Self-Efficacy, Hope, and Student Engagement Among University Students

By

Aqsa Fayyaz

The research report submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the requirement of the Degree of Masters of Science in Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

National Institute of Psychology

Center of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

2020

Certificate

It is certified that M. Sc. Research Report on **"Self-Efficacy, Hope, and Student Engagement Among University Students"** prepared by **Aqsa Fayyaz** has been approved for submission to the National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

8.9.2020

Ms. Sara Imtiaz

(Supervisor)

Self-Efficacy, Hope, and Student Engagement Among University Students

DEDICATED TO MY BELOVED FAMILY

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Abstract

The present study was designed to investigate the association between self-efficacy, domain specific hope, and student engagement among university students. Some demographic variables like age, gender, education, work status, family system, residential status, mother work status, father work status, and faculty were also catered. Convenient sample (n = 400) comprising of female students (n = 160) and male students (n = 240) was collected from different universities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Instruments used in the present study were General Self-efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1985) as measure of self-efficacy, Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999) as measure of hope, while Student Engagement Scale (Wellborn, 1991) as measure of student engagement. It was indicated that there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy, domain specific hope, and student engagement. Regression analysis revealed that self-efficacy and hope both came out to be positive predictors of student engagement. Related to gender differences t-test indcate that male students have more social hope as compared to female students. Agentic engagement was reflected higher for students living in joint family system as compared to nuclear family system. Self-efficacy has been reported higher in MPhil/PhD students as compared to BS/MSc students. Results of faculty based differences showed that social science students scored higher on overall hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement as compared to natural science students.

Acknowledgments

All Praise and Gratitude be to Allah, the Grace of Whom made all the people and circumstances around me to help me complete this project. I am very thankful to my supervisor Ms. Sara Imtiaz who has been very kind and patient through the whole process. Her support and guidance helped me through hard times for which I am very grateful to her. I am also thankful to my whole family for providing me with supportive environment. Special thanks to my parents who have always been very encouraging and supportive for me. I am thankful to my senior fellows who have guided and helped me through the process.

Aqsa Fayyaz

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The development in field of science and technology has influenced the human life to a great extent. Development has also contributed to change the student's academic goals, life priorities, and ways to deal with academic responsibilities. It has caused the pedagogical problems for university students (Kokab, 2018). University life can potentially be stressful for both the freshmen and senior students in the same manner. Most of the students find it hard to deal the academic stress which causes them to lag behind. However, a few students consider the pressure as challenge and achieve academic success through overcoming the barriers and hard work. For students, one of the most important goal is the academic success. Academic success is dependent on formation of an effective nexus among teachers, students, and the institution. It also depends on the extent to which all entities of nexus tend to achieve their respective goals.

Hope has been considered as a cognitive motivational structure in educational settings (Snyder & Lopez, 2006). It entails the conception of future which is very important in predicting success of youth (Sana, 2016). It has been found to play a beneficial role in individual's life by enhancing the psychological and physical health (Naveeda, 2018). Research has found the positive correlations between hope and an individual's interest in learning and study (Gallagher, Marques, & Lopez, 2016). Hope reflects a person's expectation of his/her best possible outcome and the concomitant work to achieve it (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Hope is not limited to academic setting rather it has influence on broader dimensions of life like impact on individual's social life, family relationships, work, and leisure activities (Sympson, 1999).

Social sciences, especially psychology has come up with theoretical approach to study hope (Sana, 2016). Yet, hope has been considered as a basic emotion over past several decades (Karatepe, 2014). Researchers have provided evidence regarding influence of hope in the domain of motivation and level of aspiration (McCulloch,

2006; Sympson, 1999). Hope can also be conceptualized as cognitive construct that represents motivation and ability of the person to endeavor toward life goals. It influences whether or not a person can meet the goals (Synder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2002).

Self-efficacy can potentially help to improve the learning methods among students particularly self-regulation and it also predicts academic progress (Peterson & Byron, 2008). Self-efficacy related beliefs influence goals, aspirations, and predict the consequences of human behavior. People who have high self-efficacy pursue higher goals and are more committed to achieve their goals which make them to show optimal behavior. On the other hand, people with low self-efficacy tend to have unfavorable behavioral outcome (Yusuf, 2011). Self-efficacy determines the way individual conceptualize the obstacles. People with low self-efficacy do not realize the importance of their behavior in coping problems rather think that their behavior will not make any difference which let them to overlook the endeavors. Yet, individuals with high self-efficacy overcome the obstacles through patience, self-management skills and improvement and they experience low uncertainty, high strength and control (Ahmad & Safaria, 2013)

Student engagement represents the extent to which student's exhibit engagement in formal education process. It refers to the time, energy, and effort invested by students in educational and learning tasks like coursework and school-related activities. Student engagement is comprised of implicit mental state, explicit behavior, and mode of thinking. Mental state involves interactive awareness of learning and attitude toward learning. Mode of thinking involves learning and cognitive strategies whereas, explicit behavior is attributed to the amount of time invested in study, participation in discussion and completion of assignments (Pajares, 2002).

Self-efficacy has been studied a lot that has revealed its importance and significance in almost every aspect of our daily life (Fridberg & Gustavsson, 2019). Here in this study role of self-efficacy and hope is being seen to predict engagement in study among higher education level students. In short, self-efficacy is the

perception of someone about his/her abilities to accomplish a specific task in any particular situation. So, one can assume self-efficacy to throw a significant impact on the hope of students is their study and professional life in future. Higher self-efficacy is supposed to promote hope among students that they can achieve a specific task no matter what the hardships or obstacles they will have to face. Hope triggered by positive self-efficacy will encourage them to overcome all the resistances on the way. In the same run, the hope in connection with self-efficacy will encourage the students to engage more in their study. The engagement in study will increase in direct association to a student's good self-efficacy and positive hope. Hence, allow us to conclude that self-efficacy and hope may contribute to better learning outcomes like engagement of students in their study.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the extent to which individual believe in their capabilities to accomplish certain tasks and complete goals (Ormrod, 2006). Self-efficacy defines the actions of an individual in day to day life that are influenced by the way they identify own capabilities. Such kind of self-estimation is named as perceived self-efficacy (Sukkarieh, 2011). According to Bandura (1986), it is the decision of individuals regarding their ability to organize and implement activities that are essential to achieve certain goals or complete some tasks. Thus, perceived self-efficacy can be referred as the notion that an individual can execute demanding or unusual tasks in order to achieve the required consequences. The cognitions that reflect 'can do' mindset shows the individuals' positive attitude which makes them able to change the demanding challenges in environment through their actions (Sana, 2016). Here, one's skills are not under discussion rather opinion of person whether they can perform something using whatever skills they possess.

Basic principle of the theory of self-efficacy states that people show increased involvement in the tasks for which they possess high level of self-efficacy and vice versa (Bijl & Baggett, 2002). Theory also illustrates that individual's beliefs in relation to their abilities strongly influence the task preference, effort invested, perseverance, resilience, and task performance. These beliefs are important because

they affect feelings, cognitions, motivation, and behavior of an individual (Bandura, 1997). Research has indicated that self-efficacy involves viewing one's ability to handle life stressors in positive light (Schwarzer & Warner, 2013). However, phenomenon of self-belief is explicit and task oriented. If an individual possess capability to perform a certain action, it does not mean that person will be able to show performance in all the relevant areas (Sukkarich, 2011). Self-efficacy is thought to be based on opinions about one's ability as well as about the outcome.

Elements of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy has two important elements; one of them is efficacy expectancy and other is named as outcome expectancy (Saleh, 2017).

Efficacy expectancy. A person's opinion regarding his/her ability to reach a certain level of performance is considered in efficacy expectancy.

Outcome expectancy. It involves person's opinion about a possible outcome that could be produced by a particular action.

Self-efficacy has impact on nearly every aspect of person's life. The way people act in face of challenges and choices they make are dependent on the beliefs of the individuals regarding their power to affect the particular situations (Luszezynska & Schwarzer, 2005). It also has influence on behavior in social domain, the way individual behave in various social situations. Whereas, self-efficacy is also related to individual's confidence to accomplish certain level of academic performance or achieve the academic goals (Bandura, 1977; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Empirical work has found that there is positive relationship between self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and creativity among the employees of advertising agencies (Khalid & Zuabair, 2014). Research has also shown the relationship between mathematical achievement and mathematics self-efficacy. Whereby, it suggests that mathematics self-efficacy can predict the achievement in mathematics significantly (Anjum, 2006). Therefore it can be seen that efficacy beliefs count a lot in relevance to performance variables. In improvising performance oriented behavior it is important to understand the cycle of self-efficacy.

The self-efficacy cycle. The cycle of self-efficacy is three-fold. Components of this cycle are forethought, performance control, and self-reflection (Zimmerman & Clearly, 2009).

Forethought. It includes processes that occur before action and it consists of steps like strategic planning and goal setting.

Performance control. This is the processes that emerge when learning continues to take place.

Self-reflection. However, self-reflection emerge after the action. Self-reflective phase is comprised of attribution and self-evaluation

Generalized vs. domain specific self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is usually conceptualized to be domain-specific but some researchers have also conceived the idea of general self-efficacy (Choi, 2005; Luszynska, Gutierrez Dona, & Schwarzer, 2005; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995; Tong & Song, 2004). General self-efficacy deals with stable sense of personal competence and ability to deal with various stressful situations in a broader perspective (Tong & Song, 2014). So, it shows the individual's ability to cope with diverse, novel, and challenging situations (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2004; Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998; Tong & Song, 2004). According to Schwarzer (1992), general sense of self-efficacy is important in order to adapt and cope with all kinds of stressful life events. It can be described as positive self-belief to deal with adversities in a number of domains of human life. Both the domain specific self-efficacy and general self-efficacy includes individuals' beliefs regarding their abilities to produce targeted outcome. Difference between both is that, domain specific self-efficacy illustrates the motivation behind a particular task performance whereas general self-efficacy describes reason behind individual differences in motivation, engagement, and pro-activity (Glenn, 2014).

High vs. low self-efficacy. Individuals having more self-efficacy related beliefs deal with change easily and also with the problems that arise from the change (Mudgett, Nease, & Quinones, 1999). Individuals with high self-efficacy show more

constructive behaviors like deep intellectual processing, initiation of a difficult task, self-management, and intellectual engagement (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990, Pintrich, 2000). All of such factors stated above can lead to academic success of students. Students may also become responsible to invest effort, face problems, and value academic tasks which can cause them to show high achievement (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002). Students with high-self-efficacy show more interest in academic activities like completing homework and involving in practicing/rehearsal which lead to better academic results than students who have low level self-efficacy (Bassi, Steca, Fave, & Vittorio, 2007).

Self-efficacy can also be considered as motivational element which can increase or decrease activity of an individual and their capability to exercise control in different areas of life. Individuals who hold suspicion regarding their abilities are easily weakened by the disappointments during the struggle. On the other hand, the ones who have high trust in their abilities continue in the face of problems and proceed. Self-efficacy influences the behavior through persistence, action, and effort. It can be considered as an individuals' judgment of or belief in their capability to accomplish a certain task (Sana, 2016). Self-efficacy is related to individual's judgment regarding their ability to achieve something in a particular situation.

Self-efficacy and behavior. Self-efficacy affects human functioning through three cognitive processes; motivation, affect, and selection. These cognitive processes have relationship with thinking evaluation component of motivation during performance of an action. They state emotional reaction and practice of control over one's motivation (Bandura, 1994).

Bandura's social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory emphasizes the role played by observational learning and social experiences in the development of personality. This theory explains the individual's cognitions, emotions and, action. It is based in premise that people are capable of self-regulation and self-reflection (Bandura, as cited in Willemse, 2008). People's cognitions and feelings have an impact on their actions. Individuals who have high level of s elf-efficacy conceive difficult tasks as something that should not be avoided rather mastered (Bandura,

1997). Self-efficacy is individuals' assessment of their own abilities and skills (Cowen, Work, Hightower, Wyman, Parker, & Lotyczewski, 1991; Muris, 2002).

Sources of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy originates from four important sources which are named as mastery experiences, vicarious reinforcement, social persuasion, and emotional arousal (Bandura, 1997), another source named imaginal experiences was added later on (Maddux, 2013).

Mastery experiences. It is the first source of self-efficacy and most influential source. It is interpreted from the results of one's previous experience, or mastery experiences. Individual engages in tasks and activities, interprets the results of their actions, use the interpretation to develop beliefs about their capability to engage in subsequent task or activities, and/or act in accordance with the beliefs created. Of course, people who possess a low sense of self-efficacy often discount their successes rather than changing their beliefs about self. Consequently, mastery experiences are only raw data and many factors influence how such information is cognitively processed and affects an individual's self-appraisal. Thus, experiencing mastery is important to have high self-efficacy. For instance, experiencing success in mastering of a task or controlling the environment can build positive self-belief. On the other hand, failure can serve to weaken the self-efficacy belief. In order to have stable sense of self-efficacy, it is important to experience the obstacles using continuous effort and perseverance. Mastery experience is most influential source to attain self-efficacy.

Vicarious experiences. It is the second source of self-efficacy. Vicarious experiences have roots in observation of individuals particularly the role models in our surroundings. When individual observes similar individuals succeeding through perseverance, such observation increase his/her belief in own abilities to attain the success in that particular area.

Verbal persuasion. People who influence the life of an individual to a great extent like parents, coaches, teachers, manager can potentially strengthen one's belief

in one's ability to succeed. If an individual believe in his/her abilities to succeed, it can cause them to invest more effort in their task when obstacles arises.

Emotional arousal. Individuals' state affects the way an individual assess their self-efficacy. For instance, depression can make someone to feel less confident regarding one's abilities. Stress and tension can make a person vulnerable to poor performance. However, confidence in own abilities can be increased through positive emotional experiences.

Imaginal experiences. Maddux contributed to the fifth source of self-efficacy. It was suggested that imaginal experiences includes visualizing oneself performing successfully in a given situation.

Attribution theory. This theory illustrates that how individuals assign reasons to events and how their beliefs and self-perception interacts (Shams, 2017). This theory states that there are three major components of the causes assigned to an event.

Locus. First component is locus that explains the place or location of perceived cause. Individual's self-efficacy or self-esteem tend to increase in case of success but it decreases when locus is external.

