P-ISSN: 2709-6254	Journal of Development and Social Sciences	April-June 2023, Vol.4, No.2
O-ISSN:2709-6262	http://dx.doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023(4-II)02	[16-28]

Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Academic Optimism: A Study of Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions

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

1. Assistant Professor, Division of Education, University of Education Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor (Visiting), Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punja Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** rizwanahmad@ue.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Teachers' positive conviction demonstrates that they can influence students' classroom, learning, and academic performance by putting their trust in their parents and cooperating with them. It is highlighted by believing their capabilities to overcome the hurdles and retort to failure with resilience as well as perseverance. The present research study was carried out to investigate the state of academic optimism as well as the relationship between its various aspects. The research makes a theoretical, managerial, or academic contribution. 1266 secondary school teachers were chosen at random from 216 Government Secondary Schools in Punjab. With permission, the Academic Optimism Survey was adapted. Pilot testing was used to ensure the instrument's validity and reliability. Data were collected in regularly scheduled meetings. To examine the data, descriptive as well as inferential statistics were employed. The ethics of research were followed. Teachers were found academically optimistic both at teachers and schools level. They confirmed the presence of academic optimism as well as its sub factors in the schools. A positive relationship was observed among collective efficacy, faculty trust and academic emphasis. There was no significant difference in academic optimism based on demographic variables. Without a doubt, school administrators may make wise choices regarding the adoption and implementation of best practices in their institutions. They might use the knowledge in the professional development programs.

KEYWORDS Faculty Trust, Collective Efficacy, Academic Emphasis, Optimism, Psychology, Trust

Introduction

Schools like other organizations, share comparable characteristics. They encounter issues that have an impact on the success and failure of various enterprises (Oplatka, 2009). The best ideas in teaching and learning are reflected in the vision that effective leaders help schools develop. (Lynch, 2015). Realizing a compelling mission statement promotes student success and lays the groundwork for a supportive school climate (Fiore, 2014). Employees are guided by the culture of the school in a consistent manner. It provides purpose and value for educators, students, and leaders. Researchers highlight different factors related to high performing schools (Beard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2010).

Prior to World War II, psychology was intertwined with the treatment of emotional problems, assisting people in living fruitful lives, and developing talent. Academic optimism has been studied as a component of optimizing human performance in this context. It has the potential to influence the outcomes that lead to human functioning (Huppert& Johnson, 2010). The acts and feelings of individuals in the context of hope and happiness are its main concerns. People having optimism tend to possess better moods, perseverance and success. They experience better physical health. Optimistic teachers emphasize positive qualities among their students, classrooms, and schools (Rand, 2009; Smith & Hoy, 2007).

It illustrates human actions in which optimism is the predominant theme, thus it is regarded as the collective set of dogmas regarding qualities and capacities of schools. In a school where the faculty have faith in that they can brought about change, students learn more, and achieve high level of academic performance is where academic optimism is practiced. It nurtures what is best in schools in order to enable students' learning. Schools demonstrating extraordinary academic optimism own the faculty which believes to bring about the change and where the students can be engaged in high level learning (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Efficacy is group confidence which is deemed cognitive in nature. Trust is affective in the sense that it manages sentiments mainly the idea that someone could be supposed to be gifted of doing their part of the process (Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006).

The cornerstone of social cognitive theory is self-efficacy, according to Wood and Bandura (1989). 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 matters. Teachers serve as role models for one another in an educational institution with a strong sense of collective efficacy. Teachers' actions are influenced by their perceptions of themselves and their coworkers. Collective efficacy increases teachers' willingness to accept inspiring goals and exert long-term organizational effort. The environment influences instructors' efforts because it promotes tenacity in the face of difficulty. It encourages a sense of purpose and helps uphold standards that are high (McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004).

Teachers may not feel compelled to work tirelessly to effect change if they do not lack trust, nor will they be able to challenge prevailing structures where necessary. Interpersonal trust in school organizations results in change that may be attributed to increased student achievement (Lewin & Regine, 2000). Shared learning goals among instructors, parents, and children lead to trust. It might make it possible to define and achieve shared learning goals, which would boost student achievement (Halverson, 2007; Hoy, Gage, & Tarter, 2006). Behavior is the primary determinant of trust. It alludes to a setting that is welcoming, kind, and legitimate (Tcshannen-Moran, 2014).

