# Perceptions Of Elementary School Teachers Concerning The Academic Optimism In Government Elementary Schools Of Lahore

**Dr Rizwan Ahmad[1] , Dr. Shamim Ullah[2] , Dr Sumaira Majeed[3]**

[1]*Assistant Professor  University of Education, Lahore rizwanahmad@ue.edu.pk*
[2]*Assistant Professor University of the Punjab, Lahore shamimullah.ier@pu.edu.pk*
[3]*Assistant Professor (Visiting) University of Education, Lahore sumaira3792@gmail.com*

## Abstract

This study explored the perception regarding academic optimism and relationship among its sub scales. The study was conducted on ESTs of Lahore. From 216 Government elementary schools, 1266 secondary school teachers were chosen using a random sample technique. Academic Optimism Scale for Teachers was adapted with the permission. Validity and reliability of the instrument was confirmed. Data were collected in regularly scheduled meetings. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study could be useful from a theoretical, managerial, and academic standpoint. Teachers found to be academically optimistic both at teachers and school level. Positive relationship among the sub scales of academic optimism was revealed. Academic optimism and its subscales showed substantial variation based on demographic characteristics.

**Keywords:** Optimism, Academic Optimism, Collective Efficacy, Organizational Trust, Academic Emphasis.

## Introduction

Researchers have concentrated their efforts on the elements that influence a school's overall success (Chin, 2004; Woolley et al., 2011). To accomplish their objectives, schools tend to rely on the effectiveness of their instructors (Kingdon, 2007). The views of teachers have a significant impact on the functioning of schools and the growth of pupils (Wu et al., 2013). Teachers are more optimistic when they are more effective, have faith in their students and parents, and receive assistance in achieving academic excellence (Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006). Academic optimism (AO), according to researchers, is a cohesive term that combines these three key variables (Hoy, et al., 2008). In academic contexts, teachers are expected to be optimists. The culture of a school serves as a compass, guiding personnel in a similar direction. For leaders, instructors, and students, it is a fountain of meaning and significance (Sergiovanni, 2007; Celep, 2000).

Optimism in academia was born of positive psychology. According to Kurz (2006), it largely concentrates on how people act and what they go through in relation to hope and happiness. People who are optimistic have better moods, are more perseverant, and are more successful (Seligman, 2002). Optimistic teachers emphasize positive qualities among their students, classrooms, schools and communities. Happiness, optimism, hope, and belief are all investigated by positive psychologists (Beard, 2008; Seligman, 2002; Myers, 2000). Academic

optimism (Kirby, 2009; McGuigan, 2005) has been conceptualized as a "triadic set of interactions" (Hoy, Tarter & Hoy., 2007). Academic optimism explains and nurtures what is best in schools. According to researchers (Hoy & Miskel, 2013), schools demonstrating extraordinary academic optimism owns the faculty which believes to brought about the change and where the students can be engaged in high level learning, and in turn it will lead to academic performance (Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006). Optimism is explored at teacher as well as school level. There are three sections to the teacher level: specifically, self-efficacy, parental and student trust, and academic concentration. At the school level, three additional elements exist: collective self-efficacy, faculty trust in parents and teachers, and academic attention. Hoy, et al. (2006) developed Academic Optimism Scales (AOS) for Schools and Teachers, which are intended to assess academic optimism.

## Collective Efficacy

Wood and Bandura (1989) are of the view that self-efficacy emerged from social cognitive theory. It is pertaining to the beliefs of individuals regarding their proficiencies to activate the inspiration, intellectual capitals and courses of action which is needed in order to control their day to day affairs. Teachers serve as role models for one another in educational institutions where there is a strong sense of collective efficacy. They have a shared responsibility to keep track of promises and learn from one another. Teachers' attitudes toward themselves and their coworkers have an influence on their actions. It instils a feeling of mission and aids in the upkeep of high standards (Mc Guigan & Hoy, 2006; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Teachers who feel they have the ability to influence student learning set higher standards, put up more effort, and are more resilient when things become tough (Woolfolk Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006). It entails a capacity evaluation as well as a forecast of future results.

It is a property at the school level as well as an individual trait. Describe schools as agentive and behaving intentionally to achieve their aims, based on social cognition theory's description of human agency. As a result, schools take on the same personality traits as people (Goddard et al., 2000).

Collective teacher efficacy is a school property that teachers judgments regarding the way they as group might assist students' learning, regardless of students' family and community resources, is a cognitive aspect of academic optimism (Tschnnen-Moran & Barr, 2004). In the light of teachers' perceptions of teaching assignments and their own capabilities, it is a collective notion. This view is formed by organizational structures and policies, as well as the experiencing mastery and vicarious learning, the organizational affect and social influence (Goddard et al., 2000). Human behavior may be described when behavioral, personal, and environmental variables interact, according to Bandura, the founder of cognitive psychology. Bandura (1997) hypothesized that people make decisions on purpose, and that we base our decisions on what we think to be the most likely result of encounters. Teachers who believe they can influence students positively will make judgments (Goddard et al., 2004; Hoy et al., 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004), t. It might work hard to help them succeed (Goddard, 2001; Bandura, 1993; Goddard et al., 2000; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006).

