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Abstract

This study attempts to identify the relation of educational hope with educational satisfaction, educational attempt and the educational progress of the students of Tehran’s smart schools. The statistical population comprises all teachers of smart schools of Tehran’s 19 districts in the academic year 2011-2012. The two-stage cluster random sampling was employed to choose the sample. Research tools comprise researcher-made questionnaires of educational hope ($\alpha = 0.89$), researcher-made questionnaire of students' educational satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.93$), and researcher-made questionnaire of educational effort ($\alpha = 0.95$), as well as the comparison of students' grades in educational attainment tests during two consecutive semesters. Generally, the research findings reveal that the impact of all investigated variables on educational has been significant. Educational hope based upon educational aptitude (0.26) has the greatest impact and after that, educational hope based upon social status (0.24) ranks second. Educational hope based upon economic status (0.28) ranks third in terms of having the greatest impact on educational attainment of students of Tehran’s smart schools. Satisfaction with teacher has the greatest indirect impact upon students’ educational attainment (0.055). According to the above table, $GFI = 0.96$, $RMR=0.087$, $P (value) = 0.000$, and $df = 3$ which indicate relatively high fitness of the model.
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1. Introduction

The educational hope influence on Students’ educational attainment Although hope is not an emotion, it is a dynamic motivational cognitive system (Khalengji, 2007). One the most significant theories regarding hope is Snyder's theory. The intellectual foundation of this theory is the fact that hope is defined as a person's expectation for success in achieving their goals (Khodakakhishi, 2004). According to Snyder, et al. (2000) hope is defined as the perceived potential for producing routes toward desirable goals and the perceived motivation to follow these routes. Studies conducted by Fadayee and et al.(2007), and Tavakoli (1999) indicate that educational enthusiasm is one of the factors affecting educational attainment and effort. Researches reveal that hope is a valid predictor for scientific success (Boldridge, 2002). According to preliminary studies, components of educational hope in this research fall into three categories including: 1. Educational hope based upon educational aptitude, 2. Educational hope based upon major's social status, and 3. Educational hope based upon major's economic status. Studies by Weiner (1985), Zeidner (1998), Pekrun (2006) and Pekrun et al. (2010) revealed that there is a significant correlation between educational hope and educational satisfaction. Educational hope refers to the student's cognitive, sentimental and behavioral reaction to the subject of study and learning (Pavot & Dienner, 1993). Educational satisfaction makes educational effort. Educational effort is explainable based upon the activity theory studied in Houman's (1987) research regarding prediction of educational attainment. Findings by Aminzadeh & Sarmad (2004) revealed that extracurricular activities play a significant part in educational attainment. It should be noted that although structural models have been
designed and proposed for educational attainment conducted in the past (cases such as Katyal and Bindra, 1995; Krishnamurthy, 2003; Singh et al., 2002; Powell & Arriola, 2003; and Tavani & Losh, 2003), the relations between research variables such as educational hope and educational satisfactions as aftermath variables and educational effort as mediator variable have not been investigated. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the relations among these factors based upon the fitted structural model. It also studies the impacts of the antecedent variables on educational attainment of students of Tehran's smart schools.

**Theoretical framework of research**

Studies conducted by Baykal et al. (2006) revealed that achieving learners' interest is a factor effective in prompting educational centers. Since learners are the clients of educational institutes, attention to their views and expectations and giving feedback to them will influence their learning. They believe that too much work (such as too many assignments) reduces students' educational satisfaction. Findings by Ansari and Eskerouchi (2006) show that students' educational satisfaction enhances their educational attainment. Edraki et al. (2011) conclude that the correlation between educational satisfaction and educational attainment in nursing students is significant. Bloom (1968) believes that affective entry behaviors (i.e., interest and motivation) play a significant part in educational attainment (Rezayee, 2005). Fardanesh (2004), as cited in Keller (1983) believes educational satisfaction depends mostly upon learning environment. Powell et al. (2003) believes that satisfaction, as a motivational factor, could affect individual performance and activities and increase the individual's cognition, achievements, responsibility and attainment. Pekrun (2006) states that there is a mutual relation between educational satisfaction, effort, achievements and circular consequences so that the person's effort causes them to achieve more success. Satisfaction, together with successes and achievements, provides a friendly, supporting atmosphere for the learner which results in the increase of their success and satisfaction. Therefore, according to the model of this research, it is expected that the increase of educational attainment result in the increase of educational satisfaction. Due to the mutuality of this relationship, educational satisfaction leads to educational attainment. Etikson (1980), as cited in Bahrami & Rezvan (2006) concludes that individuals who need more educational attainment are more inclined to acquire better grades and participate in extracurricular activities. In his research, Shah (1990) shows that educational attainment motivation has a direct, positive relation with educational attainment. Results of researches conducted by Yousofi et al. (2009), Gange & St Pere (221), and Koutsoulis & Campell (2001) reveal that there is a significant relation between educational attainment motivation and educational attainment. According to Atapoor (2001), there is a significant relation between educational attainment and personal attitude to education. Cool & Keith (1991) show that teaching quality and educational motivation have significant impacts upon educational attainment. According to Pavot & Diener (1993), the relation between educational satisfaction and control resource (internal – external) in university students is significant. Webb (1976), Leonard Hill (1986) and Watt Kinez (1993) as cited in Mortazavi (1988) argue that school's environment has a significant impact upon students' educational attainment. Kuller & Lindsten (1992) and Mo'eenpoor et al. (2004) concluded that schools' physical environment has a significant effect on student's educational performance. According to Abedi (2008), the majority of behaviors revealing educational motivation include insistence upon difficult assignments, assiduity or attempt to learn to master, and choosing assignments which need great effort. According to Trautwein et al. (2007), educational activity is significantly related to educational attainment motivation and emotional intelligence.