Academic emphasis denotes the combined buoyancy that the teaching process entails and learning is prevailing tenacity in the organizations. It portrays how much the organization is driven by journey for academic performance. In such institutions, teachers have confidence in their abilities. They also believe that their students can realize aggravated academic standards. Schools rich in academic emphasis are believed to be vigorous and healthy. In such schools, teachers are believed to like each other, students' regard one other and all are highly motivated (Tschannen-Moran & Garies, 2015; Wagner & Dipaola, 2011). Academic emphasis may help in diminishing dropout rate through increasing the prominence of academic achievement (Bower, Bowen, & Powers, 2010).

Material and Methods

Research Design

This was a descriptive research which expects to validate previous findings concerning the variable in order to provide basic direction to reinforce leadership in schools. In this research, the constructs were measured through cross-sectional survey. The method of investigation chosen was the positivist research paradigm.

Sampling

The study's participants were SSTs from government high schools in Punjab. The Punjab province's 36 districts are home to 6662 government high schools and a total of 48652 SSTs. The researcher chose 18 districts (or 50%) at random from the province of Punjab's 36 districts. To do this, the researcher employed the "lottery approach. Twelve high

schools were selected from each district (six for boys and six for females) using a table of random numbers. Every teacher who worked at a government high school was included in the cluster that was made up of those schools.

Instrumentation

In conjunction with the survey, demographic information was gathered to provide data for descriptive statistics. The state of academic optimism was measured through Academic Optimism Survey (AOS). This survey gauges academic optimism (AO) and its three subscales, faculty trust (FT), collective efficacy (CE), and academic emphasis (AE) (AE). It was designed by Hoy, Gage, and Tarter (2006). The first 22 items on a six-point Likert scale, with strongly disagree (SD) to strongly agree (SA) were used to gauge Faculty Trust (FT) and Collective Efficacy (CE). Eight final questions measured academic emphasis that ranged from rarely to very often. Together, these three metrics produce the image of academic optimism.

Table 1
Subscales of the Academic Optimism Survey

Sr. No.	Variables	Scale Item
1	CE (Collective self-efficacy)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.
2	FT (Faculty trust)	13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.
3	AE (Academic emphasis)	23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30.

Negatively phrased items were reverse scored.

Pilot Testing

It was distributed to seasoned secondary school instructors, heads of government high schools and university professors. They read each item and offered feedback on its appropriateness and clarity. Minor changes were made to the instrument in response to expert feedback. It was further tested on 94 participants yielding Cronbach's alpha of 0.85.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher contacted the concerned authorities to collect data from teachers. After making appointments, data was collected in scheduled meetings. The researcher explained the instrument during the meetings. To confirm attendance and the logistics, follow-up phone calls were made. An estimated response rate of 74.47% was obtained after 1266 valid questionnaires were received. The school level also included an aggregate of individual replies. To examine the data, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used.

Results and Discussion

Table 2
Item wise Descriptive Statistics of AOS

Sr. No.	**Scale Item**	***M***	***SD***
1	Collective Efficacy 1	4.37	1.32
2	Collective Efficacy 2	4.51	1.21
3	Collective Efficacy 3	3.77	1.53
4	Collective Efficacy 4	4.40	1.38
5	Collective Efficacy 5	4.14	1.33
6	Collective Efficacy 6	3.93	1.35
7	Collective Efficacy 7	3.59	1.45
8	Collective Efficacy 8	3.76	1.56
9	Collective Efficacy 9	3.93	1.45
10	Collective Efficacy 10	3.88	1.65

11	Collective Efficacy 11	3.42	1.53
12	Collective Efficacy 12	4.30	1.23
13	Faculty Trust 1	4.09	1.25
14	Faculty Trust 2	4.12	1.24
15	Faculty Trust 3	3.86	1.34
16	Faculty Trust 4	4.01	1.25
17	Faculty Trust 5	4.02	1.23
18	Faculty Trust 6	4.14	1.31
19	Faculty Trust 7	3.83	1.32
20	Faculty Trust 8	3.90	1.29
21	Faculty Trust 9	3.20	1.31
22	Faculty Trust 10	2.80	.93
23	Academic Emphasis 1	2.99	.80
24	Academic Emphasis 2	2.74	.88
25	Academic Emphasis 3	3.07	.91
26	Academic Emphasis 4	2.73	.89
27	Academic Emphasis 5	3.07	.90
28	Academic Emphasis 6	2.98	.88
29	Academic Emphasis 7	3.25	.88
30	Academic Emphasis 8	3.37	1.32