## Faculty Trust

On the grounds of improvement, trust is a critical component (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). It consists of regard, skill, regard for others, and honesty (Lewin & Regine, 2000). It is the outcome of instructors, parents, and students working together to achieve common learning goals. It enables students to set and achieve mutual learning objectives, resulting in increased student achievement (Halverson, 2007; Hoy, Gage, &

Tarter, 2006). Organizations demonstrating high level of trust, employees feel free to seek help because here they are not blamed of incompetency. The conduct of a person determines their level of trust. It refers to an atmosphere of candor, collaboration, and legitimacy (Tcshannen-Moran, 2014). Teachers must be able to establish trusting relationships with both their students and their parents.Students take risks and learn from their mistakes in a learning environment that is safe and trusting and parents trust that teachers care about their children's success (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Flutter, 2006, 2007). Feelings of compassion, dependability, competency, honesty, and openness are all part of it (Goddard, Tschannen Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Teachers trusting pupils and their parents might set high but attainable goals for them (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Social faith in public school education is not solely a function of education. Collaboration is the result of collaborative leadership based on lateral alliances and groups with short-term goals, as opposed to classified leadership based on ceremonial controls and drawbacks. Teachers' feelings of trust in parents and pupils were referred as faculty trust in clients and research shows that instructors do not differentiate between the two forms of trust. According to researchers (Adams, 2008; Bryk & Schneider, 2002), parental and student trustworthiness are highly related. According researchers (Goddard et al., 2007), it has been suggested an important school characteristic (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

## Academic Emphasis

Quality teachers make actively engage students in worthwhile learning activities (Woolfolk, 2010). Students need learning time because the amount of time they spend effectively and actively engaged in an academic assignment has a beneficial impact on their learning (Weinstein & Mignano, 2007). The amount to which teachers devise techniques for involving students in appropriate academic tasks is referred to as their sense of academic focus (Henderson et al., 2005; Roney, Coleman, & Schhlichting, 2007; Levpuscek & Zupancic, 2009). Schools possessing robust actions of academic emphasis make viable learning of the student as the fundamental emphasis (Adams & Forsyth, 2007). Their students can realize aggravated academic standards. According to Wagner and Dipaola (2011), in schools rich in academic emphasis, teachers are believed to like each other, students' regard one other and all are highly motivated (Tschannen-Moran & Garies, 2015). It may diminish dropout rate (Bower, Bowen, & Powers, 2010).

At the teacher level, efficacy, trust, and academic emphasis have all been assessed; the question we're interested in is how they all fit together at the school level. In theory, it sounds nice, but does it work in practice? Built upon the findings of Hoy et al. (2006), the goal of this research is to look at the link between these organizational characteristics in Government Elementary Schools of Lahore. The study is significant because it contributes to the body of knowledge about educational administration that already exists.

## Theoretical Framework

According to academicians (Beard, 2008; Hoy, 2002; Hoy & Miskel, 2013) academic optimism emerged from social cognitive theory of Bandura. Social capital theory of Coleman, learned optimism study of Seligman and empirical studies of Hoy, et al. (2006) as well as school climate ( Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006) paved the foundations for academic optimism. This construct is based on two theoretical frameworks: positive psychology and social - cognitive theory.

Optimistic teachers in class environments tend to focus on positive qualities of students, schools and society, according to positive psychology and social cognitive theory (Pajares, 2001). Positive psychology in educational study is still considered in its infancy (Hoy & Tarter, 2011). Academic optimism involves both cognitive and affective components, as well as a behavioral component. Collective efficacy is a cognitive concept that refers to a group's expectation. Academic focus drives achievement oriented behavior at work and faculty trust in parents and teachers is an effective response to interactions with them. In terms of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral characteristics, academic optimism provides a detailed account of collective behavior (Hoy et al., 2005).

## Purpose of the Research

Following were the objectives that steered the research:

1. To explore the state of academic optimism (collective efficacy, faculty trust and academic emphasis) in elementary school teachers.
2. To explore the relationship among collective efficacy, faculty trust and academic emphasis in elementary school teachers.
3. To determine the differences in academic optimism perceptions based on demographic factors (Gender and experience).

## Research Methodology

This was a descriptive research expects to validate previous findings concerning the variables in order to provide direction to reinforce leadership in schools. In this research, the constructs were measured through cross-sectional survey. The paradigm of study was chosen to be a positivist research paradigm. The study's participants were all Elementary School Teachers (ESTs) employed in Lahore's government elementary schools. Total 503 ESTs from 81 Government Elementary Schools of Lahore participated in this research study, selected randomly. Male ESTs were 224 (44.53%) while female ESTs were 279 (55.47%). Response rate was 76.45%. The school was the primary sample unit, followed by the faculty as the second sampling stage. Prior permission was taken from the concerned authority to collect the data. Teachers willingly participated in the study voluntarily.

