.01) <sup>a</sup>	5.54 (.25) <sup>bc</sup>	5.57 (.41) <sup>cb</sup>
Poweips	2.69	15.78	<.001*	.17	0.99	5.98 (.06) <sup>ab</sup>	6.00 (0.0) <sup>ba</sup>	5.58 (.79) <sup>c</sup>

Note. Means within rows having no common subscripts differ at  $p < .003$ .

Table 5

Univariate F Statistics, Observed Means, and Standard Deviations for the Self-Reported Delinquency Variables (df = 14, 314) with Group as the Independent Variable

Dependent variable	Mean	<i>F</i> - value	<i>p</i> - value	Partial $\eta^2$	Power	<u>African IEC</u>	<u>African</u>	<u>Australian</u>
	squar e					Mean ( <i>SD</i> )	<u>Mainstream</u> Mean ( <i>SD</i> )	<u>Mainstream</u> Mean ( <i>SD</i> )
Abuse of property	71.97	13.71	<.001*	.15	0.99	1.36 (.96)	1.38 (.79)	1.61 (.95)
Hard drug-related offences	.34	14.85	<.001*	.16	0.99	1.17 (.73)	1.06 (.29)	1.21 (.56)
Physical aggression	5.88	22.68	<.001*	.022	1.00	1.71 (1.31)	1.37 (.79)	1.69 (1.01)
Stealing offences	1.54	22.05	<.001*	.20	1.00	0.0 (.96) <sup>ac</sup>	1.32 (.67) <sup>b</sup>	1.53 (.83) <sup>c</sup>
School misdemeanours	71.97	81.38	<.001*	.50	1.00	2.24 (1.33) <sup>a</sup>	2.28 (1.43) <sup>b</sup>	3.03 (1.49) <sup>c</sup>
Soft drug use offences	19.27	40.54	<.001*	.33	1.00	1.22 (.52)	1.47 (.99)	2.18 (1.31)
Vehicle-related offences	.03	2.06	.13	.02	0.42	1.21(.80)	1.10 (.54)	1.34 (.70)

\* *Note.* Means within rows having no common subscripts differ at  $p < .007$ .

Table 6

Univariate F Statistics, Observed Means, and Standard Deviations for the Aggression Variables (df = 4, 330) with Group as the Independent Variable

Dependent variable	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial $\eta^2$	Power estimate	IEC African		Mainstream African		Mainstream Australian	
						<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Physical-Proactive	2.56	17.64	<.001*	.18	1.0	0	0 <sup>a</sup>	.41	.58 <sup>b</sup>	.11	.30 <sup>ca</sup>
Verbal-Proactive	0.66	12.973	<.001*	.14	1.0	0	0 <sup>ac</sup>	.21	.29 <sup>b</sup>	.98	.25 <sup>abc</sup>
Verbal-Reactive	15.01	29.317	<.001*	.26	1.0	.44	.23 <sup>a</sup>	1.45	.95 <sup>b</sup>	1.06	.78 <sup>bc</sup>
Physical-Reactive	9.57	28.397	<.001*	.26	1.0	.08	.13 <sup>a</sup>	.90	.84 <sup>b</sup>	.52	.60 <sup>bc</sup>

*Note.* Means within rows having no common subscripts differ at  $p < .0125$ .

Table 7

Univariate F Statistics, Observed Means, and Standard Deviations for the Connectedness Variables with Group as the Independent Variable

Dependent variable	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial $\eta^2$	Power estimate	IEC African		Mainstream African		Mainstream Australian	
						<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
School connectedness	21.59	128.50	<.001*	.61	1.0	2.84	.17 <sup>a</sup>	1.65	.32 <sup>b</sup>	2.12	.63 <sup>c</sup>
Teacher connectedness	37.27	158.71	<.001*	.66	1.0	3.00	.01 <sup>a</sup>	1.42	.61 <sup>b</sup>	2.24	.58 <sup>c</sup>

*p* < 0.0125.