Table 2 presents the items wise mean and standard deviation of AOS. In the CE sub scale, second item has the uppermost mean (M=4.51; SD=1.21) while the item 11 possess the lowermost mean value (M=3.41; SD=1.53). Item 18 has the highest mean value on the FT subscale (M=4.14; SD=1.31). Additionally, the AE subscale's item eight possess the greatest mean value (M=3.37; SD=1.32), while item two has the lowest (M=2.74; SD=.80).

Table 3
Psychometric Properties of Academic Optimism Survey

Scale	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*MPI*	Range		Skewness	Kurtosis
					Potential	Actual		
CE	1388	43.68	7.57	3.97	12-72	19-65	.27	-.33
FT	1388	39.47	7.14	3.95	10-60	15-60	-.26	.21
AE	1388	23.63	3.97	2.95	8-32	11-32	-.15	-.03
AO	1388	106.79	14.53	3.68	30-180	56-150	-.02	.28

Table three presents the perception regarding AO and its sub scales. The perception is bases on individual teacher responses. Academic optimism (AO) is jointly forms by three subscales (CE, FT and AE). Perception of teachers regarding AO ranged from 56 to 150 with mean per item 3.68 (M=106.79; SD=14.53). Looking at the sub scales CE has the highest mean per item 3.97 (M=43.68; SD=7.57). It scale ranged from 19 to 65. The sub scale FT has the mean per item 3.95 (M=39.47; SD=7.14). The scale ranged from 15 to 60. Whereas the AE sub scale has the mean per item 2.95 (M=23.63; SD=3.97). For the scale and subscales, skewness and kurtosis were also calculated. It stated that the date would be evenly distributed. The numbers are within the range of +1 and -1, which explains why. Hence, parametric testing is considered suitable for the data. The data is assumed to be normally distributed as per rule of thumb when the values of skewness fall between +1 and -1(Westfall, & Henning, 2013).

Table 4
Relationship between Academic Optimism Sub Scales

Variables	M	SD	CE	FT	AE
CE	43.68	7.57			
FT	39.47	7.14	.40**		
AE	23.63	3.97	.27**	.49**	

AO	106.79	14.53	.79**	.83**	.65**

To see if there is a relationship between the academic optimism scale and its subscales, Pearson r was used. The variables were confirmed to be normally distributed by preliminary analysis. The linearity presumption was not altered. According to Cohen's recommendations, it was found that six pairs of variables had a positive correlation (1988).

Table 5
Difference in AO on the basis of Gender

Variables	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*P*	Effect size r/ Cohn's *d*
CE	Male	44.21	7.40	1386	2.64	0.00	0.07/0.14
	Female	43.14	7.71				
FT	Male	39.80	7.34	1386	1.73	0.08	-0.94/-5.47
	Female	39.13	6.92				
AE	Male	23.65	3.99	1386	.15	0.88	0.00/0.00
	Female	23.62	3.96				
AO	Male	107.66	14.77	1386	2.26	0.02	0.06/0.12
	Female	105.90	14.24				

Independent samples t-test was run in order to explore whether any difference exists in AO with respect to gender. Results revealed by the test as are presented in table five. Male teachers reported significantly higher levels of AO perception (M=107.66; SD=14.77) than female teachers (M=105.90; SD=14.24). Similarly, a statistically significant difference in teacher perception of CE was observed, with male teachers scoring no higher (M=44.21; SD=7.40) than female teachers (M=43.14; SD=7.40). However on FT, there was no significant difference in the groups. Moreover, in the perception there was no difference of male SSTs (M=39.80; SD=7.34) and female SSTs (M=39.13; SD=6.92). Similarly, no significant differences in AE were discovered between the groups. There is no distinction in perception between male (M=23.65; SD=3.99) and female (M=23.62; SD=3.99) teachers based on gender.