Beard and Hoy (2009) created the Teacher Academic Optimism Scale for Elementary Teachers. The researchers collected data using this scale. It was based on five-point Likert type rating scale i.e. strongly agree (coded as 5), agree (coded as 4), undecided (coded as 3), disagree (coded as 2) and strongly disagree (coded as 1). The scales' reliability varied from 0.91 to 0.94. Several researches (Hoy et al., 2006; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Smith & Hoy, 2007) have looked at the predictive and criterion validity of the Academic Optimism Scale. The researcher collected data pertaining to the demographic information of the respondents. Several research studies have confirmed AOS's validity and reliability (Bevel & Mitchell, 2012; Hoy, Gage, & Tarter, 2006). Many other researchers also affirm it (McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Smith & Hoy, 2007; Wu & Sheu, 2015). Data Collection and Analysis

Each school's head teacher was approached to get permission to gather information. The study's objective and target population were described. During staff meetings, the respondents were given the research instrument individually. Individual responders' anonymity was protected, as was the school's secrecy. No attempt was made to collect data from the teachers who missed the faculty meeting. The elementary school teachers were given 1,200 questionnaires. A total of 1095 valid instruments were received. Ninety one percent of respondents responded, and at least five valid

instruments were returned from each of the 103 Government Elementary Schools. This study presented no risk, and the findings of the survey were kept confidential. To confirm attendance and logistics, follow-up phone calls were made.

The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. At the school level, individual replies were also pooled. The researcher also aggregated the responses at the school level. The scoring was carried out in two stages, with the first calculating the school means for each item and variable. The means for each

variable were then averaged to obtain the overall school mean for each variable. Items with negative wording were reverse coded before scoring. Survey responses were vetted at the teacher and school levels prior to performing the analyses. SPSS was used to examine the data. Missing values, outliers, skewness, and kurtosis were all examined in the data. The information was evenly dispersed. Furthermore, all of the variables satisfied the linearity requirements.

**Data Analysis**

Table 1 Mean and Standard Deviation of Teacher Academic Optimism Scale (Item wise)

| Sub Scales | N | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collective Efficacy (CE) | | | |
| Collective Efficacy 1 | 503 | 4.38 | .91 |
| Collective Efficacy 2 | 503 | 4.50 | .87 |
| Collective Efficacy 3 | 503 | 4.37 | .85 |
| Faculty Trust (FT) | | | |
| Faculty Trust 1 | 503 | 4.12 | .90 |
| Faculty Trust 2 | 503 | 3.76 | 1.06 |
| Faculty Trust 3 | 503 | 3.84 | 1.02 |
| Faculty Trust 4 | 503 | 3.68 | 1.02 |
| Academic Emphasis (AE) | | | |
| Academic Emphasis 1 | 503 | 3.92 | 1.05 |
| Academic Emphasis 2 | 503 | 4.01 | 1.06 |
| Academic Emphasis 3 | 503 | 4.14 | 1.01 |
| Academic Emphasis 4 | 503 | 4.17 | .97 |

In table 1, looking at the sub scales of collective efficacy, second item showed highest mean value (M=4.50, SD=.87). The item is pertaining to crafting questions for students. Hence, it can be conferred that teachers are able to craft good questions for their students. Looking at the section of faculty trust, item six showed highest

mean value (M=3.84, SD=1.02). The item is pertaining to trust on students by the teachers. It unveils that teachers trusts their students. While in the section of academic emphasis, the mean value of item 11 is the highest (M=4.17, SD=.97). It indicates that teachers are able to press their students for academic achievement.

Table 2 TAOS Descriptive Statistics

| | | | | Range | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale | N | M | SD | Potential | Actual | Skewness | Kurtosis |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CE | 503 | 13.25 | 2.05 | 3-15 | 7-15 | -.24 | .69 |
| FT | 503 | 15.39 | 2.97 | 4-20 | 7-20 | -.13 | -.73 |
| AE | 503 | 16.25 | 2.95 | 4-20 | 8-20 | -.69 | -.08 |
| AO | 503 | 44.88 | 6.20 | 11-55 | 23-55 | -.69 | .55 |

Table 2 presents the description of Academic Optimism (AO). The perception is bases on individual teacher responses. Academic optimism (AO) as the construct is jointly formed by three subscales. Perception of teachers regarding AO ranged between 59 and 154, having the mean value 59 110.4 (SD=14.9). The responses of ESTs on AE sub scale ranged from 8 to 20 with mean value of 16.25 (SD=2.95). The responses of FT ranged from 4 to 20 with mean values of 15.39 (SD=2.97). The CE responses ranged from 3 to 15, with a mean value of 13.25 (SD=2.05). The scale's skewness and kurtosis were also calculated. All of the fractions were assumed to be normally distributed because the values were between +1 and -1 in the array. As a result, the data is deemed suitable for parametric testing.