Stability. It is referred as steadiness and it is closely related to expectations and goals.

Controllability. This explains whether a person feels to control the cause or not. If people perceive a task to be out of control, it causes anger and humiliation.

With reference to self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement some work has been done in Pakistan. A brief sketch of these researches has been presented here. For instance, looking for predictive role of hope in combination with passive procrastination and self-efficacy on academic performance was studied. Research was conducted on a sample of 500 students. Results revealed that self-efficacy and domain specific hope were positively correlated with each other (Sana, 2016). From the

perspective of mental health a study explored about self-efficacy and life satisfaction of police man. Results revealed that there was a positive relationship between mental health and self-efficacy (Shams, 2017). Another, research examined the relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy with medical students. Findings of this research revealed that academic procrastination is a strong negative predictor of self-efficacy (Malik, 2017). A comparative research examining the relationship of social adjustment, self-efficacy, and mental health of orphans and non-orphans adolescents showed a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and social adjustment but significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and mental health. There are nonsignificant difference exist on self-efficacy between orphans and non-orphans (Riasat, 2015). Likewise, another, research attempting to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and creativity among employees of advertising agencies indicated that emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and creativity were positively correlated with each other (Khalid, 2014).

Another research was designed to investigate the relationship of self-efficacy and procrastination and the sample consisted of 60 students of college. Results revealed that there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and procrastination. Furthermore the studies also find out the significant gender difference, where boys scored high on self-efficacy and procrastination as compared to girls on self-efficacy and procrastination (Nazish, 2003). Soudhan (2006) designed a study to explore the relationship between self-efficacy and styles of handling interpersonal conflict among 80 employees working in public sector organization. The study support that self-efficacy has positive relationships with constructive styles while strongly negative relationship with destructive style of handling interpersonal conflicts and it was found that self-efficacy is higher in boys as compared to girls.

Hope

Positive psychology is based on hope theory. Since late twentieth century, hope has captured the attention of researchers from social sciences. It is explained as positive motivational condition which enables individual to have agency thinking and plans to achieve the respective goals (Snyder, 2000). Synder (1994) suggested that

hope is a set of learned cognitions about goal-related thinking rather than a hereditary factor.

High vs. low hope. Students with high hope have clear understanding of their goals whereas the ones with low hope have an uncertain and ambiguous conception of their goals (Snyder, 1994). Thus, high hope students are likely to set goals based on their previous performance. They have more stringent study and performance standards (Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder, & Adams, 2000). Such students have high intrinsic motivation and show good academic performance because they know their goals and control are the way to pursue those goals (Adams, 2000).

Individuals with high hope possess favorable emotional sets and enthusiasm and a feeling of confidence which is rooted in their history of accomplishments during past goal pursuits. Whereas, individuals having low hope have negative emotional sets, and a feeling of emotional fatigue which is rooted in their history of failed attempts of goal pursuits (Synder, Sympson, Michael, & Cheavens, 2000). These emotional sets are carried by individual with high or low hope when they face a particular goal related activity.

People with high hope conceive the obstacles in way of goal achievement as challenge and explore alternative routes, and invest energy and motivation to make them work. Typically, the high-hope people are pushed forward by their positive emotions when overcoming the barriers because they had successful experience of working with obstacles. However, individuals with low hope become stucked because they fail to find alternative routes and their lack of enthusiasm and rumination hinder the goal accomplishment and pursuits (Synder, Lopez, & Pedrotti, 2010).

Hope theory. Synder (2003) introduced the hope theory which explains the role of barriers, emotions, and stressors in an explicit manner. Experience of confronting obstacles hinder goal attainment and can make an individual to consider a situation as stressful.

Hope theory indicates that an individual having a set of positive emotions is likely to be successful in goal achievement. Yet, the individuals with negative emotions have perceived absence of achievement under both obstructed and unobstructed situations. Thus, perceptions regarding goal achievement can cause both positive and negative emotional sets. Moreover, these emotions can potentially act as feedback influencing reinforcement (Lopez, Synder, & Pedrotti, 2003).

Theoretical models linked with hope have been developed in recent past. These models have influenced the scholars from the domain of positive psychology enormously. Instead of focusing on cognitive dimension of hopefulness, Synder conceived hope as cognitive construct that represents person's motivation and ability to work hard (Rand, Martin, & Sigmon, 2011; Synder, 1999). Hope particularly depends upon two cognitive states which are pathways thinking and agency thinking.

Pathways thinking. In order to achieve certain goals, it is important for individuals to consider themselves as equipped for finding workable routes to the respective objectives. This thinking process is referred as pathways thinking. It can be called as a person's perceived ability to produce workable routes and ability to have positive self-talk related to search of desired goals. In addition, it is found that this mode of thinking involves exclaiming internal messages which are similar to appellation (Synder, Lapointe, Crowson, & Early, 1998). Pathway thinking involves the capacity of an individual to produce one or more workable routes to reach a desired goal. It is vital to generate numerous pathways when obstacles are faced. Individuals with high hope think of discovering alternative routes to success and find it easy to generate alternative routes (Snyder, 1998).

Agency thinking. In hope theory, agency thinking serves as motivational element. It is the ability of a person to use pathways to achieve the goals and objectives. At this point, high-hope individual exhibit agentic self-talk (Synder, 1998). Agency thinking involves the thought patterns of self-referring nature, in which an individual conceptualizes This is the kind of goal-directed thinking, which enables a person to utilize workable solutions to alternate the pathway in situation where a problem is faced (Synder, 2002). In order to evaluate the suitable ideas, specifically

the ones related to diverse life areas, trait hope conceptualization including both pathway and agency thinking were modified to add the specific life domains (Sympson, 1999) to start moving along a pathway and proceed along that pathway.

Hope in life domain (domain specific hope). Situational dimension of hope has been neglected although the time-limited and dispositional type has received the great attention (Sympson & Synder, 1997). In order to conceptualize hope, it should not be considered to be limited to one dimension because there are multiple dimensions of life, so hope should also be defined in multiple dimensions. Sympson (1999) found six important domains of hope. The domains of hope are related to social relationships, family life, academics, romantic life, leisure activities, and work life. It was found that academic domain is the most relevant domain for students. But in order to lead a prosperous life, students should not only focus on academics rather all domains of hope should be improved. Some of the important domains explained by Sympson have been outlined as under:

Social hope. Individuals' with high-hope in social relationships can find number of ways to make new relationships and friends. Such people pursue their relationships actively and make multiple ways to meet new people. Moreover, high-hope individuals can easily become the member of groups they have interest in. They are able to use the past experience related to socialization to make new friends in future (Babayan & Babaei, 2015; Sympson, 2000).

Academic hope. People having high hope in academic domain are able to produce workable ways to prosper in academia. In challenging situations they are not vulnerable to lose the confidence rather they overcome the difficulties with help of past experiences in effective manner (Babayan & Babaei, 2015). Research has shown that the enhanced academic performance among university students can be achieved through high level of hope. It can be due to the improved psychological structures (Ebrahimi, Sabaghian, & Abolghasemi, 2011; Rajabi & Hosseini, 2013; Rand, Martin, & Shea, 2011).

Family hope. Hopeful people have capability to enjoy different family-related activities and tend to keep their family relationships healthy. They exhibit high satisfaction regarding family life and in face of disagreement. They are capable overcome the challenge through feasible solutions. They find it easy to express their emotions and discuss them with their family (Babayan & Babaei, 2015). Individuals with high family hope can consider multiple ways to find a new job. Hopeful people actively participate in workplace and are able to learn a great deal from jobs of less importance. They are able to make good relationship with their boss. People with high hope in leisure activities can think of number of ways to use their spare time productively (Babayan & Babaei, 2015).

With reference to self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement some work has been done in Pakistan. A brief sketch of these researches has been presented here. The relationship between self-criticism, attribution style, hope, and depressive symptoms was also investigated. The results of the study reported that self-criticism had a significant positive relationship with depressive symptoms but hope had a negative significant relationship with depressive symptoms (Naveeda, 2018). Kokab (2018) explored the relationship between hope, happiness, and quality of life among university students. Correlation analysis showed significant positive relationship between hope, happiness and quality of life. Mean difference along gender revealed that men scored significantly higher on hope as compare to women.

Kokab (2018) worked with university students to explore hope, happiness and, quality of life and found that hope is high in male participants as compared to female participants whereas Sana (2016) explored that female students scored high on domain specific hope. The role of demographics has also been disclosed where findings showed that nuclear family system scored high on hope as compared to joint family system (Sana, 2016; Naveeda, 2018). Residence type has also been explored where domain specific hope was found to be higher in hostilities as compared to day scholars (Rasool, 2015; Sana, 2016). Level of education is also a predictor of hope where findings showed that hope is high in BS students as compares to MPhil students (Sana, 2016; Kokab, 2018).

Students' Engagement

Students' engagement is considered as an important factor in education. A wide range of literature has explored how educators and the environment of organizations affect the student's engagement (Noureen, 2016). Similarly, Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, and Hayek (2006) have stated that educators and organizations are the main power to influence students' engagement. The organizational environment must be amiable so that students can get honor and hospitality irrespective of their cultural identity (Gavala & Flett, 2005), provide the learners distinct facilities to make learning easy for them (Piker, Smart, Kuh & Hayek, 2006), and willingness to make alterations according to students expectations. Environment should also facilitate students to be ready to transform and adapt (Rotgans & Schmidt, 2011).

Harper and Quaye (2015) regarded student's engagement as something more than the contribution or participation in academic activities; it also entails the feelings and activities in academic context. Participation or engagement in learning without emotions can reflect disinterest. For some students the objectives, inspiration, and interest do not develop in the organization. In addition, they do not learn to communicate with other individuals from their families and participate in activities that are essential in the academic society.

Kuh (2007) stated the definition of student engagement as involvement in educational activities taking place both inside the class and outside of the class, it can lead to a number of outcomes that can be calculated. Student engagement can also be conceptualized as degree to which students engage in activities that are linked with learning objectives of excellent quality that are indicated by higher education (Krause & Coates, 2008). Student engagement can also be described as the extent to which students invest their psychological and physical energy in academic activities (Wajid, 2017). It is thought to be an important element of learning situations where students are willing to invest effort and motivation to make learning experience meaningful (Rotgans & Schmidt, 2011).

Similarly, engagement can be defined as the quality of effort exerted by students in purposeful educational activities that can directly lead to the expected results (Hu & Kuh, 2003). Other researchers have given somehow a different explanation. They describe engagement as the process in which students are empowered in learning and shaping process through conscious and deliberate measures that are taken by the educational institutions (HEFCE, 2008). To integrate the concept, student engagement can be regarded as the students' time and efforts devoted to educational activities that have evidence based connection with the required outcome of an institution and the institution's input to increase student's participation in such activities (Kuh, 2001; Kuh, 2005; Kuh, 2009). Student engagement has three dimensions and all dimensions of students' engagement are related to each other and all of the dimensions are of equal importance for the learning of students (Trowler, 2010).

Student engagement covers the fundamental academic and some non-academic facets of students' life thus it can be considered as a diverse construct (Coates, 2007). Learning in university and active participation in academic activities includes collaborative and active learning, participation in various educational activities, strong communication with teachers, and support from communities. Engagement of students reflect the degree of student's active participation in activities related to learning (Skinner, Kinderman, & Furrer, 2009), more generally, the school activities (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004).

Student engagement is a construct with a number of dimensions. Its dimensions are distinct but highly related to each other. In opinion of different theorists, student engagement is ranged from helping behavior in class (behavioral engagement) effort and perseverance to enthusiasm, high interest, less boredom and low anxiety (emotional engagement) to strategic planning, concentration, advanced learning techniques, and cognitive engagement (ability to regulate oneself) to deliberate behaviors of agency to improve the experience through learning activities, and subject matter (agentic engagement).

Typology of student engagement styles. Typology of student engagement styles has two axes (Coates, 2007). These typologies have been outlined under a social and the academic axes. Passive and independent are social axes, intense and collaborative are academic axes.

Intense. Students who exhibit intense engagement also show high involvement in university studies. These students view teaching faculty as friendly and consider their educational environment to be supportive, challenging, and responsive.

Independent. This engagement style is distinguished as more academics oriented and less socially oriented approach to studies. Students who exhibit independent style of engagement are more likely to see their learning environment and community as supportive. They view teaching staff as hospitable and sensitive to student's needs. They also consider staff as encouraging and valuing student's feedback. Yet, such students are not much likely to involve in collaborative activities with other students of their class or beyond the class. They also show less involvement in other activities and other events in the campus.

Collaborative. Students who exhibit the collaborative style are more likely to cherish the social aspect of life at university rather than adopting the pure cognitive and individualistic interactions. Students with high collaborative engagement enjoy validation of their feelings within university, communities by interaction with other students and staff, and through participation in talent development activities.

Passive. Students who possess the passive style do not participate in activities related to productive learning or general activities. Yet, these engagement styles are short-lived states and should not be conceptualized as types or traits. So, it cannot be assumed that these are stable characteristics of individuals over time and situations.

Dimensions of Student Engagement. Student engagement is a construct having many facets and it explains diverse areas of student practices. Student

engagement is a diverse construct that intends to include fundamental academic and non-academic experiences of students. Research has identified a number of components of student engagement. There are two major dimensions of student engagement one is emotional and other is behavioral (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). However, some other researchers have recommended three dimensions of the construct, namely cognitive, emotional, and behavioral (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). It is not clear that which holds greater importance. In current research, all of the dimensions outlined by Wellborn (1991) are utilized to construe the phenomemeon of student engagement which are explained below:

Motivational engagement. Students with motivational engagement choose the activities and content of their interest and show engagement into it. Motivational engagement can lead to achievement and learning because student's deeper and personal interest can lead to improved learning. High levels of motivational engagement can lead to enhanced cognitive engagement and increased use of self-regulated strategies in learning. Self-efficacy and motivational engagement are mutually related. In the same way emotions can affect the efficacy and efficacy can influence the emotions. Developing the sense of competence related to a task can make one's attitude positive toward that task. However, students' interest to engage in a task is dependent on their likeability of a certain task. Students' persistence and engagement in a task can lead to increased self-efficacy (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003).