Table 6
Differences in AO based on Marital Status

Variables	**M.Status**	**M**	**SD**	**df**	**t**	**P**	**Effect size r/ Cohn's d**
CE	Single	43.18	7.23	1386	-1.62	0.10	-0.05/-0.11
	Married	43.99	7.71				
FT	Single	39.29	7.38	1386	-0.61	1386	-0.02/-0.04
	Married	39.55	7.04				
AE	Single	23.34	4.23	1386	-1.78	0.07	-0.05/-0.11
	Married	23.77	3.86				
AO	Single	105.81	14.17	1386	-1.65	1386	-0.05/-0.10
	Married	107.22	14.67				

Mean AO score of married and single teachers was compared through independent samples t-test was run. The results of the independent samples t-test are shown in Table 6. Single teachers (M=105.82; SD=14.17) did not report significantly higher AO perception than married teachers (M=107.22; SD=14.67). The mean AO score does not differ statistically in single and married SSTs. Likewise, there was no statistically significant difference in the perception of single SSTs on CE (M=43.18; SD=7.23) versus married SSTs (M=43.99; SD=7.71). In the same way, there no difference in perception of single SSTs (M=39.2; SD=7.38) and married SSTs (M=39.55; SD=7.04) teachers FT was observed. Similarly, there was no difference between the groups on AE. In the same way no significant difference in the perceptions of single SSTs (M=23.34; SD=4,23) versus married SSTs (M=23.77; SD=3.86) on AE.

Table 7
Locality wise Comparison of AO

Variables	Locality	M	SD	df	t	P	Effect size r/ Cohn's d
CE	Urban	43.49	7.42	1386	-1.28	0.20	-0.04/-0.07
	Rural	44.04	7.84				
FT	Urban	39.23	7.18	1386	-1.65	0.09	-0.05/-0.09
	Rural	39.89	7.06				
AE	Urban	23.52	4.01	1386	-1.54	0.12	-0.04/-0.09
	Rural	23.86	3.91				
AO	Urban	106.24	14.43	1386	-1.91	0.05	-0.05/-0.11
	Rural	107.79	14.68				

In table 7, the results of the independent samples t-test are revealed. It was detected that urban teachers (*M=106.24; SD=14.43*) rural teachers' perceptions of AO were significantly lower (M=107.79; SD=14.68). However, no significant differences were found based on locality in urban perceptions of CE, FT, and AE.

Table 8
Qualification wise Mean AO Score of Teachers

AO Sub Scale	Qualification	N	M	SD
CE	BA/BSc	143	42.35	6.41
	BS/MA/MSc	956	44.19	7.73
	MPhil/PhD	289	42.66	7.42
FT	BA/BSc	143	35.65	6.64
	BS/MA/MSc	956	36.12	6.57
	MPhil/PhD	289	34.78	6.57
AE	BA/BSc	143	30.31	3.88
	BS/MA/MSc	956	30.95	4.63
	MPhil/PhD	289	30.23	4.60
AO	BA/BSc	143	108.31	12.87
	BS/MA/MSc	956	111.26	15.03
	MPhil/PhD	289	107.67	14.49

Table eight presents the qualification wise descriptive statistics of AO. Qualification wise SSTs were allocated into three groups. Group 1 was made up of BA/BSc students, while Group 2 was made up of MA/MSc students. Furthermore, group 3 was made up of MPhil/PhD candidates.

Table 9
Qualification wise Difference in AO

Variable	Source	df	SS	MS	F	P	η^2
CE	Between groups	2	801.22	400.61	7.05	.00	.01
	Within groups	1385	78756.93	56.86			
FT	Between groups	2	403.39	201.69	4.66	.01	.00
	Within groups	1385	59914.27	43.26			
AE	Between groups	2	143.38	71.69	3.46	.03	.00
	Within groups	1385	28701.52	20.72			
AO	Between groups	2	3434.16	1717.08	7.94	.00	.01
	Within groups	1385	299678.98	216.37			

Table nine presents the results of one way ANOVA. Subjects were divided into three groups based on their qualifications (BA/BSc; MA/MSc; MPhil/PhD). There was a significant difference in AO based on qualification F (2, 1385) =7.94, P=.00. Moreover, the groups differ significantly on CE F (2, 1385) 7.05, P=.00. Data analysis also revealed significant difference in FT F (2, 1385) = 4.66, P= .01. Similarly the groups also differ significantly on AE F (2, 1385) = 3.46. P= .03.