Table 3 Aggregated TAOS Descriptive Statistics by School

| Scale | N | M | SD | Range Potential | Actual | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CE | 80 | 13.24 | 1.07 | 3-15 | 10-15 | -.89 | .74 |
| FT | 80 | 15.42 | 1.45 | 4-20 | 12-20 | -.05 | .53 |
| AE | 80 | 16.20 | 1.59 | 4-20 | 11.80-20 | -.03 | .47 |
| AO | 80 | 44.87 | 3.10 | 11-55 | 37.20-54 | -.18 | .68 |

Table 3 presents the description of Academic Optimism (AO). The perception is bases on data aggregated at schools level. Academic optimism (AO) as the construct is jointly formed by three subscales. Perception of teachers concerning AO ranged from 11 to 55 (M=44.87; SD=3.10). The responses of AE ranged from 4 to 20 (M=16.20; SD=1.59). The responses of FT ranged from 4 to 20 with mean values of 15.42 (SD=1.45). The CE responses ranged from 3 to 15, with a mean value of 13.24 (SD=1.07). The scale's skewness and kurtosis were also calculated. All of the fractions were assumed to be normally distributed because the values were between +1 and -1 in the array. As a result, the data is deemed suitable for parametric testing.

Table 4 Standardized Score of Teachers Academic Optimism Scale (Teachers Wise)

| Component | Formula of Standardized Score | Standardized Score |
|---|---|---|
| CE | [100X(CE-7.68)/.856] + 500 | 1150.70 |
| FT | [100X(FT-3.86)/.642] + 500 | 2295.95 |
| AE | [100X(AE-4.42)/.470] + 500 | 3014.89 |
| AO | (SSCE + SST + SSAE)/3 | 6461.54 |

Table 4 unveils Teacher Academic Optimism Scales for Elementary Teachers standardized results. The score were standardized using mean (M=500) for ETSs. The score of 650 on AO indicates a very high level of optimism. Likewise, score of 350 indicates a highly negative perspective on AO. Scores of the majority ESTs, on the other hand, lie somewhere in between these two extremes.

Table 5 Standardized Score of Teachers Academic Optimism Scale (Schools Wise)

| Component | Formula of Standardized Score | Standardized Score |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| CE | [100X(CE-7.68)/.856] + 500 | 2306.93 |
| FT | [100X(FT-3.86)/.642] + 500 | 2300.62 |
| AE | [100X(AE-4.42)/.470] + 500 | 3006.38 |
| AO | (SSCE + SST + SSAE)/3 | 2537.98 |

Table 5 shows the standard AO scores, which were computed following Wayne Hoy's TAOS-E standards. AO score for each sub scale was aggregated at the school level. It was done by adding the mean scores. In each elementary school after that, the score was divided by the number of ESTs. With a mean score of 500, the score was converted into standardized score. The standardized AO score was calculated using the sum of all subscale scores. A score of 500 on the Academic Optimism (AO) scale is deemed an average, according to Wayne Hoy's guidelines.

Table 6 Relationship between Academic Optimism and its Sub Scales (School Wise)

| Variables | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----------|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| 1. CE | 13.25 | 2.05 | -- | | | |
| 2. FT | 15.39 | 2.97 | .33** | -- | | |
| 3. AE | 16.24 | 2.95 | .46** | .41** | -- | |
| 4. AO | 44.88 | 6.21 | .71** | .78** | .83** | -- |

To determine whether there is a link between academic optimism and its subscales, correlational analysis was run. Preliminary analysis indicated that the data was normally distributed prior to the correlation analysis. The linearity assumption was also checked and confirmed. As per the guidelines suggested by Cohen (1988), five pairs of variables were observed to be positively correlated. Positive relationship ranged from moderate (r=.33) to strong (r=.83) relationship

Table 7 Relationship among Sub Scales of Academic Optimism (Schools Wise)

| Variables | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. CE | 13.24 | 1.07 | -- | | | |
| 2. FT | 15.42 | 1.45 | 0.25* | -- | | |
| 3. AE | 16.20 | 1.59 | 0.53** | 0.26* | -- | |
| 4. AO | 44.87 | 3.10 | 0.74** | 0.69** | 0.82** | -- |

Academic Optimism (AO) has three sub scales (CE, FT and AE). Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between the variables. It was revealed in the preliminary analysis that the variables are normally distributed. Furthermore, linearity of the data was also tested. Data analysis revealed that there were five pairs of variables which were found to be positively related. Guidelines of Cohen (1988) were followed. Positive relationship ranged from weak (r=.25) to strong (r=.82) relationship

Table 8 Difference in Elementary Teachers' Academic Optimism Scores on the basis of Gender

| Variables | Gender | M | SD | df | t | P | Effect size r/ Cohn's d |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CE | Male | 13.50 | 1.88 | 501 | 2.47 | .01 | .1104/.2222 |
| | Female | 13.05 | 2.16 | | | | |
| FT | Male | 15.30 | 2.84 | 501 | -.63 | .53 | -.0287/-.0575 |
| | Female | 15.47 | 3.07 | | | | |
| AE | Male | 16.73 | 2.94 | 501 | 3.36 | .00 | .1490/.3014 |
| | Female | 15.85 | 2.90 | | | | |
| AO | Male | 45.53 | 5.93 | 501 | 2.09 | .04 | .0938/.1883 |
| | Female | 44.37 | 6.38 | | | | |