Agentic engagement. In opinion of Reve and Tseng (2011), students' contribution to the instructions they receive, in a constructive manner is called agentic engagement. Agentic engagement accounts for personalizing the content to be learned in a proactive and an intentional manner. They not only narrow down what to learn but also under what conditions that content should be learned. For instance, during lecture student may show participation by asking questions, showing preferences, recommending goal to be pursued, suggesting something, communicating their interest level, finding ways to make lesson of personal significance, seek clarification,

focus on problem solving, seek assistance like feedback, background knowledge, coming up with concrete examples, and modeling.

Behavioral engagement. Behavioral engagement is reflected by student's class participation, high involvement in learning tasks, perseverance, and effort (Rotgans & Schmidt, 2011). According to Fredricks, Blumenfelf, and Paris (2004), it can also be described as a range of behaviors shown by students in school activities. In the process of learning, three major types of behavioral engagement are involved. The types are; positive conduct, class-activities participation, and contribution in learning.

Positive conduct. It is manifested by being present in the class, following class room rules, and regulations, following the instructions and avoiding mischievous behaviors.

Involvement. Having involvement in learning is characterized by student's persistence, investing efforts, asking questions, involving in class discussions, spending time in class activities, and completing homework.

Participation. It in school activities is characterized by active involvement in co-curricular activities like participation in student society or in athletic team..

Willms (2001) indicated that behavioral engagement represents the educational abilities of students at school. The academic performance and behavioral engagement were found to be positively related in a study that considered participation, learning effort, and extracurricular activities to conceptualize behavioral engagement (Noureen, 2016).

Emotional engagement. Emotional engagement can be characterized by student's affective reaction to teachers, peers, classroom, and school (Rotgans & Schmidt, 2011). Likewise, Willms (2001) regarded emotional engagement as affective engagement and included the emotional reactions and sense of belongingness at school to the construct. Most of the researchers gave the uniform explanation of the

construct of emotional engagement. It can be described as student's feeling of interest, anger, happiness, and anxiety during the course of achievement or school related activities (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Moreover, it can also be defined as degree to which students possess sense of belongingness to their institution and the extent to which they express care for their school (Sciarra & Seirup, 2008). Research has also indicated that emotional engagement is concerned with the both positive and negative emotions of students that are related to peers, teachers, or school (Wang & Eccles, 2013).

Cognitive engagement. It is characterized by student's effort invested in learning, self-regulation, learning goals, and planning. It also involves the students' feelings regarding themselves, student's skills, work, and strategies used by them to learn (Metallidou & Viachou, 2007). Construct of cognitive engagement explains that why some students fail to learn the concepts in class efficiently. It can be due to the reason that students might show behavioral engagement but due to less cognitive engagement, learning does not take place. So, it can be said that if students appears to be engaged in class, it does not necessarily mean that they are learning new concepts in the class.

Effort plays an important role for both behavioral and cognitive engagement. In this regard, cognitive engagement can be considered as quality of engagement shown by the student and effort can be conceived as quantity of student engagement (Pintrich, 2003). In order to increase the achievement in students, student engagement particularly the cognitive engagement should be promoted (Greene, Miller, Crowson, Duke, & Akey, 2004). Students with high cognitive and behavioral engagement have capability for various tasks. They can learn new things and in face of problems, they seek help from others and also utilize problem solving techniques to overcome the problems.

There are positive and negative dimensions of engagement, separated by the void of non-engagement. These dimensions reflects attitude of students during learning. So, engagement is important and has been seen as a positive predictor of academic achievement in students (Trowler, 2010). Students with high determination,

exhibit cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, and class participation during the course of learning (Chapman, 2003). Student's efforts and motivation can potentially play a vital role in their engagement (Schuetz & Bar, 2008). Research has also explained how a teacher practices and makes connection with students, keeping in view the role of educational environment or culture on the student (Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2004).

Researches have highlighted the role of student's engagement in learning. A student has been considered as a person who aims to learn and work hard for it. Researchers have emphasized the role of student's motivation, collaboration among students, teacher-student relationship, and institutional rules, and regulations. Moreover, factors that are not related to the institution like peers, family, and vocation. Students are motivated to engage in learning in exciting ways and learning is the journey for them to build their knowledge (Krause & Coates, 2008).

Student engagement not only indicates the level of education within a society but also the nature of education, an institution delivers (Kuh, 2001). Moreover, student's engagement is important to enhance the academic abilities and accomplishments of students. It also helps them in socialization, welfare, and life fulfillment (Krause & Coates, 2008; Wang & Eccles, 2013).

Student engagement reflects the quality of education delivered by an institution. It also reflects quality of education system and level of education in a society (Kuh, 2001). Student engagement holds significant value for effective learning, achievement, academic competency, life satisfaction, socialization, and welfare of the students (Marine, 2005; Fredricks et al., 2004; Krause & Coates, 2008; Wang & Eccles, 2012). Education system where students show least or no engagement cannot produce positive outcomes. So, there is positive relationship between engagement and academic achievement of the students (Carini, Kuh, & Klein, 2006; Coates, 2007; Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Marine, 2005). Thus student engagement is vital for learning, achievement, and performance (Fredricks, 2004; Klem & Connell, 2004).

Low levels of students' engagement or its absence in an institution should receive the attention of teachers and policy makers because such students are more likely to have problematic behaviors or to be dropped out of schools than the ones having high student engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). If developmental point of view is considered, educational failure and being dropped out of school are not two discrete processes rather long time of withdrawal from school can be a reason of both (Randolph, Fraser, & Orthner, 2004). Role of student's engagement to determine the academic achievement depends upon the components of engagement under consideration.

Self- Efficacy, Domain Specific Hope, and Student Engagement

Hope is a predictor of student engagement in academic domain. A study has shown that hope predicts academic achievement in college students and it suggested that students should build the ability to move towards and maintain their goals in order to achieve high academic performance (Gallagher, Marques, & Lopez, 2016). According to research, it is indicated that cognition focused and goal focused approaches have predicted factors that can result in enhanced academic performance and high self-efficacy (Synder, 1994).

Synder (2002) has compared the hope and self-efficacy. Hope is related to the expectancies to achieve a goal and self-efficacy is conceptualized as expectancy to perform a certain behavior. Self-efficacy explains whether or not behavior of an individual will positively lead to the goal. On the other hand, hope entails the expectation whether an individual can achieve the goals through integrated use of pathways (goal-related planning) and agency (motivation) approaches. The concept of agency and self-efficacy emphasize on persistence in the same way, thus suggesting the relationship between self-efficacy and hope (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999).

Behavioral engagement is indicted through observable behaviors of effort and persistence. One of the functions of self-efficacy is to keep the person in the job, despite the failures (Bandura, 1997). The quality of this effort reflects the cognitive engagement (Linnenbrink & Printrich, 2003). In case of emotional engagement,

increased levels of anxiety, especially test anxiety, are negatively associated with learning and performance (Zeidner, 1998). On the other hand, students with low levels of self-efficacy often experience negative emotions such as anxiety or depression (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara & Pastorelli, 1996). Positive emotions tend to be associated with self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Despite that one must first invite interest among students in order to make them learn. This is a belief that is deeply ingrained about teachers but there are other alternatives as well (Linnenbrink & Printrich, 2003).

For Bandura (1997), individuals first develop a sense of competence or efficacy in an activity and hence develop the interest and appreciation of that activity. The agenciative dimension directly implies self-efficacy, because the student can only will sees him/herself as an agent if he/her believes in his/her competence. Thus, self-efficacy plays an important role in engaging students in class (Linnenbrink & Printrich, 2003). According to these authors, it gives hope to teachers because the students' self-efficacy is inherently modifiable and sensitive to the context of the classroom.

Role of Demographic Variables

The assumption is that the beliefs that young people hold about their capability to succeed in their endeavors are vital forces in the subsequent successes or failures they attain in these endeavors (Pajares, 2005). These self-efficacy beliefs provide the foundation for motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishment in all areas of life. This is because unless young people believe that their actions can produce the results they desire, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of the difficulties that inevitably ensue. They can, of course, be cajoled or coerced to complete tasks or participate in activities not of their choice, but as soon as they are provided with the option to select their own life paths, they will surely select tasks and activities they believe are within their capabilities and avoid those that they believe are beyond their perceived competence (Pajares, 2005).

Looking for age based changes self-belief theorists have argued that self-belief differences change during life stage. For example Goetz (2010) demonstrated that the domain-specific self-concepts of young children are less distinct than those of relatively older children, adolescents, and adults. However, findings for the effect of age on self-efficacy are inconsistent. For example Liew (2008) found that self-efficacy changes little from grade 1 to grade 2. On the other hand Caprara (2008) utilized the six-wave design to examine the development of self-regulatory efficacy for a sample of 412 students aged 12 at study inception. The interval between each measurement was 1 year. They demonstrated that self-regulatory efficacy declined progressively.

Using a cross-sectional design, Hunter (2005) analyzed speaking and listening self-efficacy of 577 grade 5, 594 grade 8, and 556 grade 11 students using a five-item questionnaire. Gender differences were moderated by age. The beliefs of both boys and girls in their abilities as effective listeners increased as age increased. For the remaining items, female self-efficacy reduced from grade 5 to grade 8 and then returned to near its original level in grade 11. Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990) examined the development of self-efficacy for 30 grade 5, 30 grade 8, and 30 grade 11 gifted students. Notably, they failed to find evidence of a significant interaction between gender and grade (Lloyd, 2005). Another research finding shows that self-efficacy is higher in 17-24 years young people in comparison to 25-34 year individuals (Shabbir, 2017). Similarly, (Zafar, 2005; Naveeda, 2018) findings showed that self-efficacy is higher in 35 years and above aged individuals. In addition, findings of another study (Naveeda, 2018) showed that late adolescents scored high on hope.

With reference to gender based comparison, the degree of self-efficacy was seen to differ between gender groups. In the context of information and communication technology a study (Broos, 2005) found males had high self-efficacy, performed better, and had less anxiety in comparison with females. Pajares and Schunk (2001) highlighted that, in comparison with females, males tend to have high self-efficacy and they tend to do better in academic areas that include mathematics,

technology, and science. Contrary to the above-mentioned findings, girls in high school report better self-efficacy in comparison with boys when it to comes to academic writing (Pajares, 2003). A number of other researches have also confirmed that female students were high on self-efficacy as compare to male students (Abdullah, 2006; Kumar & Lal, 2006; Qureshi, 2007; Soudhan, 2005; Tenaw, 2013; Saunders, Davis, Williams, & Williams, 2004; Zafar, 2005). While investigating the influence of learning disability, gender, and self-efficacy on academic achievement among high school students Hampton and Mason (2002) realized that gender had little to no influence on the self-efficacy beliefs that learners held. The differences in self-efficacy between different genders are influenced mainly by gender stereotyping in the fields of study. For example, Hampton and Mason explain that differences in self-efficacy tend to be more prominent in gender-stereotypical tasks and activities. Academic activities that can be considered gender neutral show less reported gender differences in self-efficacy.

Pajares (2003) cautions against gender stereotyping when it comes to specific subjects. It was argued that in subjects that are deemed more masculine, boys would be more likely to report high self-efficacy. The same is true of feminine-considered subjects. Nonetheless, females are usually socialized and orientated towards completing and graduating from high school, which requires a high level of self-efficacy and academic achievement. Furthermore it was explained that females have more academic skills (i.e., commitment and effort) and they tend to utilize self-regulated learning strategies more often than males do (Saunders et al., 2004). Edens (2008) argues that although females outperform males in academics, females underestimate their competence, report low self-efficacy while males overestimate their self-efficacy. In gender-neutral academic programs, gender has no moderating effect. Thus, it is clear that more research on self-efficacy and the moderating effect of gender in gender-neutral academic tasks and activities is necessary.

Kokab (2018) worked with university students to explore hope, happiness and, quality of life and found that hope is high in males as compared to females whereas Sana (2016) explored that female students scored high on domain specific hope. The

role of demographics has also been disclosed where findings showed that nuclear family system scored high on hope as compared to joint family system (Sana, 2016; Naveeda, 2018). Residence type has also been explored where domain specific hope was found to be higher in hostilities as compared to day scholars (Rasool, 2015; Sana, 2016). Level of education is also a predictor of hope where findings showed that hope is high in BS students as compare to MPhil students (Sana, 2016; Kokab, 2018)

Researchers have worked to disclose the role of different demographics on self-efficacy of students where Malik (2012) findings showed that self-efficacy is higher in working students as compared to nonworking students. Khalid (2014) also supported the findings by exploring that those with more than ten years of job experience score high on self-efficacy. Type of education was examined by Shabbir and Wajid (2017) and found that self-efficacy is higher in social science students as compared to natural sciences. Further, Shams (2017) showed that self-efficacy is higher in joint family system as compared to nuclear family system (Malik, 2012, Easool, 2015).

Pakistani Literature

With reference to self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement some work has been done in Pakistan. A brief sketch of these researches has been presented here. For instance, in order to explore the relationship among implicit beliefs, student engagement, and academic achievement research was conducted on 300 university students and results revealed a significant positive relationship of incremental beliefs with all aspects of students engagement. Results also revealed that natural science students scored high on behavioral and cognitive engagement as well as in entity beliefs as compare to social science students (Noureen, 2016).

Noureen (2015 worked with students to explore the study engagement pattern among students of different scenario and context and found that female students scored higher on student engagement, natural science students score high on student engagement as compared to social science students and MPhil students score high on student engagement as compare to BS/M.Sc. students

Rationale of the Study

Self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement are important variables for analytical skills and move towards excellence in higher education. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between self-efficacy, hope, and engagement of students in higher education.

Self-efficacy refers to people's judgment about their abilities to successfully complete a task. Researchers suggest that self-efficacy beliefs influence academic motivation and achievement (Multon 1991) given that students with higher self-efficacy tend to participate more readily, work harder, pursue challenging goals, spend much effort toward fulfilling identified goals, and persist longer in the face of difficulty (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 2003; Schunk, 1991). Therefore, students not only need to have the ability and acquire the skills to perform successfully on academic tasks, they also need to develop a strong belief that they are capable of completing tasks successfully. Having high self-efficacy may therefore lead to more positive learning habits such as deeper cognitive processing, cognitive engagement, persistence in the face of difficulties, initiation of challenging tasks, student motivation, use of self-regulatory strategies, and more positive hope (Pintrich 2000b; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990), all of which can contribute to students' university coursework success.