Table 10
Qualification wise Difference in AO (Post Hog Test)

Dependent Variable	Qualification Groups	Qualification Groups	Mean Difference	*p*
CE	BA/BSc	MA/MSc	-1.84	.01
	MA/MSc	MPhil/PhD	1.52	.00
FT	MA/MSc	MPhil/PhD	1.34	.00
AE	MA/MSc	MPhil/PhD	0.71	.05
AO	MA/MSc	MPhil/PhD	0.99	.00

Table 10 shows the results of the Post Hoc analysis. It was used to decide whether the groups differed statistically. The mean score for Group 1 (M=42.35, SD=6.41) was significantly different from Group 2 (M=44.19, SD=7.73) on CE. The mean score for Group 2 (M=44.19, SD=7.73) was also significantly different from Group 3 (M=42.66, SD=7.42) on CE. On FT, group 2 (M=36.12, SD=6.57) was different from group3 (M=34.78, SD=6.57). Similarly on AE group 2 (M=30.95, SD=4.63) was different from group 3 (M=30.23, SD=4.60).

Table 11
Age wise Mean AO Score of Teachers

AO Sub Scale	Age	N	M	SD
CE	Below 30	544	42.90	7.35
	30-40	566	44.17	7.63
	41-50	208	43.83	7.86
	Above 50	70	45.39	7.45
FT	Below 30	544	35.21	6.81
	30-40	566	36.22	6.50
	41-50	208	36.16	6.29
	Above 50	70	35.81	6.34
AE	Below 30	544	30.26	4.69
	30-40	566	31.05	4.51
	41-50	208	30.99	4.35
	Above 50	70	31.13	4.31
AO	Below 30	544	108.37	14.82
	30-40	566	111.43	14.90
	41-50	208	110.97	14.05
	Above 50	70	112.33	14.47

Table 11 presents age wise descriptive statistics of AO. Teachers were divided into four groups based on their age. The classification was made on the basis of age. Group 1 comprised of SSTs under the age of 30, group 2 of SSTs between the ages of 30 and 40, and group 3 SSTs over the age of 50.

Table 12
Age wise Difference in AO

Variable	Source	Df	SS	MS	F	P	η^2
CE	Between groups	2	671.05	223.68	3.92	.00	.00
	Within groups	1384	78887.10	57.00			
FT	Between groups	2	312.91	104.30	2.41	.06	.00
	Within groups	1384	60004.74	43.36			
AE	Between groups	2	201.46	67.15	3.24	.02	.00
	Within groups	1384	28643.45	20.70			
AO	Between groups	2	3109.18	1036.39	4.78	.00	.01
	Within groups	1384	300003.97	216.76			

In order to explore the difference in AO, one way NOVA was used. Results of which are presented in table 12. There was a statistically significant difference in AO based on age F (2, 1384) = 4.78, P= .01. While on CE, the groups also differed significantly F (2, 1384) = 3.92, P= .00. Likewise the groups were found different on AE F (2, 1384) = 2.42, P= .02. Conversely the groups did not differed significantly on FT (P=.06).

Table 13
Age wise Difference in AO (Post Hog Test)

Dependent Variable	Age Groups	Age Groups	Mean Difference	*p*
CE	Below 30	Above 50	-2.48	.05
	Below 30	30-40	1.27	.02
AE	Below 30	30-40	-0.79	.02
AO	Below 30	30-40	-3.05	.00

Table 13 displays the findings of a post-hoc analysis using Tukey HSD to determine whether the groups differed statistically on age. Tukey HSD post-hoc comparisons were carried out to explore the difference in AO with respect to age. It was indicated by the test that on age the score of Group 1 (M=42.90, SD=7.35) was found different from Group 2 (M=108.37, SD=14.82). On CE, the age Group 1 (M=42.90, SD=7.35) was different from Group 4 (M=45.39, SD=7.45). Moreover, the age Group 2 (M=44.17, SD=7.63) was different from Group 3 (M=43.83, SD=7.86) on CE. Likewise, on AE age Group 2 (M=31.05, SD=4.51) was dissimilar from Group 3 (M=30.99, SD=4.35).