It was independent samples t-test that was run in order to explore whether any difference exists in AO and its sub scales with respect to gender. Male ESTs (M=45.53, SD=5.93) reported significantly higher AO perception than female ESTs (M=44.37, SD=6.38), with a small effect size (.0938/.1883). Data analysis confirmed that male and female ESTs have different perspectives on AO. In the same manner, it was detected that there was a statistically noteworthy change in opinion of CE score between male ESTs (M=13.50, SD=1.88) and female ESTs (M=13.05, SD=2.16). with a small effect size (.1104/.2222). In the same manner, the groups vary pointedly on the Academic Emphasis (AE) subscale, male (M=16.73, SD=2.94) and female teachers (M=15.85, SD=2.90) showed perceptions with samll effect size (.1490/.3014). On Faculty Trust (FT), however, there was no significant difference between the groups, with male (M=15.30, SD=2.84) and female (M=15.47, SD=3.07) ESTs having similar perceptions.

Table 9 Academic Optimism Differs Based on Experience of Teachers

| Variable | Source | df | SS | MS | F | P | η² |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CE | Between groups | 3 | 15.48 | 46.44 | 3.75 | .01 | .0220 |
| | Within groups | 499 | 4.13 | 2061.49 | | | |
| FT | Between groups | 3 | 40.39 | 121.16 | 4.68 | .00 | .0273 |

|      |                |     |        |          |       |     |       |
| ---- | -------------- | --- | ------ | -------- | ----- | --- | ----- |
|      | Within groups  | 499 | 8.64   | 4308.69  |       |     |       |
| AE   | Between groups | 3   | 91.96  | 275.88   | 11.21 | .00 | .0631 |
|      | Within groups  | 499 | 8.20   | 4093.05  |       |     |       |
| AO   | Between groups | 3   | 103.96 | 311.89   | 2.73  | .04 | .0161 |
|      | Within groups  | 499 | 38.13  | 19025.42 |       |     |       |

The researcher employed one way ANOVA. The intent was to know whether any difference exists in AO (experience wise). Based on their level of experience, ESTs were divided into four groups. ESTs in Group 1 had a shorter experience history (Below 10 years), while ESTS in Group 2 had a longer experience history (11-20 years). ESTS in Group 3 had a longer experience history 21-30 years, while ESTS in Group 4 had an experience history exceeding (above 30 years). A statistically significant variation in AO was detected based on experience with small effect size (.0161). There was also difference in Collective Efficacy (CE) with moderate effect size (.0220). Similarly, with a moderate effect size, a difference in Faculty Trust (FT) was observed based on experience (.0273). Likewise, there was difference in Academic Emphasis on the basis of experience with moderate effect size (.0631).

Table 10 Academic Emphasis (AE) Differences Based on Experience of Teachers

| Dependent Variable | Age Groups | Age Groups | Mean Difference | p   |
| ------------------ | ---------- | ---------- | --------------- | --- |
| CE                 | Below 10   | 11-20      | -.7433          | .00 |
| FT                 | Below 10   | 11-20      | -1.0416         | .01 |
|                    | Below 10   | 21-30      | 1.0952          | .05 |
| AE                 | Below 10   | 11-20      | -1.7442         | .00 |
|                    | 11-20      | 21-30      | 2.2273          | .00 |
|                    |            | 21-30      | 2.7373          | .04 |

Post Hoc analysis was run to find out whether the groups statistically different from one another. Results are presented in table 15. Post-hoc comparison was performed using Tukey HSD. It was observed that mean score for Group 1 and Group II were different on Collective Efficacy (CE). Mean score for Group 1 and Group II and mean score of Group I and Group III was also different on Faculty Trust (FT). Mean score of Group I was also different than Group II and mean score of Group II was also different than Group III on Academic Emphasis (AE). Mean score of Group II and Group III was also different on Academic Optimism (AO). On the scales, the remaining groups did not differ significantly.

**Findings**

To determine whether there is a link between academic optimism and its subscales, correlational analysis was run. Preliminary analysis indicated that the data was normally distributed prior to the correlation analysis. The linearity assumption was also checked and confirmed. As per the guidelines suggested by Cohen (1988), the variables were observed to be positively correlated that ranged from moderate (r=.33) to strong (r=.83) relationship. It was

independent samples t-test that was run in order to explore whether any difference exists in AO and its sub scales with respect to gender. Male ESTs (M=45.53, SD=5.93) reported significantly higher AO perception than female ESTs (M=44.37, SD=6.38), with a small effect size (.0938/.1883). Data analysis confirmed that male and female ESTs have different perspectives on AO. The researcher employed one way ANOVA to know whether any difference exists in AO (experience wise). Based on their level of experience, ESTs were divided into four groups. Statistically significant variation in AO was detected based on experience with small effect size (.0161). Post Hoc analysis was run to find out whether the groups statistically different from one another. Results are presented in table 15. Post-hoc comparison was performed using Tukey HSD. Mean score of Group II and Group III was different on Academic Optimism (AO).

## Conclusions

Correlational analysis was run to determine the relationship between academic optimism and its subscales. The variables were observed to be positively correlated. This relationship ranged from moderate to strong. Independent samples t-test that was run to explore whether any difference exists in AO with respect to gender. Regarding AO, male ESTs reported perception significantly higher than female ESTs. One way ANOVA was employed to know whether any difference exists in AO on the basis of experience. Significant difference in AO was observed based on experience.