Hope is a tool for bringing positivity in each dimension such as academics, social relationships, family ties, and leisure (Babayan & Babaei, 2015) as our society presents a lot of problems for youth and day by day the demands posed on them are increasing in facing of ever increasing competition. It will be intriguing to find out how hope influences youth especially those studying in universities. Therefore, hope variable has also been selected to explore its role for student engagement. The students who come with a hope of achieving higher education and other goals most of the time face unpleasant events which affect their goals and study outcomes. Hence, their attention mostly diverts from education and different kinds of problems supersede their lives. No small wonder that students are more motivated and committed to their studies than their counter-parts with a more pessimistic disposition

(Goleman, 1996). To many people, including teachers, a student is motivated when they express interest in a school task, feel excited about it, or think that it is important and worthwhile. Motivation research has shown that these feelings and beliefs about interest and value lead to more student engagement and learning (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Self-efficacy can lead to more engagement and subsequently to more learning and better achievement; however, the relations also flow back to self-efficacy over time. Similarly, positive association has also been outlined for self-efficacy and hope (Synder, 2002). Those individuals who are having high self-efficacy are very confident in their abilities, they set different targets and approaches them with energy (Schunk, 2000).

Student engagement is a current buzzword with the domain of education, increasingly researched, theorized, and debated with growing evidence of its critical role in achievement and learning. Trowler and Trowler's (2010) explored that student engagement was seen as an evolving construct that captures a range of institutional practices and student behaviors related to student satisfaction and achievement, including time on task, social and academic integration, and teaching practices (Kahu, 2011). Student engagement encompasses 'time and effort students devote to educationally purposeful activities' (Australian Council for Educational Research 2010). Student engagement is concerned with the extent to which students are engaging in a range of educational activities that research has shown as likely to lead to high quality learning. Such activities might include active learning, involvement in enriching educational experiences, seeking guidance from staff or working collaboratively with other students. Therefore, picking it up provides with an enriched framework to study a learning outcome among university students.

Students with more confidence in their abilities generally are more willing to persist in the face of adversity and students with goals of 'mastering a task' tend to invest in focused effort. Therefore, self-efficacy and hope can be considered useful for predicting student engagement in university students because they face so many challenges in academic tasks and the competition is high in their surroundings. So, the study of self-efficacy in this sample will be useful to look for variables that are

important in educational life and other outcomes of university students which will positively influence their practical and professional life ahead. This sample is also important because university students are being prepared for field work and practical life. This also is in line with previous work advocating incorporating hope in the lives of youth because otherwise it will lead to the outcome by having negative impact on their academic performance (Synder, 2002).

Chapter 2

METHOD

Objectives

The aim of present study is to fulfill the following objectives.

1. To study the relationship between self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement among university students.
2. To study the role of demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, education, degree, faculty, mother work status, father work status, your work status, job experience, no. of siblings, family system, and residential status) in connection to self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement among university students.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present research.

1. Self-efficacy and hope will have a positive relationship with student engagement among university students.
2. Self-efficacy will have a positive relationship with hope among university students.
3. Male university students will have high self-efficacy and student engagement than female university students.
4. University students with more education will have more student engagement than less educated university students.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions

The variables of the present study are defined below:

Generalized self-efficacy. Self-efficacy show beliefs about oneself that one can achieve any specific task in any difficult situation and hardships (Schwazrer & Jerusalem, 1995).

Self-efficacy of research participants was measured by the Generalized Self-efficacy Scale (Schwazrer & Jerusalem, 1995). High scores indicate for high self-efficacy while low values indicate low self-efficacy.

Domain specific hope (DSH). Hope is a feeling of expectation and desire for a particular thing to happen. Hope of an individual to accomplish a task in any specific domain of life like, social, professional, educational etc.

Hope was measured by using Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999). High scores will indicate high hope and low scores indicate low hope.

Social relationships hope. Social relationships hope indicates for a person's tendency to be socially interactive, get into new friendships, maintaining and retaining the friendships (Babyan & Babaei, 2015).

Social relationships hope was measured by using social relationship hope subscale of Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999). High scores on this subscale will indicate good social relationship experiences.

Academic hope. Academic hope indicates for a person tendency to discover new things or ideas in educational settings for improving the older concepts or betterment of existing technologies or theories (Babyan & Babaei, 2015).

Academic hope was measured by using academic hope subscale of Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999). High scores on this subscale will show high academic hope.

Family hope. Family hope indicates a person's tendency to maintain strong, positive, and healthy familial relationships which is reflected through time spent with family members (Babayan & Babaei, 2015).

Family hope was measured by using family hope subscale of Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999). High scores on this subscale will show high family hope.

Leisure hope. Leisure hope indicates that a person tendency to actively participate in healthy activities and achieve something new from those activities They do also know to bring variety of different useful activities to utilize the free time (Babayan & Babaei, 2015).

Leisure hope was measured by using leisure subscale of Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999). High scores on this subscale will show high leisure hope.

Student engagement. Student engagement is defined as the effort both in terms of time and energy that students commit to educationally purposeful activities as well as the institutional conditions that encourage students to engage in such practices (Kinze & Goneya, 2009).

Current study measured student engagement utilizing Students' Engagement Scale. High scores on the scale indicate more student engagement. Student engagement is a meta construct that consists of emotional, behavioral and cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004). What makes engagement unique is the potential in its dimensions involved. The dimensions are explained as follows.

Behavioral engagement. Behavioral engagement is based on the concept of physical participation. This implies the involvement in social, academic and extracurricular activities. These activities are considered to be compulsory for good academic behavior and decrease the probability of dropping out (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Finn, 1989).

Current study measured behavioral engagement through behavioral engagement subscale of Students' Engagement Scale. High scores on the subscale indicate for more behavioral engagement.

Emotional engagement. Emotional engagement involves the positive or negative reactions to teachers, classmates, academics, and school etc. Some define emotional engagement as identification or belongingness to the school or institution.

This also includes an appreciation for success in school related outcomes (Finn, 1989; Voelkl, 1997).

Current study measured emotional engagement through emotional engagement subscale of Students' Engagement Scale. High scores on the subscale indicate for more emotional engagement.

Cognitive engagement. Cognitive engagement involves the investment of mental processing in learning. It implies that how well an individual willingly exert his/her efforts to make understanding of complex and difficult ideas and concepts. (Noureen, 2016; Fredricks et al., 2004).

Current study measured cognitive engagement through cognitive engagement subscale of Students' Engagement Scale. High scores on the subscale indicate for more cognitive engagement.

Agentic engagement. The constructive contribution of students in their received flow of instructions is called agentic engagement. This concept is about the process of students' intentional and proactive effort to personalize the thing to be learned and also the circumstances and conditions, under which things are to be learned (Reve & Tseng, 2011).

Current study measured agentic engagement through agentic engagement subscale of Students' Engagement Scale. High scores on the subscale indicate for more agentic engagement.

Instruments

In the present study, three instruments were used to measure study variables.

Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES). Initially, this scale was developed in German language (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1979) that composed of 20 items but was lessened into 10 items later on. After that it was translated into 28 different languages. English version was developed in 1985 (see Appendix C). It was intended

to use on adults and adolescents in order to assess their general sense of their self-efficacy which predicts their capacity of coping with their adversities of daily life. Four point *Likert* scale was used for scoring of items starting from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (exactly true). The total score thus lies from maximum 40 to minimum 10. The General Self-Efficacy Scale has a reported *Cronbach* alpha is .90 among university students (Javaid, 2014).

Domain Specific Hope Scale. This scale was developed by Sympson (1999). This is 48-item scale and this scale is being designed to measure the level of hope in the various domains of life. There are eight items measuring each domain which were modified to access the relevant concepts of each of the domain related to the life. Responses range is from definitely false (1) to definitely true (8). The university students were selected as a sample. Possible score range is 8-64. Social hope subscale has 8 point *Likert* scale and range of possible score is 32-256. Social hope subsclae has 8 items and range of possible score is 8-64. Family hope subscale has 8 items and range of possible score is 8-64. Academic hope subscale has 8 items and range of possible score is 8-64. Leisure hope subscale 8 items and range of possible score is 8-64. The permission for use of the Domain Specific Hope scale was acquired via-email (see Appendix F). Its reliability coefficient is .92 among university students (Sana, 2016).

Students' Engagement Scale. This scale was developed by Wellborn (1991). The purpose of this scale is to measure the engagement of students in their school related activities. There are 22 items in this scale and is based on 4 subscales. These subscales are measuring the behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, emotional engagement, and agentic engagement (see Appendix D). Responses range is from never (1) to always (5). It is 5- point *Likert* type scale. Possible scores ranged from 22 to 110. Agentic engagement subscale has 5 items and it is 5-point liker scale and range of possible scores is 5-25. Behavioral engagement Subscale has 5 items and range of possible score is 5-25. Emotional engagement subscale has 4 items and 5point *likert* sub scale. The range of possible scores is 4-20. Cognitive engagement subscale has 8 items and 5-point *Likert* subscale

the range of possible scores is 8-40. The permission for use of the Student Engagement scale was acquired via-email (see Appendix E). Its reliability coefficient is .78 among university students (Noureen, 2016).

Research Design

Research was aimed at examining the relationship between self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement among university students. Using quantitative and correlational approach, cross-sectional design was used. The scales used for each study element are Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1985), Domain Specific Hope Scale (Sympson, 1999), and Student Engagement (Wellborn, 1991). Data was collected from the participants of this study through survey method. Empirical study was done to investigate the proposed hypotheses.

Sample

For the present study, sample of 400 university students (240 males and 160 females) was selected by convenient sampling. Sample was taken from different universities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi like Arid University, PIEAS University, Quaid-i-Azam University, Comsats University and Islamic university. Participant's age range was 17 to 32 years (M = 22.65; SD = 2.87). Present study analyzed about age, gender, education, degree, faculty, discipline, mother work status, father work status, student's work status, job experience, and no. of siblings, family system and residential status. Frequency of participants in each demographic category is given in the table below

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage of Participants With Reference to Demographic Variables ($N = 400$)

Demographic Variables	Categories	*f*	%
Age	17-20 years	86	21.5
	21-25years	261	65.4
	26-32years	53	13.4
Gender	Male Student	240	60
	Female Students	160	40
Education	12-14years	208	51.8
	15-16years	137	34.3
	17-18years	54	13.5
	19-20years	1	.3
Current Enrollment	BS/Masters	320	80
	MPhil/Ph.D	80	19.8
Mother Work Status	Working	57	14.2
	Non-working	342	85.5
Faculty	Natural Sciences	208	52
	Social Sciences	138	34.5
	Biologoical Sciences	54	13.5
Father Work Status	Working	333	83.3
	Non-working	47	11.8
Job Experience	1-7years	70	98.9
	8-10years	2	.3
	11-20years	1	.5
	21-25years	1	.3
No. of siblings	1-5	319	79.9
	6-10	81	20.3
Family System	Joint	183	45.8
	Nuclear	217	54.3
Work Status	Working	77	19.3
	Non-working	323	80.8
Residential Status	Hostelite	242	60.5
	Day scholar	158	39.5

Procedure

Before beginning the process of data collection, essential steps were taken with regards to the participant's rights. Participants of study were approached in their academic institutes. At first, authorities of respective institutes were asked for permission to collect data. Then participants were informed about the nature of the study as well as about their voluntary participation. Informed consent was taken from study participants which is a voluntary agreement acquired from the sample of participants, for their participation in the research process, so as to ensure that they have been thoroughly informed about study purpose and method and that they could quit at any time during their participation. Important consideration was given to their anonymity and confidentiality of provided data that the data will be used only for research purpose and their information will be kept confidential. After that the questionnaire booklets consisting of consent form (see Appendix A), demographic sheet (see Appendix B), and the scales used in the study were distributed among the participants and instructions were given both verbally and in written. All the participants filled the questionnaires independently of each other without discussing with each other. Average time taken by the participants in filling the questionnaire booklet was from 20 to 30 minutes. After collecting all the data, the students were thanked for their voluntary participation.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The aim of the present research was to study self-efficacy, hope, and student's engagement among university students. For this purpose hypotheses were formulated in the light of literature and then were tested. Analysis was done through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-22) by using descriptive statistics i.e., calculating *Cronbach* alpha, mean, standard deviation, range, skewness, and kurtosis for scales and sub-scales whereas, inferential statistics includes *Pearson* Product Moment Correlation, *t*-test, and ANOVA. To check the internal consistency of scales reliability coefficients were computed. To check the relationship of self-efficacy, hope and student engagement correlation coefficients were calculated. To further explore for the predictive role of self-efficacy and hope for student engagement. In order to see group differences based on age, gender, education, degree, mother work status, faculty, father work status, job experience, number of siblings, family system, work status and residential status *t*-test and ANOVA was done.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Self-efficacy, Domain Specific Hope Scale, and Student Engagement Scale (N = 400)

Scales	No. of items	*M*	*SD*	α	Score Range		Skewness	Kurtosis
					Potential	Actual		
Self	10	30.16	4.879	.79	10-40	12-40	-.38	.117
DSH	32	195.11	39.661	.96	32-256	49-256	-1.10	.950
HF	8	49.63	12.689	.94	8-64	9-64	-1.13	.600
HS	8	47.29	11.696	.91	8-64	8-64	-.842	.216
HA	8	48.53	11.093	.92	8-64	8-64	-.960	.696
HL	8	49.64	11.884	.93	8-64	12-64	-.863	.050
SE	22	77.64	14.134	.89	22-110	30-110	-.277	-.253
AGE	5	13.97	4.982	.85	5-25	5-25	.170	-.735
BEE	5	19.07	4.179	.80	5-25	5-25	-.522	-.233
EME	4	14.85	3.293	.70	4-20	4-20	-.503	-.228
COE	8	29.74	6.070	.86	8-40	11-40	-.421	-.305

Note. Self = Self Efficacy Scale, DSH = Domain Specific Hope Scale, HF = Family Hope, HS = Social Hope, HA = Academics Hope, HL = Leisure Hope, SE = Student Engagement Scale, AGE = Agentic Engagement, BEE = Behavioral Engagement, EME = Emotional Engagement, COE = Cognitive Engagement.