Table 14
Mean AO Score of Teachers with Different Experience Groups

AO Sub Scale	Experience	N	M	SD
CE	Below 10 years	722	43.48	7.53
	10-20	477	43.40	7.62
	21-30	147	45.07	6.94
	Above 30 years	42	45.43	9.25
FT	Below 10 years	722	35.55	6.66
	10-20	477	35.89	6.59
	21-30	147	36.43	6.06
	Above 30 years	42	36.64	7.21
AE	Below 10 years	722	30.50	4.60
	10-20	477	30.88	4.72
	21-30	147	31.31	3.85
	Above 30 years	42	31.05	4.13
AO	Below 10 years	722	109.54	14.87
	10-20	477	110.17	14.90
	21-30	147	112.81	12.88
	Above 30 years	42	113.12	17.15

Table 14 present experience wise descriptive statistics of AO. Based on their experience, teachers were separated in four groups. Conferring to the classification, group 1 had less than 10 years of experience. While group second had experience between 10 and 20 years. Group third had experience between 21 and 30 years. Group 4 had more than 30 years of experience.

Table 15
Experience wise Difference in AO

Variable	Source	df	SS	MS	F	P	η^2
CE	Between groups	3	478.64	159.55	2.79	.04	.00
	Within groups	1384	79079.51	57.14			
FT	Between groups	3	137.66	45.89	1.06	.37	.00
	Within groups	1384	60179.99	43.48			
AE	Between groups	3	100.34	33.45	1.61	.19	.00
	Within groups	1384	28744.56	20.77			

AO	Between groups	3	1676.03	558.68	2.57	.05	.00
	Within groups	1384	301437.12	217.80			

In order to explore the difference in AO, one way ANOVA was used. On the basis of age, it showed significant difference in AO F (3, 1384) = 2.57, P= .05. Similarly on CE the groups differed significantly F (3, 1384) =2.79, P= .04.

Table 16
Experience wise Difference in AO (Post Hoc Test)

Dependent Variable	Experience Group	Experience Group	Mean Difference	P
CE	Below 10 years	21-30	-1.59	.02
	10-20	21-30	-1.67	.01
AO	Below 10 years	21-30	-3.27	.01

Table 16 reveals the results of Post-hoc analysis. It was used to determine whether the groups were different statistically from one another. On AO, the mean score for experience Group 1 (M=109.54, SD=14.87) differed from Group 2 (M=110.17, SD=14.90). On AE, experience Group 1 (M=30.50, SD=4.60) was different from Group 2 (M=30.88, SD=4.72) and Group 2 (M=30.88, SD=4.72) was different from Group 3 (M=31.31, SD=3.85).

Conclusion

Academic optimism is an existing construct acknowledged by Hoy, Tarter, and Woolfolk Hoy (2006) comprising of collective efficacy (CE), faculty trust (FT) and academic emphasis (AE). Judgments of teachers with respect to the degree to which they can be effective are regarded as Collective efficacy. Trust upon parents and students are related to the conception that valued contribution of parents and students in educational decision justifies the need for teachers to trust parents. According to Hoy, Gage and Tarter (2006), academic emphasis is the perspective where the school is quite ambitious for academic excellence (Hoy, Gage, & Tarter, 2006). Forsyth (2011) described AO studies as the "Holy Grail" for educational researchers. Fahy, Wu and Hoy (2010) further extended the work of Hoy, Gage, and Tarter (2006). 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).

Academic optimism scores for teachers and schools are above the scale's median for academic optimism and its sub-factors. The data puts forward moderately high levels of academic optimism on overall as well as on the sub-factors. Teachers were agreeof its presence and each aspect of academic optimism in the schools. The existence of academic optimism in schools has already been supported by research (Anderson, 2012; Dean, 2011). Many other researchers also supported the findings (Guvercin, 2013; Messick, 2012). Similar findings have been revealed by many other researchers (Sims, 2011; Wu, 2013). This research builds on previous work at the school level (Gage, 2003; Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006; Wagner, 2008) and recent research on ESTs (Beard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2009). Additionally, there are numerous study papers that support this research (May, 2016; Mitchell, Mendiola, & Schumacker, 2016; Thorn, 2018). The existence of academic optimism in schools has already been supported by research (Dean, 2011; Guvercin, 2013). The literature confirms that AO improves student learning (Mc Guigan & Hoy, 2006). Smith and Hoy (2007) agree as well. The research confirmed that it is a worthwhile construct among elementary school teachers (Hoy, Hoy, &Kurz, 2007; Beard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2010).