## Discussion

Woolfolk, Hoy, and Tarter Hoy (2006) consider academic optimism to be a construct with three distinct characteristics. The characteristics are academic attentiveness. It also includes faith in parents as well as students to work together to create a positive academic environment. It is an organizational characteristic that influences students. The concept (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Hoy & Smith, 2007) is a hidden characteristic of school that has been connected to school success and has been used to assess the culture of a school (Hoy et al., 2006; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006). Forsyth (2011) described AO studies as the "Holy Grail" for educational researchers. Fahy, Wu, and Hoy (2010) expanded on the work of Hoy, Gage, and Tarter (2006). It was discovered to be a valid construct at the elementary and secondary school levels. Previous research underpins it as a groundbreaking force seeing educators to be proficient, students willing to learn, parents as concerned, and school leadership as the drivers to fashion an environment which targets academic achievement as the fundamental objective (Hoy & Miscall, 2013).

The researcher explored the state of academic optimism at teachers' level as well as at schools' level as fairly good, falling above the scales median. The data puts forward moderately high levels of academic optimism on overall as well as on the sub-scales. Teachers were agreeing of its presence and each aspect of academic optimism in the schools. According to previous studies on schools (Anderson, 2012; Guvercin, 2013; Messick, 2012), there is a feeling of AO (Wu, 2013). Some other researchers also believe it (Dean, 2011; Sims, 2011). This research study was built on previous school-based research (Gage, 2003; Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006; Wagner, 2008) as well as recent research on primary teachers (Beard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2010). Many prior research investigations support the findings of this study (May, 2016; Mitchell, Mendiola, & Schumacker, 2016; Thorn, 2018). A high degree of academic optimism was also discovered in certain research (Dean, 2011; Guvercin, 2013). It was confirmed by the research that It is regarded as a valuable construct among elementary school instructors. (Hoy, Hoy, & Kurz, 2007; Beard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2010). Additionally, some previous studies also found the magnitude of academic

optimism as being high in schools (McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Srivastva & Dhar, 2016). Large number of research studies exist which provide evidence of the positive relationship between the subscales of academic optimism (Anderson, Kochan, Kensler, & Reames, 2018; May, 2016; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Mitchell, Mendiola, Schumacker, & Lowery, 2016; Perelli, 2018; Sims, 2011; Thorn, 2018; Wu, Hoy, & Tarter, 2013). Positive relationship was revealed among the variables of research. Findings of many researches are in line with the present research (Bevel, & Mitchell, 2012; Kirby, & DiPaola, 2011; Hejazieh, Lavasani, & Mazarei, 2011; Schwabsky, Erdogan, & Tschannen-Moran, 2019;

Some other researchers (Tschannen-Moran et al., 2013; Wu et al., Hoy, & Tarter, 2013) also found similar findings in their research. Interesting findings were revealed by Yildiz and Ozer (2012) where negative relationship among the variables was explored. Statistical analysis was run to reveal whether any significant difference lies in academic optimism with respect to gander and experience. Significant differences were detected based on gender and experience in academic optimism. Similarly, Ngidi (2012) found no variation in AO based on gender, experience, or its subscales. Administrators and teachers have reasons to be optimistic. Administrators should encourage the development of an environment which is optimistic and where teachers have faith in their capabilities to develop students' learning. When teachers have trust on the coworkers, students as well as parents, they may develop positive and effective working relations. They develop trust in their working relationships when they feel valued and appreciated. When school leaders support teachers fix small but realizable goals they foster collective efficacy. School leaders look for shared beliefs among teachers, parents as well as the community that students might learn and teachers might teach effectively. According to

Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2004), academics should be prioritized in mission statements and decision-making procedures. Administrators and instructors, therefore, should integrate the knowledge into their professional development programs. The researcher commends that this research be replicated in varied population and geographic regions. Schools in this study were similar in various perspectives; consequently a diverse population may offer more information. If this study was longitudinal and attitudes were tracked over time, it would be fascinating to see how much the results changed over time. Furthermore, a qualitative research at the elementary school level might provide useful data. An inquiry like this might corroborate prior research. This study focuses on Lahore's government primary schools. Because of the differences in demography, these findings may not apply to other provinces of the country. Folks' capability to reminiscence their impression while recording their responses determines response accuracy, which may include people's proclivity to present presenting themselves in the best possible light. Latest happenings, which the researcher was not aware of, may have influenced instructor perceptions.

**Recommendations**

Inspiring the faculty to play with ideas produces uniqueness in teaching. They may encourage reflective discussion regarding potential problems that may arise. They may promote trust and cooperation through open communication. Time spent with students and teachers might be the best gauge of school climate. Celebrations might be held to recognize faculty for excellence in achievement and academics. Events might be held regularly to foster teacher and parent relationships such as parent meetings so parents feel welcome in the school, and faculty might be asked to attend student activities to build genuine relationships. The faculty might be kept aware of

individual and group attainments in order to be accepted and valued.