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics including alpha reliability, means, standard deviation, range (actual and potential), skewness, and kurtosis for all scales and subscales. It can be seen that *Cronbach* alpha reliability of Self- efficacy Scale is .79. Alpha reliability for Domain Specific Hope Scale is .96. While, alpha reliability of subscales of Domain Specific Hope Scale including Family Hope is .94, Social Hope is .91, Academic Hope is .92, and Leisure Hope alpha reliability is .93. Alpha reliability for Student Engagement Scale is .89 and alpha reliability of its subscales

including Agentic Engagement is .85, Behavioral Engagement is .80, Emotional Engagement, and Cognitive engagement is .70 and .86.All reliability values indicate good internal consistency of scales used to measure study variables. In the table, mean of all study variables are average score and standard deviation tells about variability in the data. As shown in the table, the skewness and kurtosis values that are within -2 and +2, indicating for normally distributed data set (George & Mallery, 2016).

Table 3

Correlation Matrix Between Study Variables and Demographics (N = 400)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	SELF	-	.48**	.39**	.43**	.39**	.40**	.47**	.28**	.35**	.41**	.40**	.12*	.12*	-.01	.03
2	DSH		-	.84**	.84**	.83**	.83**	.58**	.20**	.50**	.51**	.57**	.10*	.12*	-.04	.11*
3	HF			-	.63**	.58**	.57**	.44**	.09	.42**	.39**	.44**	.06	.11*	-.02	.12*
4	HS				-	.61**	.58**	.48**	.19**	.38**	.42**	.47**	.11*	.13**	-.04	.14**
5	HA					-	.62**	.58**	.21**	.54**	.51**	.53**	.11*	.13**	-.04	.08
6	HL						-	.45**	.18**	.33**	.38**	.46**	.06	.04	-.03	.04
7	SE							-	.61**	.78**	.82**	.83**	.13**	.04	.04	.04
8	AGET								-	.23**	.31**	.28**	.16**	.06	.09	.00
9	BEE									-	.71**	.55**	.08	.03	.00	.07
10	EME										-	.62**	.07	.03	.02	.02
11	COE											-	.08	.00	.00	.03
12	Age												-	.66**	.26**	-.00
13	EDU													-	.14**	-.00
14	JE														-	.05
15	NOS															-

Note. Self = Self Efficacy Scale, DSH = Domain Specific Hope Scale, HF = Family Hope, HS = Social Hope, HA = Academics Hope, HL = Leisure Hope, SE = Student Engagement Scale, AGET = Agentic Engagement, BEE = Behavioral Engagement, EME = Emotional Engagement, COE = Cognitive Engagement, EDU = Education, JE = Job Experience, NOS = No. of Siblings.

Table 3 shows the values of *Pearson* Product Moment correlation between the variables of the study. Self-efficacy is positively correlated with domain specific hope, and the individual domains (including family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope). Similarly, it was positively correlated with student engagement and its domains (including agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement). Moreover, the overall hope along with the individual domains (including family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope) were positively correlated with student engagement and its domains (including agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement).

The overall domain specific hope is positively correlated with its domains like family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope. Moreover, positive correlation was observed between different domains as well. Student engagement is also positively correlated to its sub-domains like agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement. Also, the domains of student engagement also correlated positively with each other. Therefore, it signifies the evidence for construct validity of each scale.

The positive correlation of age with self-efficacy, overall hope, social hope, academic hope, student engagement, and agentic engagement stood significant. Then, education had a positive correlation with self-efficacy, overall hope, family hope, social hope, and academic hope. Number of siblings positively correlated with overall hope, family hope, and social hope. Rest of the correlation coefficients were nonsignificant.

Table 4

Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Student Engagement from Self Efficacy, and Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

				95% *CI*	
Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*LL*	*UL*
Constant	23.72	3.68	-	16.47	30.95
Self-Efficacy	.73	.13	.25***	.46	.98
Hope	.164	.02	.46***	.13	.19
R^2	.39				
R^2	.384				
F	125.54				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 4 shows regression analysis for predicting student engagement from self-efficacy, and hope. Table shows that independent variables including self-efficacy and hope are positively predicting the student engagement. Self-efficacy and hope have explained 39% variance in student engagement scores.

Table 5

Step-wise Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Student Engagement From Different Domains of Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	95% CI	
Step 1				*LL*	*UL*
Constant	41.47	2.58	-		
Academic	.74	.05	.58***	36.40	46.54
Hope					
R^2	.34			.64	.85
F	207.02***				
Step 2					
Constant	37.47	2.71	-		
Academic	.59	.06	.46***	32.14	42.81
Hope					
Social Hope	.25	.06	.20***	.46	.71
R^2	.36			.13	.37
ΔR^2	.02				
F	115.91***				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 5 indicates predictive role of hope domains for student engagement. It is clear that academic hope and social hope stood positive predictors in intrinsic order. Academic hope explained 34% variance in student engagement, additional 2% variance was explained through social hope variance in student engagement scores of university students.

Table 6

Step-wise Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Agentic Engagement From Different Domains of Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	95% *CI*	
Step 1				*LL*	*UL*
Constant	9.32	1.09	-	7.17	11.47
Academic Hope	.09	.02	.21***	.05	.13
R^2		.04			
ΔR^2		.46			
F		18.98***			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 6 shows regression analysis for predicting agentic engagement from domains of hope. Results show that only academic hope is positively predicting the agentic engagement of university students and is explaining 4% variance in their agentic engagement scores.

Table 7

Step-wise Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Behavioral Engagement From Different Domains of Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	95% *CI*	
Step 1				*LL*	*UL*
Constant	9.16	.79	-	7.61	10.72
Academic Hope	.20	.01	.54***	.17	.23
R^2	.29				
F	165.53***				
Step 2					
Constant	8.29	.83	-	6.65	9.93
Academic Hope	.17	.01	.45***	.13	.20
Family Hope	.05	.01	.15***	.01	.08
R^2	.31				
ΔR^2	.01				
F	89.02***				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 7 indicates predictive role of hope domains for behavioral engagement. It is clear that academic hope and family hope stood positive predictors in intrinsic order. Academic hope explained 29% variance in student engagement, and an additional 2% variance was explained through family hope variance in behavioral engagement scores of university students.

Table 8

Step-wise Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Emotional Engagement From Different Domains of Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	95% *CI*	
Step 1				*LL*	*UL*
Constant	7.39	.63	-	6.14	8.64
Academic Hope	.15	.01	.51***	.12	.17
R^2		.26			
F		145.51***			
Step 2					
Constant	6.63	.67	-	5.31	7.95
Academic Hope	.12	.01	.41***	.09	.15
Social Hope	.04	.01	.16***	.01	.07
R^2		.28			
ΔR^2		.01			
F		79.22***			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 8 indicates predictive role of hope domains for emotional engagement. It is clear that academic hope and family hope stood positive predictors in intrinsic order. Academic hope explained 26% variance in student engagement; additional 2% variance was explained through family hope variance in student engagement scores of university students.

Table 9

Step-wise Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting Cognitive Engagement From Different Domains of Domain Specific Hope (N = 400)

Predictors	*B*	*SE*	*β*	95% *CI*	
Step 1				*LL*	*UL*
Constant	15.58	1.15	-	13.31	17.85
Academic Hope	.29	.02	.53***	.24	.33
R^2	.28				
F	157.93***				
Step 2					
Constant	13.54	1.20	-	11.16	15.91
Academic Hope	.21	.02	.38***	.15	.26
Social Hope	.12	.02	.24***	.07	.18
R^2	.32				
ΔR^2	.03				
F	94.12***				
Step 3					
Constant	12.63	1.24	-	10.18	15.08
Academic Hope	.17	.03	.32***	.11	.23
Social Hope	.10	.02	.19***	.04	.15
Leisure Hope	.07	.02	.14***	.02	.13
R^2	.33				
ΔR^2	.01				
F	66.10***				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 9 indicates predictive role of hope domains for cognitive engagement. It is clear that academic hope, social hope, and leisure hope stood positive predictors in intrinsic order. Academic hope explained 28% variance in student engagement domain; additional 4% variance was explained through social hope, and leisure hope explained additional 1% variance in student engagement domain scores of university students.

Table 10

Gender Difference on Study Variables (N = 400)

Scales	Male students (n = 240)		Female students (n = 160)				95% *CI*		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's *d*
SELF	30.46	4.84	29.70	4.91	1.52	.12	-.22	1.73	-
DSH	197.86	36.08	190.97	44.29	1.63	.10	-1.38	15.16	-
HF	50.25	12.18	48.70	13.39	1.17	.24	-1.05	4.13	-
HS	48.35	11.28	45.70	12.14	2.23	.02	.31	4.98	.22
HA	49.21	10.19	47.51	12.28	1.50	.13	-.61	4.00	-
HL	50.04	11.26	49.04	12.77	.80	.42	-1.45	3.44	-
SE	78.38	14.08	76.54	14.17	1.27	.20	-.99	4.67	-
AGE	14.48	4.96	13.21	4.91	2.52	.01	.28	2.26	.25
BEE	19.04	4.06	19.12	4.36	-.18	.85	-.91	.76	-
EME	14.94	3.25	14.71	3.35	.68	.49	-.43	.89	-
COE	20.90	5.995	29.49	6.19	.66	.50	-.80	1.63	-

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Academic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behavioral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 10 indicates mean based group comparison on the basis of gender. Male and female groups were compared through *t*-test analysis. It can be seen that gender based differences on social hope and agentic engagement stood significant, where male students scored higher on social hope and agentic engagement than female students. Cohen's d indicates small sized effect for the observed mean differences. Other group differences stood nonsignificant.

Table 11

Family System Based Difference on Study Variables (N = 400)

Scales	Nuclear ($n = 217$)		Joint ($n = 183$)				95% CI		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's *d*
SELF	29.96	4.82	30.39	4.94	-.87	.38	-1.39	.53	-
DSH	193.96	38.92	196.46	40.58	-.62	.53	-10.33	5.32	-
HF	48.92	12.85	50.46	12.46	-1.2	.22	-4.04	.95	-
HS	46.56	11.42	48.16	11.98	-1.37	.17	-3.91	.69	-
HA	48.83	10.68	48.18	11.58	.58	.56	-1.54	2.83	-
HL	49.64	11.88	49.64	11.91	-.00	.99	-2.35	2.34	-
SE	76.59	14.40	78.89	13.73	-1.61	.10	-5.07	.49	-
AGE	13.23	5.13	14.86	4.65	-3.30	.00	2.60	-.66	.33
BEE	18.92	4.17	19.26	4.18	-.81	.41	-1.16	.48	-
EME	14.68	3.21	15.04	3.37	-1.11	.26	-1.01	.28	-
COE	29.76	6.17	29.71	5.95	.08	.93	-1.15	1.24	-

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behivoral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 11 shows, *t*-test results for comparison of mean based comparison on family system (nuclear and joint family system) for overall self-efficacy, hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, agentic engagement, emotional engagement, behavioral engagement and cognitive engagement. It can be seen that mean based differences on agentic engagement stood significant, where participants from joint family system scored higher than those belonging to nuclear family system Cohen's *d* indicate small to medium sized effect for the observed mean difference. While, mean based differences on all other variables stood nonsignificant.

Table 12

Education Based Difference on Study Variables (N = 400)

Scales	BS/MSc (n = 320)		MPhil/PhD (n = 79)				95% *CI*		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's *d*
SELF	29.84	4.96	31.46	4.31	-2.66	.00	-2.82	-.42	.34
DSH	193.15	41.18	203.9	30.93	-2.57	.01	-19.00	-2.51	.29
HF	49.08	13.25	51.97	9.86	-2.16	.03	-5.52	-.25	.24
HS	46.69	12.07	49.97	9.48	-2.59	.01	-5.77	-.78	.30
HA	47.99	11.62	50.97	8.06	-2.66	.00	-5.18	-.77	.29
HL	49.37	12.47	50.98	8.87	-1.32	.18	-4.01	.79	-
SE	76.97	14.59	80.53	11.73	-2.28	.02	-6.62	-.48	.26
AGE	13.79	4.99	14.83	4.79	-1.67	.09	-2.26	.18	-
BEE	18.87	4.32	19.89	3.48	-2.22	.02	-1.93	-.11	.26
EME	14.71	3.43	15.44	2.54	-2.10	.03	-1.40	-.04	.24
COE	29.59	6.37	30.35	4.64	-1.20	.23	-2.01	.48	-

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behivoral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 12 shows *t*-test based mean comparison for education level (BS/MSc, Mphil/Ph.D) on self-efficacy, overall hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. It can be seen that mean based differences on self efficacy, overall hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, student engagement, behavioral engagement, and emotional engagement stood significant where MPhil/Phd students scored higher on all of these variables than BS/MSc students. Cohen's *d* indicate small to medium sized effect for the observed mean difference. While, mean based difference on a other variables were nonsignificant.

Table 13

Difference of Mother Work Status on Study Variables (N = 400)

	Working (n = 57)		Non-working (n = 342)				95% *CI*		
Scales	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's *d*
SELF	29.49	4.74	30.25	4.90	-1.09	.27	-2.13	.60	-
DSH	193.57	43.67	195.25	39.02	-.29	.76	-12.84	9.49	-
HF	47.66	13.38	49.93	12.57	-1.25	.21	-5.83	1.30	-
HS	47.15	12.77	47.28	11.52	-.07	.94	-3.41	3.16	-
HA	47.78	12.41	48.63	10.87	-.53	.59	-3.96	2.27	-
HL	50.96	11.99	49.40	11.88	.917	.36	-1.78	4.90	-
SE	75.85	12.68	77.87	14.31	-.99	.31	-5.98	1.95	-
AGE	14.00	4.04	13.95	5.11	.08	.93	-1.14	1.24	-
BEE	18.05	4.24	19.23	4.15	-1.99	.04	-2.35	-.01	.28
EME	14.91	3.29	14.82	3.29	.186	.85	-.83	1.01	-
COE	28.89	6.19	29.85	6.03	-1.11	.26	-2.67	.74	-

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behavioral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 13 shows, *t*-test mean based comparison on mother work status (working and nonworking) for overall all study variables. It can be seen that mean based difference on behavioral engagement is significant, where non-working mothers scored higher as compare to working mothers. Cohen's d indicate small to medium sized effect for the observed mean difference. While, mean based difference on all other variables nonsignificant.