**Research hypotheses**

H₀: There isn’t a significant relation between the educational hope and educational attainment of the students’ of Tehran's smart schools.

H₁: There is a significant relation between the educational hope and educational attainment of the students’ of Tehran's smart schools.

H₀: There isn’t a significant relation between the educational satisfaction and educational attainment of the students of smart schools.
H₁: There is a significant relation between the educational satisfaction and educational attainment of the students of smart schools.
H₀: Educational effort doesn’t mediate between the relationship between educational hope and educational satisfaction, and the educational attainment of the students of smart schools.
H₁: Educational effort mediate between the relationship between educational hope and educational satisfaction, and the educational attainment of the students of smart schools.

2. Research methodology

This study is a descriptive correlational research. The statistical population comprises all the smart students of the twelve districts of Tehran in the academic year 2011-2012. The two-stage cluster random sampling was employed to choose the sample. Research tools comprise researcher-made questionnaires of educational hope (α = 0.89), researcher-made questionnaire of students' educational satisfaction (α = 0.93), and researcher-made questionnaire of educational effort (α= 0.95), as well as the comparison of students’ grades in educational attainment tests during two consecutive semesters. Expert's views were used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Data analysis was conducted by using multiple regression method and structural equation modeling.

Table 1. Descriptive and correlational indexes between research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational effort</td>
<td>54.23</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational hope dependent on educational aptitude</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational hope dependent on the major's social status</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational hope dependent on the major's economic status</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with school</td>
<td>38.28</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with teachers</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with lessons</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.01* & P<0.05**

According to the above table, between educational attainment and educational effort (r = 0.23), educational hope dependent upon educational aptitude (r = 0.17), educational hope dependent upon social status (r = 0.29), educational hope dependent upon economic status (r = 0.31), satisfaction with school (r = 0.34), satisfaction with the teacher (r = 0.32) and satisfaction with lessons (r = 0.31) there is a significant relation at P < 0.05 level. This indicates that the research hypotheses have been verified. The findings presented in the above table reveal that between educational effort and educational hope.
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dependent upon educational aptitude ($r = 0.28$), educational hope dependent upon social status ($r = 0.18$), educational hope dependent upon the major’s economic status ($r = 0.25$), satisfaction with school ($r = 0.22$), satisfaction with the teacher ($r = 0.31$) and satisfaction with the lessons ($r = 0.35$) there is a significant relation at $P < 0.05$ level.

Table 2. Routes tested in structural equation modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Research variables</th>
<th>Educational effort</th>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational effort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Educational hope</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependent on educational aptitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational hope</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependent on the major's social status</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Educational hope</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependent on the major's economic status</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfaction with school</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfaction with teachers</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Satisfaction with lessons</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings presented in the above table, the direct impact of educational hope dependent upon educational aptitude on educational attainment (0.183), educational hope dependent upon social status (0.492), educational hope dependent upon economic status (0.105), satisfaction with school (0.193), satisfaction with the teacher (0.174), and satisfaction with the lessons (0.086) is significant. The indirect impact of educational hope dependent upon educational aptitude on educational attainment (0.086), educational hope dependent upon social status (0.044), satisfaction with school (0.038), satisfaction with the teacher (0.067), and satisfaction with the lessons (0.098) is significant.

Table 4. Indexes of the structural equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P(value)</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table, $\text{GFI} = 0.96$, AGFI = 0.89, $\text{RMR} = 0.087$, $\text{P(value)} = 0.000$ and $\text{df} = 3$ which indicates the relative fitness of the model.
3. Discussion and Results

Attention to students' educational attainment in smart schools increases their motivation and their families' support for their entering such schools. As regards the first hypothesis, the findings reveal that there is a significant relation between educational hope and educational attainment of students of smart schools. According to Atapoor (2001), there is a significant relation between educational attainment and personal attitude to education. Shah (1990) maintains that educational motivation has a direct, positive relation with educational attainment. As regards the second hypothesis, the findings reveal that the relation between educational satisfaction and educational attainment of the students of smart schools is significant. According to Ansari & Eskerouchi (2006), learners' educational satisfaction leads to their better educational performance. Edraki et al. (2011) maintain that the relation between educational satisfaction and educational attainment of nursing students is significant. Findings of the researches conducted by Zeidner (1998), Pekrun (2006), and Pekrun et al. reveal that there is a significant relation between educational hope and educational satisfaction which aids educational attainment. As regards the third hypothesis, the research findings reveal that the effect of all investigated variables upon the educational attainment of the students of smart schools is significant. The indirect effect of educational hope dependent upon educational aptitude on educational attainment (0.086), educational hope dependent
upon the major's social status (0.011), educational hope dependent upon the major's economic status (0.044), satisfaction with school (0.038), satisfaction with the teacher (0.067) and satisfaction with the lessons (0.098) is significant. According to the structural equation modeling, the indexes GFI =0.96, AGFI = 0.89, RMR = 0.087, P (value) = 0.000 and df = 3 which indicates the model's relatively desirable fitness.

4. Conclusion

The results of this research showed that there were relation between educational hope and educational satisfaction with students’ educational attainment. Also Educational effort mediates between the relationship between educational hope and educational satisfaction, and the educational attainment of the students of smart schools.
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