Additionally, some previous studies also found the magnitude of academic optimism as being high in schools (Mc Guigan & Hoy, 2006; Shrivastva & 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;

M Guigan & Hoy, 2006; Mitchell, Mendiola, Schumacker, & Lowery, 2016; Perelli, 2018; Sims, 2011; Thorn, 2018; Wu, Hoy, & Tarter, 2013). Statistical analysis was run to reveal whether any significant difference lies in academic optimism with respect to demographic characteristics of respondents. Academic optimism did not differ significantly by gender, marital status, locality, qualification, age, or experience. Similarly, Ngidi (2012) discovered no differences in AO based on experience or gender. 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. Finally, mission statements and decision-making should be academic priorities (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004). The information should also be included by administrators in professional development programs for both teachers and leaders.

This study might be replicated in other populations as well as other geographic areas. Schools in this study were similar in many ways; therefore, a diverse population may provide more information. If this study was longitudinal and perceptions were tracked over time, it would be interesting to observe how much the results shift. Additionally, an elementary school-level qualitative investigation would yield insightful data. This kind of research could support earlier findings. Punjab's public high schools were the subject of this research. The findings might not be applicable to other provinces as well as regions of Pakistan. The reason might be different demographics. When recording their comments, participants must be able to recollect their perceptions, which may include their propensity to present oneself in the best possible light. The researcher's lack of knowledge about recent events could have an effect on teachers' perceptions.

References

Anderson, K. (2012). *Examining relationships between enabling structures, academic optimism and student achievement* (Order No. 1033785182) [Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn].ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

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.

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

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.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavior sciences* (2nded.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Dean, S. D. (2011). *Collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, faculty trust: Predicting teacher academic optimism in elementary schools* (Order No. 3461037)[Doctoral dissertation, University of Albama, Tuscaloosa]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Fiore, D. (2014). *Creating connections for better schools: How leaders enhance school culture* (1sted.). London: Routledge.

Forsyth, P.B., Adams, C.M., & Hoy, W.K. (2015).*Collective Trust.*Teachers College Press.

Gage,CharlesQuincey, III. (2003). *The meaning and measure of school mindfulness: An exploratory analysis* (Order No. 3119233) [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

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.

Guvercin, M. (2013). *Academic optimism, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student achievement at charter schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).University of Houston-Clear Lake.

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

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.

Hoy, W. K., &Miskel, C.E. (2013). *Educational Administration* (9thed.). New York: McGrawHill.

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.

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.

Huppert, F. A., & Johnson, D. M. (2010). A controlled trial of mindfulness training in schools: The importance of practice for an impact on well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *5*(4), 264–274. doi:10.1080/17439761003794148.

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

Lynch, M. (2015). *What factors make a school effective?* The Edvocate, MA: Allyn& Bacon.

May, J. D. (2016). *The effects of individual and school mindfulness on the academic optimism in schools in North Alabama* (Order No. 10162705) Doctoral dissertation, University of Albama, Tuscaloosa]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

McGuigan, 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.

Messick, P. P. (2012). *Examining relationships among enabling school structures, academic optimism and organizational citizenship behaviors* (Order No. 3520487) [Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

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.

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

Oplatka, I. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. *International Journal of Educational Management, 23*(5), 375-389. doi: 10.1108/09513540910970476.

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

Rand, K. L. (2009). Hope and optimism: Latent structures and influences on grade expectancy and academic performance. *Journal of Personality, 77*(1), 231-260. doi/10.1111/ j.1467- 6494.2008.00544.x.

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 organizational commitment. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *65*(3), 351-377.

Sims, R. (2011). *Mindfulness and academic optimism: A test of their relationship* (Order No. 3461140) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Albama, Tuscaloosa]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

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

Thorn, L. A. (2018). *School academic optimism and physical fitness* (Order No. 10837949) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Albama, Tuscaloosa]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

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

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.

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

Wagner, C. A. (2008). *Academic optimism of Virginia high school teachers: Its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors and student achievement* (Order No. 3302006) [Master's thesis, College of Williams and Mary, Williamsburg]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Wagner, C. A.,&Dipaola, M.F. (2011). Academic optimism of high school teachers: Its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, *21*(6), 893-925.

Westfall, P., & Henning, K. S. (2013). *Understanding advanced statistical methods*. Boca Raton: Chapman and Hall.

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

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.

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.