Table 14

Difference of Work Status on Study Variables (N = 400)

Scales	Working Students ($n = 77$)		Non-Working Students ($n = 323$)				95% *CI*		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's *d*
SELF	30.74	4.84	30.02	4.88	1.16	.24	-.49	1.93	-
DSH	196.71	36.67	194.72	40.16	.39	.69	-7.91	11.88	-
HF	49.12	12.25	49.75	12.80	-.38	.69	-3.78	2.54	-
HS	48.38	11.10	47.03	11.83	.91	.36	-1.56	4.26	-
HA	49.24	10.31	48.36	11.28	.62	.53	-1.88	3.64	-
HL	49.94	10.96	49.56	12.10	.25	.80	-2.58	3.34	-
SE	80.35	15.35	77.00	13.77	1.87	.06	-.16	6.86	-
AGE	15.88	4.98	13.52	4.88	3.79	.00	1.13	3.58	.47
BEE	19.01	4.05	19.09	4.21	-.15	.88	-1.12	.96	-
EME	15.25	3.40	14.75	3.26	1,21	.22	-.31	1.32	-
COE	30.19	6.08	29.63	6.07	.72	.46	-.95	2.07	-

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behivoral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 14 shows, *t*-test based mean comparison of working and nonworking students. Mean difference on agentic engagement stood significant where working students scored higher on agentic engagement. Cohen's *d* indicate small to medium sized effect for the observed mean difference. All other study variables stood nonsignificant findings.

Table 15

Father Work Status Based Difference on Study Variables (N = 400)

	Working (n = 333)		Non-working (n = 47)				95% *CI*	
Scales	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*
SELF	30.28	4.92	29.82	4.37	.60	.54	-1.03	1.94
DSH	196.24	39.00	189.46	44.56	1.09	.27	-5.39	18.94
HF	50.07	12.21	46.02	16.09	1.65	.10	-.84	8.94
HS	47.42	11.58	46.74	12.79	.36	.71	-2.92	4.27
HA	48.64	11.08	49.04	11.12	-.23	.81	-3.79	3.00
HL	50.10	11.94	47.65	11.42	1.32	.18	-1.19	6.08
SE	77.84	13.94	76.68	15.49	.52	.59	-3.16	5.49
AGE	13.95	4.84	13.72	5.40	.30	.76	-1.27	1.73
BEE	19.14	4.20	19.14	3.98	-.01	.99	-1.28	1.27
EME	14.95	3.26	14.53	3.43	.83	.40	-.58	1.43
COE	29.78	6.12	29.27	6.14	.53	.59	-1.36	2.39

Note. Self = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behivoral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 15 shows, *t*-test results for comparison of mean based differences for working and nonworking fathers on self-efficacy, domain specific hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. There were no significant differences related to fathers work status on all study variables.

Table 16

Residential Status Based Differences on Study Variables (N = 400)

	Hostellite (n = 242)		Day scholar (n = 158)				95% *CI*	
Scales	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*
SELF	30.00	5.00	30.39	4.68	-.79	.43	-1.36	.57
DSH	193.38	39.89	197.74	39.28	-1.07	.28	-12.33	3.61
HF	49.20	13.25	50.29	11.78	-.83	.40	-3.64	1.46
HS	46.86	12.04	47.96	11.14	-.91	.35	-3.45	1.25
HA	47.99	11.37	49.36	10.63	-1.20	.22	-3.60	.85
HL	49.32	11.64	50.12	12.26	-.65	.51	-3.19	1.59
SE	76.87	13.95	78.82	14.36	-1.35	.17	-4.79	.88
AGE	13.82	4.88	14.20	5.14	-.75	.45	-1.38	.61
BEE	18.84	4.27	19.43	4.02	-1.39	.16	-1.43	.24
EME	14.68	3.29	15.10	3.28	-1.23	.21	-1.07	.24
COE	29.52	6.07	30.08	6.07	-.90	.36	-1.78	.65

Note. Self = Self-efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Acdemic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behivoral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement.

Table 16 shows *t*-test for comparison of mean based differences with reference to residential status (hostilities and day scholar) on self-efficacy, domain specific hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. There are nonsignificant differences between hostilities and day scholars on all of the study variables.

Table 17

Faculty Based Difference on Self-efficacy, Hope, and Student engagement (N = 400)

Variable	Natural Science a (n = 208)		Social science b (n = 138)		Biological science c (n = 54)					95% CI	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*i-j*	*D.(i-j)*	*LL*	*UL*
SELF	29.88	4.84	30.89	4.70	29.33	5.28	2.66				
DSH	187.74	44.1	204.29	28.70	200.00	40.68	7.96**	b>a	16.55*	6.26	26.84
HF	47.57	13.97	52.73	9.49	49.61	13.21	7.07**	b>a	5.16*	1.86	8.46
HS	45.65	12.25	49.47	10.32	48.05	12.03	4.62**	b>a	3.81*	.75	6.87
HA	46.68	12.10	50.45	8.58	50.77	11.65	6.23**	b>a	3.77*	.88	6.66
								c>a	4.09*	.07	8.11
HL	47.82	13.16	51.63	9.27	51.55	11.69	5.16**	b>a	3.80*	.69	6.90
SE	74.79	13.49	80.06	14.65	82.46	12.89	9.80**	b>a	5.27*	1.62	8.92
								c>a	7.66*	2.59	12.74
AGE	13.18	4.63	14.63	5.38	15.37	4.75	6.09**	b>a	1.44*	.14	2.74
								c>a	2.18	.38	3.99
BEE	18.47	4.47	19.68	3.84	19.85	3.48	4.67**	b>a	1.21*	.12	2.31
EME	14.37	3.34	15.28	3.21	15.57	3.06	4.74**	b>a	.90*	.04	1.76
								c>a	1.19*	.00	2.39
COE	28.76	5.96	30.46	5.79	31.66	6.54	6.56**	b>a	1.69*	.11	3.27
								c>a	2.90*	.70	5.10

Note. SELF = Self efficacy, DSH = Domain Specific Hope, HF = Family hope, HS = Social hope, HA = Academic hope, HL = Leisure hope, SE = Student engagement, AGE = Agentic engagement, BEE = Behavioral engagement, EME = Emotional engagement, COE = Cognitive engagement

*$p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Results in table 17 indicate differences on self-efficacy, overall hope, and student engagement among university students for faculties (natural sciences, social sciences, and biological sciences). Social science students scored high on overall hope, family hope, social hope, academic hope, leisure hope, student engagement, agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement as compared to natural science students. Likewise biological science students scored significantly greater than natural science students on academic hope, student engagement, agentic engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

Aim of study was to explore the associations between self-efficacy hope and student engagement among university students through quantitative framework. Various demographic variables like age, gender, education, number of siblings, father's work status, residential status, mother work status, student work status, and job experience were catered for exploration of the role of these demographic variables. Data of research were collected through survey method. For this purpose three scales were used Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), Domain Specific Hope Scale (Symposon, 1999), and Student Engagement Scale (Wellborn, 1991). Domain Specific Hope Scale has four subscales i.e., family hope, social hope, academic hope, and leisure hope (Symposon, 1999). Student Engagement Scale also has four subscales agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, and emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement (Wellborn, 1991).

Alpha reliabilities were computed for each scale and their subscales for finding the psychometric properties of study instruments. Results indicated that *Cronbach alpha* was satisfactory for Self-Efficacy Scale, Domain Specific Hope Scale, and for Student engagement along with their domains (see Table 2). Inter-scale correlation (see Table 3) were also computed to find out the construct validity. All subscales had a significant positive correlation between themselves and with the total score. Therefore, there is evidence for construct validity that was indicated through these correlations, suggesting that these instruments accurately measures the variables that they propose to measure. Moreover, skewness and kurtosis values lie between absolute value of 2 (see table 2) thus establish that the data is a normally distributed data set (George & Mallery, 2016).

Correlation Among Study Variables

In order to fulfill first objective 'to study the relationship between self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement among university students' firstly, it was hypothesized that self-efficacy will have a positive relationship with student

engagement. For this purpose, correlation analysis was computed between self-efficacy and student engagement. Results showed that self-efficacy was significantly and positively correlated to student engagement (see Table 3). Chang and Chien (2015) conducted a research on self-efficacy and student engagement, where results revealed that self-efficacy is significantly correlated to student engagement. The key to promote academic engagement is the promotion of self-efficacy. Without skills, behavior will never be possible but this is not enough, one must believe that he/she will be able to do that action. All the work of the teachers is to promote the skills of their students. To establish objectives for learning is essentially to guide our actions. Self-efficacy comes as a variable that allows the students to risk more ambitious goals, leading to greater effort, and commitment that can assure achievement. It is here that self-efficacy can be manifested to withstand failures and maintaining the motivation to continue. It is through the realization that one has expertise and that one can attribute the failure to lack of effort rather than lack of ability. This is because a person believes that one is worth it and one will reach the targeted goals and that the student will continue to work hard (Nogueira & Veiga, 2014).

Secondly, it was hypothesized that there will be positive relationship between self-efficacy and domain specific hope. In order to test this hypothesis, correlation between self-efficacy and domain specific hope was computed. Results showed that self-efficacy is significantly positively correlated with domain specific hope. Similarly it was indicated that different domains of hope including family hope, academic hope, social hope, and leisure hope also had a positive association with self-efficacy (see table 3). Researchers also found a significant and positive relationship between self-efficacy and hope having a belief in one's abilities and capacities generates a positive outlook towards various life domains (Carifio & Rhodes, 2002; Magaletta & Oliver, 1999; O'Sullivan, 2011; Sana, 2016).

Predictive Role of Self-efficacy and Domain Specific Hope for Student Engagement

To find out the predictive role of self-efficacy and domain specific hope on student engagement, stepwise linear regression was used. Specifically, self-efficacy

and domain specific hope played a significant role to positively predict student engagement (see table 4). In line with this self-efficacy theory predicts that student self-efficacy should be positively related to their cognitive engagement (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1991). Similarly, in another study it was observed that hope had a significant effect on student engagement (Amundson et al., 2001). Predictive role of hope domains for student engagement was also seen. Academic hope and social hope positively predicted student engagement in university students (see table 5). Regression analysis for predicting agentic engagement from hope domains showed that academic hope is positively predict the agentic engagement (see table 6). Predictive role of hope domains for behavioral engagement showed that academic hope and family hope positively predict behavioral engagement in university students (see table 7). Predictive role of hope domains for emotional engagement showed that academic hope and family hope are positive predictors (see table 8). Predictive role of hope domains for cognitive engagement showed that academic hope, social hope, and leisure hope were positive predictors (see table 9). Hence, importance of respective domains of hope has been highlighted through study findings for overall student engagement and the different domains of student engagement.

Role of Demographic Variables

Concerning the gender differences in student engagement after reviewing the previous available literature it was hypothesized that male student will have higher student engagement than female students. Independent sample *t*-test was applied to calculate mean differences. The results of present study showed that male students are scoring high on one of the domain of student engagement that is agentic engagement but there are nonsignificant results on student engagement and rest of its domains (see table 10). These results are supported by previous literature indicating significant gender difference on agentic engagement where it was confirmed that male students are more agenticaly engaged than female students (Noureen, 2016). Within a Pakistani context men supposed to be more social, outgoing, and there is more responsibility on their shoulders. In doing so, they are confronted more to situations where their analytical skills are utilized more as compared to women this can be the

reason for the male dominance related to agentic engagement. Further findings showed that male students scored higher on social hope as compared to female students (see table 10). A reasonable justification for the finding is that male students are engaged more in social activities which enhance social dependence and hope in male students as compared to female students.

Next hypothesis was that university students with more education will have more student engagement than less educated university students. In order to test this hypothesis *t*-test analysis was performed to see the mean based differences. Results revealed that MPhil/PhD students are more engaged in studies as compared to BS/MSc students (see table 12) so the hypothesis of present study got accepted. Similar trends have been reported by earlier findings (Noureen, 2016) where more educated students were more engaged in studies as compared to less educated students. The reason is that students studying at higher level are supposedly more career oriented, are more concerned about their studies, and some may also be serving in different organizations. Moreover, the increased level of competition at higher education levels might also add to it.

With reference to gender based differences it was hypothesized that male university students will have high self-efficacy than female university students. Mean differences on self-efficacy between female and male university students were nonsignificant (see table 10), so hypothesis was rejected. However, Shikullaku (2013) working with Albanian students looked into gender differences on self-efficacy where it was found that there were nonsignificant differences in the level of self-efficacy between male and female students. In addition, Abd-Elmotaleb and Saha (2013) revealed in their study that there is nonsignificant difference in level of general self-efficacy between male and female students although this finding was inconsistent with previous findings (Abdullah, 2006). This may be due to equitable parenting practices and provison of impartial exposure opportunities at least among students studying in universities.

Further, *t*-test analysis was also performed to see the mean based differences on residential status. Results show that day scholars scored high on social hope than

hostilities (see Table 16). Sana (2016) also concludes in her research that day scholars scored high on social hope as compared to hostilities. Possible explanation can be that hostilities face a lot of problems in adjusting to a new city. They face so many hurdles in a new place away from home and family and the day scholars are well aware of everything and every situation within the area of their own place so are more hopeful to interact socially.

Results of faculty based differences show that social science students scored high on overall hope as compared to natural science students. Also, social science students scored high on family hope, social hope, leisure hope, and behavioral engagement as compare to natural science students (see Table 17). Social science students undergo more towards theory based learning and they are more involved in interaction oriented learning have a more globalized view of events and happenings that might add to their level of hope and engagement. Natural science students are more oriented towards logical, practical, and analytical domains that might restrict generation of a broader view of the world.