## References

1. Adams, C. M., & Forsyth, P. B. (2007). Promoting a culture of parent collaboration and trust: An empirical study. Journal of School Public Relations, 28(1), 32-56.

2. Adams, C. M., & Forsyth, P. B. (2008). Promoting a climate of trust: An empirical study. Journal of School Public Relations, 28(1), 32-56.

3. Anderson, K. (2012). Examining relationships between enabling structures, academic optimism and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 1033785182).

4. Anderson, K., Kochan, F., Kensler, L. A., &Reames, E. H. (2018). Academic Optimism, Enabling Structures, and Student Achievement: Delving into Relationships. Journal of School Leadership, 28(4), 434-461.

5. Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational psychologist, 28(2), 117-148.

6. Bandura, A. (1997). The anatomy of stages of change. American journal of health promotion: AJHP, 12(1), 8-10.

7. Beard, K. L. S. (2008). An exploratory study of academic optimism and flow of elementary school teachers. The Ohio State University.

8. Beard, K. S., & Hoy, A. W. (2009). Academic optimism of individual teachers: Confirming a new construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(5), 1136-1144.

9. Beard, K. S., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2010). Academic optimism of individual teachers: Confirming a new construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(5), 1136-1144.

10. Bevel, R. K., & Mitchell, R. M. (2012). The effects of academic optimism on elementary reading achievement. Journal of Educational Administration, 50(6), 773-787

11. Bower, H. A., Bowen, N. K., & Powers, J. D. (2011). Family-faculty trust as measured with the elementary school success profile. Children & Schools, 33(3), 158-167.

12. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002).Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

13. Celep, C. (2000). Teachers' Organizational Commitment in Educational Organizations. National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 10(3), 1999-2000.

14. Chin, A. (2005). Can redistributing teachers across schools raise educational attainment? Evidence from Operation Blackboard in India. Journal of development Economics, 78(2), 384-405.

15. Dean, S. D. (2011). Collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, faculty trust: Predicting teacher academic optimism in elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3461037)

16. Fahy, P. F., Wu, H. C., & Hoy, W. K. (2010). Individual academic optimism of teachers: A new concept and its measure. Analyzing school contexts: Influences of principals and teachers in

the service of students. Greenwich, CN: Information Age.

17. Flutter, J. (2006). This place could help you learn: Student participation in creating better school environments. Educational review, 58(2), 183-193.

18. Flutter, J. (2007). Teacher development and pupil voice. The Curriculum Journal, 18(3), 343-354.

19. Forsyth, D., & Ponce, J. (2011). Computer vision: A modern approach (p. 792). Prentice hall.

20. Gage, C. Q., III., (2003). The meaning and measure of school mindfulness: An exploratory analysis (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3119233).

21. Goddard, R. D. (2001). Collective efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. Journal of educational psychology, 93(3), 467.

22. Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K. & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. Educational Research, 33(3), 3-13.

23. Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. The elementary school journal, 102(1), 3-17.

24. Goddard, R.G., Hoy, W.K. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 37(2), 479-508.

25. Goddard, R.G., Hoy, W.K. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2004). Collective efficacy: theoretical development, empirical

evidence, and future directions. Educational Researcher, 33(3), 3-13.

26. Guvercin, M. (2013). Academic optimism, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student achievement at charter schools (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3578718).

27. Halverson, R. (2007). How leaders use artifacts to structure professional community in schools. Professional learning communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas, 93-105.

28. Hejazieh, E., Lavasani, M. G., & Mazarei, F. (2011). Individual characteristics, identity styles, identity commitment, and teacher's academic optimism. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 646-652.

29. Henderson, K. A., & Shaw, S. M. (2005). Leisure and gender: Challenges and opportunities for feminist research. In A handbook of leisure studies (pp. 216-230). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

30. Hoy, A. W. Hoy, W. K., & Kurz, N. M. (2007). Teachers' academic optimism: The development and test of a new construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(4), 821-835.

31. Hoy, A. W., Davis, H., & Pape, S. J. (2006). Teacher Knowledge and Beliefs. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 715–737). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

32. Hoy, W. K. (2002). Faculty trust: A key to student achievement. Journal of School Public Relations, 23(2), 88-103.

33. Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C.E. (2013). Educational Administration (9thed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

34. Hoy, W. K., & Smith, P. A. (2007). Influence: A key to successful leadership. International journal of

educational management, 16(5), 135-151.

35. Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2011). Positive psychology and educational administration: An optimistic research agenda. Educational Administration Quarterly, 47(3), 427-445.

36. Hoy, W. K., Gage, C. Q., & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School mindfulness and faculty trust: Necessary conditions for each other? Educational Administration Quarterly, 42, 236-255.

37. Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. The High School Journal, 86(2), 38-49.

38. Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J. & Hoy, A. (2007). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. In W. K. Hoy & M. F. DiPaola (Eds.). Essential Ideas for the Reform of American Schools (pp. 26-34). Information Age.

39. Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 43(3), 425-446.

40. Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 43(3), 425-446.

41. Kingdon, G. G. (2007). The progress of school education in India. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 23(2), 168-195.