Results related to student's work status indicate that working students are high on agentic engagement towards as compare to non-working students (see table 14). Agentic engagement in working students is more as compared to non-working students because during their job, they may participate in different activities in order to tackle the tasks given to them in their job. The working students apply their knowledge practically in their work place and so if they are gaining knowledge either from class or anywhere else, they will think that how to apply this knowledge practically, in this way it can be said that they would be more oriented to contribute constructively to the assigned tasks. Their enriched experience through interaction with others at work enables them to think critically about everything. If a person does work, they came to know about the importance of money, time and education and so he/she may think to take advantage of availed opportunities and therefore do not tend to waste resources spent on them.

Looking for mean difference on the basis of family system it was seen that students living in a joint family system scored high on agentic engagement than

students living in nuclear family system (see table 11). It can be explained by the fact that versatile social environment in joint a family system equip residents with personal characteristics that they are more oriented towards yielding productive outcomes from the services availed.

Mean comparison with reference to mother's work status shows that children of non-working mothers are more behaviorally engaged towards studies as compared to children of working mothers (see table 13). Such an observation can be explained by the idea that presence of mothers for their children marks for better behavioral development and thus making a way for more involvement in social, academic, and co-curricular realm.

Conclusion

Aim of present study was to explore the relationship between self-efficacy, hope, and student engagement among university students. It was observed that self-efficacy, hope and student engagement was positively correlated with each other. Moreover, self-efficacy and hope were positively predicted student engagement. Academic hope and social hope positively predicted student engagement. Academic hope and family hope positively predicted behavioral engagement. For emotional engagement academic hope and family hope were positive predictors. For cognitive engagement academic hope, social hope, and leisure hope were positive predictors.

Limitations and Suggestions

Some of the study limitations are outlined as follows:

1. This research cannot be generalized to the all of the university students because data was collected from few universities. The population and the area were limited too (Only Rawalpindi and Islamabad). This should be broadened for further research because with such limited focus it is difficult for to generalize findings. For better generalization it is recommended to collect data from variety of locations. Moreover, larger samples would significantly increase the statistical power of test.

2. This study used self-report measures that can be biased in a socially desirable manner. So, the further researches should use other methods than self-report measures to control for any such bias.
3. Though relationship trends are often studied using cross-sectional research designs but they can be better portrayed utilizing longitudinal designs.
4. This study has signified for the role of self-efficacy and domain specific hope, further research may study the predecessors of yielding self-efficacy and domain specific hope so as to add depth in currently studied model.

Implications

This research is helpful in the following ways.

1. These findings can be utilized in educational settings, for the sake of prevention and intervention efforts to ascend student engagement. In this realm school psychologists may work out plans addressing self-efficacy and hope in different life domains.
2. Similarly teachers may also benefit and tune their teaching practices keeping in view a focus of instruction which is directed at generating positive self beliefs and an optimistic outlook on different domains of life.
3. Moreover, these will also be helpful for university students who can become aware of the usefulness of self-efficacy beliefs and the level of hope to enthrall learning related outcomes specially at higher education levels.

REFERENCES

Abd-Elmotaleb, M., & Saha, S. K. (2013). The role of academic self-efficacy as a mediator variable between perceived academic climate and academic performance. *Journal of Education and Learning, 2*(3), 117-129.

Abdullah, M. C. (2006). The relationship between student's self-efficacy and their English language achievement. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education, 21*, 61-71.

Abesha, A. G. (2012). *Effect of parenting styles, academic self-efficacy, and achievement motivation on the academic performance of university students in Ethiopia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Edith Cowan University Western, Australia.

Abrams, Karen, & Kong, F. (2012). *The variables most closely associated with academic achievement: A review of the research literature.* Omaha, NE: Progressive Research Institute of Nebraska.

Adeyemo, D. A. (2007). Moderating influence of emotional intelligence on the link betweenacademic self-efficacy and achievement of university students. *Psychology & Developing Societies, 19*(2), 199-213.

Afsar, A. A. (2016). *Mediating role of coping self-efficacy in relation to peer victimization and anxiety among adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Aftab, A. R. (2010*). Role of self-efficacy and emotional expression in social competence of adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 261-271.

Anjum, R. (2006). The impact of self-efficacy on mathematics achievement of primary school Children. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology Research, 21*(3/4), 61-78.

Anwar, A. N. (2000). *Relationship between self-efficacy and burnout among nurses* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Students Development, 40*(5), 519-549.

Babayan, S., Babaei, M. (2015). Determination of specific-domain hope in university students a case study: Students of Islamic Azad university of Gorgan-Iran. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 5*(4), 22-26.

Bahar, M. (2016). Student Perception of Academic Achievement Factors at High School. *European Journal of Educational Research, 5*(2), 85-100.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

Bandura, A. (1994). Social cognitive theory and exercise of control over HIV infection. In *Preventing AIDS* (pp. 25-59)., Boston, MA, Springer.

Bandura, A., Pastorelli, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G. V. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 258–269

Bassi, M., Steca, P., DelleFave, A., & Caprara, G. V. (2007). Academic self-efficacy beliefs and quality of experience in learning. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *36*(3), 301-312.

Caprara, G. V., Fida, R., Vecchione, M., Del Bove, G., Vecchio, G. M., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of the role of perceived self-efficacy for self-regulated learning in academic continuance and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(3), 525.

Carifio, J., & Rhodes, L. (2002). Construct validities and the empirical relationships between optimism, hope, self-efficacy, and locus of control. *Work*, *19*(2), 125-136.

Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 1-32.

Chang,D., & Cheng Chien, W. (2015). Determining the relationship between academic self-efficacy and student engagement by meta-analysis. In *2015 International Conference on Education Reform and Modern Management*. Atlantis Press.

Chapman, E. (2003). Alternative approaches to assessing student engagement rates. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 8*(13), 228-245.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2004). General self-efficacy and self-esteem: Toward theoretical and empirical distinction between correlated self- evaluations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *25*(3), 375-395.

Choi, J. N., & Moran, S. V. (2009). Why not procrastinate? Development and Validation of a new active procrastination scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 149*, 195-211. doi: 10.3200/SOCP. 149.2.195-212.

Choi, N. (2005). Self-efficacy and self-concept as predictors of college students' academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, *42*(2), 197-205.

Coates,D. (2007). Stadiums and arenas: Economic development or economic redistribution? *Contemporary Economic Policy, 25*(14), 565-577.

Collaço, C. M. (2017).Increasing student engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *17*(4), 40-47.

Cowen, E. L., Work, W. C., Hightower, A. D., Wyman, P. A., Parker, G. R., & Lotyczewski, B. S. (1991). Toward the development of a measure of perceived self-efficacy in children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *20*(2), 169-178.

Ebrahimi, N., Sabaghian, Z., & Abolghasemi, M. (2011). Investigating relationship of hope and academic success of college students. *Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education, 60*(2), 1-16.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109-132. doi:10.1146/annurv.psych.53.100901.135153

Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(2), 117-142.

Finn, J. D., & Pannozzo, G. M. (2004). Classroom organization and student behavior in kindergarten. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *98*(2), 79-92.

Finn, J. D., & Rock, D. A. (1997). Academic success among students at-risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(2), 221-234.

Fredricks, J, A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence, *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 159-109.

Fridberg, H., & Gustavsson, C. (2019). Self-efficacy in Activities of daily living and symptom management in people with dizziness: A focus group study. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *41*(6), 705-713.

Furlong, M. J., & Christenson, S. L. (2008). Engaging students at school and with learning: A relevant construct for all students. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(15), 365-368.

Gallagher, M. W., Marques, S. C., & Lopez, S. J. (2017). Hope and the academic trajectory of college students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *18*(2), 341-352.

Gavala, J., & Flett, R. (2005). Influential factors moderating academic enjoyment/motivation and psychological well-being for Maori university students. *Journal of Psychology, 34*(1), 52-57.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS statistics 23 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Glenn, P. J. (2014). *The role of reading interventions on students' self-efficacy and reading growth* (Doctoral dissertation), Walden University. Minneapolis, USA.

Goleman, D. (1996). Emotional intelligence. Why it can matter more than IQ. *Learning*, *24*(6), 49-50.

Götz, T. (2013). Emotion and achievement in the classroom. *International Guide to Student Achievement*, *59*(4) 192-199.

Greene, B., Miller, R., Crowson, M., Duke, B., & Akey, K. (2004). Predicting high school students' cognitive engagement and achievement: Contributions of classroom perceptions and motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 29*(4), 462-482.

Harper, S.R., &Quaye, S.J. (2015). Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspective and particle approach for diver's population. *Journal of College Students' Development, 56*(3), 311-338.

Hu, S. &Kuh, G.D. (2003).Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 320-334.

Hunter, D., Gambell, T., & Randhawa, B. (2005). Gender gaps in group listening and speaking: Issues in social constructivist approaches to teaching and learning. *Educational Review*, *57*(3), 329-355.

Hussain, H. M. (2017). *Role of work-related self-efficacy and job stress in psychological well-being of rescue workers* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Jerusalem, M. (1995). Self-efficacy in stressful life transitions. *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*, 177-201.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, *11*(2-3), 167-187.

Karatepe, M. O. (2014). Hope, work engagement, and organizationally valued performance outcomes: An empirical study in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 23,* 678-698. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.855994

Khalid, S., & Zubair, A. (2014).Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and creativity among employees of advertising agencies. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology Research, 29*(2), 203-221.

Kokab, K. S. (2018). *Hope, happiness and quality of life among university students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Krause, K., & Coates, H. (2008).Student engagement in first-year University. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 493-505.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to students learning*: Inside The National Survey of Student Engagement Change, 33*(3), 10-17.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 141*(2), 5-20.

Kuh, G. D. (2007). How to help students achieve. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(41), 12-13.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J. L., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature* (Vol. 8). Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Kuh, G.D. (2005). Putting student engagement results to use: Lessons from the field. *Assessment Update, 17*(1), 12-13.

Lenz, E. R., & Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2002). *Self-efficacy in nursing: research and measurement perspectives*. Springer Publishing Company.

Liew, J., McTigue, E. M., Barrois, L., & Hughes, J. N. (2008). Adaptive and effortful control and academic self-efficacy beliefs on achievement: A longitudinal study of 1st through 3rd graders. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *23*(4), 515-526.

Lindsey, H. L. (2017). *Self-efficacy, student engagement, and student learning in introductory statistics* (Doctoral dissertation). Montana State University-Bozeman.

Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review*, *31*(3), 313-327.

Liu, R., Zeng, P., & Quan, P. (2018). The role of hope and self-efficacy on nurses' subjective well-being. *Asian Social Science*, *14*(4), 18-22.

Lloyd, J. E., Walsh, J., & Yailagh, M. S. (2005). Sex differences in performance attributions, self-efficacy, and achievement in mathematics: If I'm so smart, why don't I know it? *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne De l'education*, 384-408.

Luszczynska, A., Gutierrez-Dona, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology, 40*(2), 80-89.

Maddux, J. E. (Ed.). (2013). *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application*. Springer. Dordrecht.

Magaletta, M. & Oliver, O. (2009). Purpose, hope, and life satisfaction in three age groups. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *4*(6), 500-510.

Malik, M. A. (2017). *Relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy among medical students* (Unpublished masters research). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Pakistan.

Marine, C. (2005). Implicit theories of intelligence, goal orientation, cognitive engagement, and achievement: A test of Dweck's model with returning to school adults. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30*(1), 43-59.

McCormick A.C., Kinzie J., Gonyea R.M. (2013). Student Engagement: Bridging Research and Practice to Improve the Quality of Undergraduate Education. In Paulsen, M. (Eds.). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research,* Springer, Dordrecht.

McCullouch, M. E. (2006). Positive responses to benefit and harm: Bringing forgiveness and gratitude into cognitive psychotherapy. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *20*(2), 147-190.

Metallidou, P., & Vlachou, A. (2007). Motivational beliefs, cognitive engagement, and achievement in language and mathematics in elementary school children. *International Journal of Psychology, 42*(1), 2-15.

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *38*(1), 30-61.

Muris, P. (2002). Relationships between self-efficacy and symptoms of anxiety disorders and depression in a normal adolescent sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *32*(2), 337-348.

Naveeda. N. (2018). *Self-criticism, attribution style, hope, and depressive symptoms in adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Nazish, N. (2003). *Relationship between self-efficacy and procrastination among college students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Nease, A. A., Mudgett, B. O., & Quiñones, M. A. (1999). Relationships among feedback sign, self-efficacy, and acceptance of performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(5), 806-991.

Nogueira, J., & Veiga, F. (2014). Relationships as a basis of engagement? Self-efficacy and school engagement of pupils in school. *International Perspectives of Psychology and Education*, *13*(5) 373-385.

Noureen, N. I. (2016). *Relation of implicit beliefs, students' engagement and academic achievement among university students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

O'Sullivan, G. (2011). The relationship between hope, eustress, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction among undergraduates. *Social Indicators Research*, *101*(1), 155-172.

Pajares, F. (2009). *Information on self-efficacy: A community of scholars*. Retrieved from http:// www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/self-eficacy.html

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, S. J., & Byron, K. (2008). Exploring the role of hope in job performance: Results from four studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29,* 785-803.

Piker, G. R., Smart, J., Kuh, G. D., & Hayek, J. H. (2006). Educational expenditures and student engagement: When do money matter? *Research in Higher Education, 47*(7), 847-872.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Multiple goals, multiple pathways: The role of goal orientation in learning and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(3), 544 - 667.

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 667-686.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(1), 33-89.

Qureshi, Q. M. (2007). *Relationship between parental acceptance, self-efficacy, and academic achievement of adolescents* (Unpublished master's research). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Rand, K. L., Martin, A. D., & Shea, A. M. (2011). Hope, but not optimism, predicts academic performance of law students beyond previous academic achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*(6), 683-686.

Randolph, K. A., Fraser, M. W., & Orthner, D. K. (2004). Educational resilience among youth at risk. *Substance Use and Misuse*, *39*(5), 747-767.

Rasool, R. I. (2015). *Role of perceived self-efficacy and spousal support in psychological well-being of female entrepreneurs* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Reve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*(4), 257-267.

Riasat, R. S. (2015). *Social adjustment, self-efficacy, and mental health among orphan and non-orphan adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Rotgans, M., & Schmidt, A. (2011). Student engagement literature review. *The higher Education Academy, 35*(2), 320-340.

Safaria, T., & Ahmad, A. (2013).Effects of Self-efficacy on students' academic performance. *Journal of Educational, Health, and Community Psychology*, *2*(1), 345- 543.

Saleh, S. W. (2017). *Role of attitude towards mathematics and mathematics self-efficacy in achievement among secondary school students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Sana, S. F. (2016). *The predictive role of hope, self-efficacy, active and passive procrastination in academic performance of students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Scholz, U., Dona, B. G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 18*(3), 242-251. doi.org/10.1027//1015-5759.18.3.242.

Schunk, D. H., & Ertmer, P. A. (2000). Self-regulation and academic learning: Self-efficacy enhancing interventions. *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 631-649). Academic Press.

Schwarzer, R. (1992). Self-efficacy as a resource factor in stress appraisal processes. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (195-213). Washington DC: Hamesphere.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Measuring optimistic self-beliefs: A Chinese adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient, 3*(1), 35-37.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Optimistic self-beliefs as a resource factor in coping with stress. In S. E. Hobfoll & M. W. deVries (Eds.) *Extreme Stress and Communities: Impact and Intervention* (pp. 159-177). Springer Netherlands. doi: 10.1007/978-94-015-8486-9-7

Schwarzer, R., & Warner, L. M. (2013). Perceived self-efficacy and its relationship to resilience. *Resilience in Children, Adolescents, and Adults, 9*(3), 139-150.

Sciarra, D., & Seirup, H. (2008). The multidimensionality of school engagement and math achievement among racial groups. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(4) 218-228.

Seirup, H., & Rose, S. (2011). Exploring the effects of hope on GPA and retention among college undergraduate students on academic probation. *Education Research International, 7*(6), 5-69.

Shabbir, S. A. (2017). *Implicit beliefs of intelligence, achievement emotions and academic self-efficacy among university students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Shams, S. U. (2017). *Relationship of mental health, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction among Islamabad police* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Shkullaku, R. (2013). The relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance in the context of gender among Albanian students. *European Academic Research, 1*(4), 467-492.

Shorey, H. S., Roberts, C. R., & Huprich, S. K. (2012). The roles of domain specific hope and depressive personality in predicting depressive symptoms. *Personality and Mental Health, 6*(3), 255-265.

Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2002). The theory and measurement of the self-efficacy construct. *Self-Efficacy in Nursing: Research and Measurement Perspectives, 9*(12), 234-763.

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 571-581.

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavior and emotional participation in academic activities in classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*(3), 493-525.

Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*(4), 249-275.

Snyder, C. R., Feldman, D. B., Taylor, J. D., Schroeder, L. L., & Adams, V. H. (2000). The roles of hopeful thinking in preventing problems and enhancing strengths. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *9*(4), 249-269.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(4), 570 - 789.

Snyder, C. R., Ilardi, S., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. (2000). Hope theory: Updating a common process for psychological change. In C. R. Snyder & R. E. Ingram (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological change: Psychotherapy processes and practices for the 21st century* (pp. 128-153). New York: Wiley

Snyder, C. R., LaPointe, A. B., Jeffrey Crowson, J., & Early, S. (1998). Preferences of high-and low-hope people for self-referential input. *Cognition and Emotion*, *12*(6), 807-823.

Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S. J., Shorey, H. S., Rand, K. L., & Feldman, D. B. (2003). Hope theory, measurements, and applications to school psychology. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *18*(2), 122 - 435.

Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., & Sigmon, D. R. (2002). Hope theory. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, *15*(1), 257-276.

Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H. S., Cheavens, J., Pulvers, K. M., Adams, V. H., & Wiklund, C. (2002). Hope and academic success in college. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(4), 267 - 820 .

Soudhan, S. N. (2005). *Relationship between employee's self-efficacy and interpersonal conflict management styles in public sector* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Soysa, C. K., & Wilcomb, C. J. (2015). Mindfulness, self-compassion, self-efficacy, and gender as predictors of depression, anxiety, stress, and well-being. *Mindfulness*, *6*(2), 217-226.

Sukkarieh, O. A. (2011). *The relationship among diabetes self-care, psychological adjustment, social support and glycemic control in the Lebanes population*

with type 2 diabetes mellitus (Doctoral Dissertation). Northeastern University, Manssachusetts. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20002096.

Sympson, S. C. (1991). *Validation of the domain specific hope scale: exploring hope in life domains* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Sympson, S. C., & Synder, C. R. (1997). *Development and initial validation of the Domain Specific Hope Scale*. University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence. doi. Org/10.1037/1089-2699.1.2.107

Tenaw, Y. A. (2013). Relationship between self-efficacy, academic achievement and gender in analytical chemistry at Debre Markos College of teacher education. *African Journal of Chemical Education*, *3*(1), 3-28.

Tombaugh, J. R., Mayfield, C. O., & Wooten, K. C. (2011). Examining the affective and temporal dimensions of the positive affect-work attitude relationships: The mediating role of hope. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, *16*(2), 25- 210.

Tong, Y., & Song, S. (2004). A study on general self-efficacy and subjective well-being of low SES-college students in a Chinese university. *College Student Journal*, *38*(4), 637-643.

Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. New York: Higher Education Academy Available.

Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2004). Faulty does matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(2), 153-184.

Urdan, T., & Midgley, C. (2001). Academic self-handicapping: What we know, what more there is to learn. *Educational Psychology Review*, *13*(2), 115-138.

Vuong, M., Brown-Welty, S., & Tracz, S. (2010).The effects of self-efficacy on academic success of first-generation college sophomore students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(1), 50-64.

Wajid, W. U. (2017). *Self-efficacy among research students: Role of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, research anxiety, and attitude towards research* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Wang, M. T., & Eccles, J. S. (2013). School context, achievement motivation, and academic engagement: A longitudinal study of school engagement using a multidimensional perspective. *Learning and Instruction, 28*(3), 12-23.

Warmack, D. J. (2011). *Comparison of satisfaction levels of minority and non-minority students in higher education based on levels of student engagement*. Union University. Jackson: Tennessee.

Willemse, M. (2008). *Exploring the relationship between self-efficacy and aggression in a group of adolescents in the peri-urban town of Worcester* (Doctoral dissertation). Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

Willms, J. D. (2001). Monitoring school performance for 'standards-based reform. *Education and Research in Education, 14*(3), 237-53.

Yoon, H. J., In, H., Niles, S. G., Amundson, N. E., Smith, B. A., & Mills, L. (2001). The effects of hope on student engagement, academic performance, and vocational identity. *The Canadian Journal of Career Development/Revue, 8*(6), 55-67.

Yusuf, M. (2011).The impact of self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and self-regulated learning strategies on students' academic achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 2623-2626.

Zafar, Z. S. (2005). *Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among university teachers* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan.

Zeidner, M. (1998). *Test anxiety: The state of the art*. New York: Plenum.

Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749-768). Cambridge: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Cleary, T. J. (2009). Motives to self-regulate learning. *Handbook of Motivation at School, 47*, 247-256.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(3), 663-676.

Appendix A

Informed Consent

I Aqsa Fayyaz is an MSc research student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. I am conducting a research as per requirement of this degree. This research aims to explore the relationship between student's hope levels and study engagement. I request you to support my purpose and participate in this research. I assure you that information provided on this questionnaire will be kept confidential and will only be used for research. You have full right to quit at any stage.

However your help, support, and participation will be highly appreciated.

Participation in this research is completely based on your willingness to participate.

If you agree to participate then please sign below

Thank You!

Signature _____

Regards,

Aqsa Fayyaz.

For any further inquiry you can contact me at aqsaahmed1142@gmail.com

Appendix B

Demographics Sheet

Demographic sheet

Date (Today): _____

Date of Birth: _____

Age (Years):_____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Your education (in education): _____

University you are enrolled in: _____

Current educational Degree: BS / Master/ MPhil/ Ph.D Other

_____

Faculty: Natural Science Social Science Biological Science

Discipline/Field: _____

Mother's work status: Working/Nonworking

If working, specify occupation: _____

Father's work status: Working/Nonworking

If working, specify occupation: _____

Your work status: Working_____ Non-Working_____

If working, job experience (Years): _____

Birth order: _____

Family structure: Nuclear_____ Joint_____

Residential status: Hostelite_____ Day scholar_____

Appendix C

	Items	Not at all true	Hardly true	Moderately true	Exactly true
1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	1	2	3	4
2	If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	1	2	3	4
3	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	1	2	3	4
4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	1	2	3	4
5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	1	2	3	4
6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	1	2	3	4
7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	1	2	3	4
8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can rely on my coping abilities.	1	2	3	4
9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	1	2	3	4
10	I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	1	2	3	4

Appendix D

Read each statement carefully and chose which one of five possible responses best reflect you by circling the corresponding numbers. There is no right or wrong answers. We are just interested in your views. Using the scale below, Please indicate your level of agreement with each item.

	Items	Never	Rarely	Often	Very often	Always
1	During class I ask questions.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I tell the teacher what I like and what I don't like.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I let my teacher know what I am interested in.	1	2	3	4	5
4	During class, I express my preference and opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I offer often suggestion how to make the class better.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I listen carefully in class.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I try very hard in school.	1	2	3	4	5
8	The first time my teacher talks about a new topic, I listen very carefully	1	2	3	4	5
9	I work very hard when we start something new in class.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I pay attention in class.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I enjoy learning new things in class.	1	2	3	4	5
12	When we work on something in class, I feel interested.	1	2	3	4	5
13	When I am in class, I feel cautious about what we are learning.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Class is fun.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Before I begin to study, I think about what I want to get done.	1	2	3	4	5
16	When I study, I try to connect what I am learning with my own experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I make up my own examples to help me understand the important concepts I study.	1	2	3	4	5
18	When I am working on my schoolwork, I stop once in a while and go over what I have been doing.	1	2	3	4	5
19	As I study, I keep track of how much I understand, Not just if I am getting the right answer.	1	2	3	4	5
20	If what I am working on is difficult to	1	2	3	4	5

	understand, I change the way I learn the material.					
21	When doing university work, I try to relate what I am learning to what already know.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I try to make all the different ideas fit together and make sense when I study.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion in the space next to each statement.

The following statements are related to your level of hope in your **Family Life**. For each statement, please indicate your response by marking the appropriate number on the scale.

Items		Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True
1	I can think of lots of things I enjoy doing with my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	I energetically work on maintaining family relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3	I can think of many ways to include my family in things that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	I have a pretty successful family life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	Even when we disagree, I know my family can find a way to solve our problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6	There are lots of ways to communicate my feelings to family members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7	I have the kind of relationships that I want with family members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8	My experiences with my family have prepared me for a family of my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The following statements are related to your level of hope in your Social Relationships. For each statement; please indicate your response by marking the appropriate number on the scale.

Items		Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True
1	I can think of many ways to make friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	I actively pursue friendships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3	There are lots of ways to meet new people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	I can think of many ways to be included in the groups that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	I've been pretty successful where friendships are concerned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6	Even when someone seems unapproachable, I know I can find a way to break the ice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7	My past social experiences have prepared me to make friends in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8	When I meet someone I want to be friends with, I usually succeed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The following statements are related to your level of hope in your Academic(University/College, Course work). For each statement, Please indicate your response by marking the appropriate number on scale.

Items		Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True
1	I can think of lots of ways to make good grades.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	I energetically pursue my university work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3	There are lots of ways to meet the challenges of any class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	Even if the course is difficult, I know I can find a way to succeed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	I've been pretty successful in university.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6	I can think of lots of ways to do well in classes that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7	My past academic experiences have prepared me well for future success.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8	I get the grades that I want in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The following statements are related to your level of hope in your Leisure Activities (Sports, music, art, reading, biking) for each statement; please indicate your responses by marking the appropriate number on the scale.

Items		**Definitely False**	**Mostly False**	**Somewhat False**	**Slightly False**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Mostly True**	**Definitely True**
1	I can think of many satisfying things to do in my spare time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	I energetically pursue my leisure time activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3	If my planned leisure time activities fall through, I can find something else to do that I enjoy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	I can think of lots of ways to make time for the activities that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	Even if others don't think my activities are important, I still enjoy doing them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6	My experiences with hobbies and other leisure time activities are important in my leisure time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7	I have satisfying activities that I do in my leisure time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8	When I try to perform well in leisure time activities, I usually succeed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Appendix F

Permission Require

aqsa fayyaz <aqsaahmed1142@gmail.com> Mon, Mar 18, 10:16 AM

Respected James Well born

I am research {psychology (educational) } student from Pakistan studying in National Institute of psychology- Quaid -e- Azam University Islamabad. I am working on**" Social competence,Self efficacy, Hope and student engagement"** I am in need for the Scale
Engagement Scale to complete my work...

Here I am requesting your permission to use your Scale for research..
I will be honoured if allowed ...

Optimistically waiting for

Regards : Aqsa Fayyaz

James G Wellborn <jamesgw@comcast.net> Tue, Mar 19, 8:01 PM

to Ellen, me

Dear Aqsa,
I have copied this email to Ellen Skinner who continues (and greatly extends) the work on engagement and a remarkable array of motivation concepts. Im sure she will direct you to the appropriate instrument.

Good luck on your research!

(Hey Ellen. Love you. Hope everyone is doing well)

Ellen Skinner <skinnee@pdx.edu> Tue, Mar 19, 11:51 PM

to James, me, Ellen

Thanks for your e-mail. I enclose a link that includes the most current versions of all the assessments that we have available and articles that include their psychometric properties. You are welcome to use any of them in your research.

Appendix G

permission require

aqsa fayyaz <aqsaahmed1142@gmail.com> Fri, Mar 22, 11:35 AM

to ssympson

Dear Author!

I am research {psychology (educational) } student from Pakistan studying in National Institute of psychology- Quaid -e- Azam University Islamabad. I am working on **" Social competence,Self efficacy, Hope and student engagement"** I am in need for the Scale
Domain Specific Hope Scale(Sympson, 1999) to complete my work...

Here I am requesting your permission to use your Scale for research..
I will be honoured if allowed ...

Optimistically waiting for

Regards : Aqsa Fayyaz

Susie Sympson <ssympson@jccc.edu> Fri, Mar 22, 10:56 PM

to me

Of course you have my permission to use the DSHS. Please cite my work.
Thanks for your interest.
Susie Sympson, Ph.D

Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy Note9