42. Kirby, M. M. (2009). Academic optimism and community engagement in urban elementary schools. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

43. Kirby, M. M., & DiPaola, M. F. (2011). Academic optimism and community engagement in urban schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 45(5), 556-568

44. Kurz, N. M. (2006). The relationship between teachers' sense of academic optimism and commitment to the profession (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3217407).

45. Levpuscek, M.P., & Zupancic, M.(2009). Math achievement in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement, teachers' behavior, and students' motivational beliefs about Math. Journal of Early Adolescence, 29(4), 541-570.

46. Lewin, R., & Regine, B. (2000). The soul at work: Listen, respond, let go: Embracing complexity science for business success. New York, NY: Orion Business.

47. May, J. D. (2016). The effects of individual and school mindfulness on the academic optimism in schools in north Alabama (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 10162705)

48. Mc Guigan, J. (2005). Neo-liberalism, culture and policy. International journal of cultural policy, 11(3), 229-241.

49. Mc Guigan, L., & Hoy, W. K. (2006). Principal leadership: Creating a culture of academic optimism to improve achievement for all students. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5(3), 203–229.

50. Messick, P. P. (2012). Examining relationships among enabling school structures, academic optimism and organizational citizenship behaviors (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3520487).

51. Mitchell, R. M., Mendiola, B., Schumacker, R. E. & Lowery, X. M., (2016). Creating a school context of success: The role of enabling school structure and academic optimism. Journal of Educational Administration, 54(6), 626–646.

52. Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. American psychologist, 55(1), 56.

53. Ngidi, D. P. (2012). Academic optimism: An individual teacher belief. Educational Studies, 38(2), 139-150.

54. Pajares, F. (2001).Toward a positive psychology of academic motivation. The Journal of Educational Research, 95(1), 27-35.

55. Perelli, T. E., (2018). Principal Support and Academic Optimism in Urban High Schools.
Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects. Paper 1530192495. http://dx.doi.org/10.25774/w4-vszg-a163

56. Roney, K., Coleman, H., & Schlichting, K. A. (2007). Linking the organizational health of middle grades schools to student achievement. NASSP Bulletin, 91(4), 289–321. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636507310161

57. Schwabsky, N., Erdogan, U., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2019). Predicting school innovation: The role of collective efficacy and academic press mediated by faculty trust. Journal of Educational Administration, 58(2), 246-262.

58. Seligman, M. E. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. Handbook of positive psychology, 2(2), 3-12.

59. Sergiovanni, T. (2007).Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles (2nded). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

60. Sims, R. (2011). Mindfulness and academic optimism: A test of their relationship (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3461140).

61. Smith, P. A., & Hoy, W. K. (2007). Academic optimism and student achievement in urban elementary schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 45(5), 556-568.

62. Srivastava, A. P., &Dhar, R. L. (2016). Impact of leader member exchange, human resource management practices and psychological empowerment on extra role performances: the mediating role of organisational commitment. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 65(3), 351-377.

63. Thorn, L. A. (2018). School academic optimism and physical fitness (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 10837949)

64. Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools. Jossey-Bass.

65. Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014).Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools (2nded.). Jossey-Bass.

66. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. Leadership and policy in schools, 3(3), 189-209.

67. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004).Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3(3), 189-209.

68. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 53(1), 66-92. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0024.

69. Tschannen-Moran, M., Bankole, R. A., Mitchell, R. M., & Moore, D. M. (2013). Student academic optimism: A confirmatory factor analysis. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(2), 150-174

70. Wagner, C. A. (2008). Academic optimism of Virginia high school teachers: Its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3302006)

71. Weinstein, C. S., & Mignano, A. J. (2011). Elementary classroom management: Lessons from research and practice. McGraw-Hill.

72. Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989).Social cognitive theory of organizational management. The Academy of Management Review, 14(3), 361-384.

73. Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Educational psychology in teacher education. Educational Psychologist, 35(4), 257-270.

74. Woolfolk Hoy, A., Davis, H., & Pape, S. (2008). Teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and thinking. In P. A. Alexander & P. H, Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 715–737.). Erlbaum.

75. Woolley, L., Caza, A., & Levy, L. (2011). Authentic leadership and follower development: Psychological capital, positive work climate, and gender. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 18(4), 438-448.

76. Wu, J. H. (2013). Academic optimism and collective responsibility: An organizational model of the dynamics of student achievement. Asia Pacific Education Review, 14(3), 419-433.

77. Wu, J. H., Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2013). Enabling school structure, collective responsibility, and a culture of academic optimism: Toward a robust model of school performance in Taiwan. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(2), 176-193.

78. Wu, J. H., Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2013). Enabling school structure, collective responsibility, and a culture of academic optimism: Toward a robust model of school performance in Taiwan. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(2), 176-193

79. Wu, J., & Sheu, T. (2015). How to improve academic optimism? An inquiry from the perspective of school resource and investment. Asia Pacific Education Review, 16(4), 663-674.

80. Yildiz, G., & Ozer, A. (2012). Examining of adaptability of academic optimism scale into Turkish language. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 47, 566-571.