Student-Teacher Interpersonal Relationship, Psychological and Subjective Well-Being, and Academic Performance of Public and Private Secondary School Students in Cavite

[1]ThankGod Amukele Mahel, PhD., [2]Christian Ndede, PhD Candidate

[1]Adventist University of the Philippines

[2]Cavite State University, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300177

Received: 12 March 2026; Accepted: 17 March 2026; Published: 30 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explored the teacher-student interpersonal relationship and its influence on the psychological and subjective well-being, and students' academic performance/achievements in the overall academic weighted grade point average (GPA) of high school students in public and private schools in Trece Martires City School District, Philippines. The descriptive-quantitative research design, the purposive sampling technique, and stratified sampling techniques to stratify the respondents based on their grade levels. Four hundred and ten (n=410) respondents participated in the study. The study data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The frequency and percentage, mean, and standard deviation tools were used in the data treatment, while tables were used to visualize the results. The findings revealed both moderate and low levels of teacher-student interpersonal relationships. The research also showed a very high level of satisfaction with life about their families, friends, and belief in themselves. Similarly, a high level of satisfaction with their school and living environment was found. The research revealed that the construct joy for learning had a very high mean score, while school connectedness had a high level of academic efficacy. The findings on psychological well-being disclosed an extremely high level of psychological flourishing. This study concludes with implications for secondary school educators, basic education institution stakeholders, program developers, and curricula designers to consider the mental, emotional, behavioral, and interpersonal relationships between teachers and students as fundamental to their overall well-being and academic performance.

Key Words: Student-Teacher Interpersonal Relationship, Psychological and Subjective Well-Being, Academic Performance

INTRODUCTION

In all human activities, the construct relationship is so important that it is central in achieving positive and strong goals as well as objectives. Within education and so on, the relationship between student/teacher has been shown to have fundamental roles to play in developing students' psychology and behavior. It is well-known that the relationships that teach students in schools— the whole learning process, including teachers, peers, and principal relationships- have a bearing on students' developing social, academic, and professional skills for their study in schools (Pakarinen et al., 2018).

Students begin their educational experience in a different school, and the relationships they develop with teachers become critical for their academic success in the future (Heatly & Votruba-Drzal, 2017). But problems with mental health can negatively influence the development of young people and adolescents, making them less focused or have consequences for their academic and social lives (Cavioni & Zanetti, 2015; Cefai et al., 2014; Ornaghi et al., 2016; Thorlacius & Gudmundsson, 2019). Schools are one of the primary environments where children and adolescents learn to access mental health services (Costello et al., 2014; Georgiades et al., 2019; Green et al., 2013). It seems the interpersonal relationships in schools can help students to receive these services (Halladay et al., 2020). Yet teacher-student interactions are still very poorly understood. Tobbell and O'Donnell

(2013) identified a need for research on the dynamics of relationships between the learners and their school. Zhang (2022) also suggested that research on educators' perceptions of the students would be useful.

Thus, the motivation in this academic study to fill these gaps was brought about in this excellent work on the teacher-student friendship with regard to the psychological and subjective well-being and performance in high school in both public and private schools in Cavite, Philippines:

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Teacher-student relationships create emotional bonds that can be positive or harmful. As the teacher-student relationship promotes motivation and teamwork in student learning (Chen, 2016; Syahabuddin et al., 2020), and as such, the teacher-student collaborative interaction made the students' learning successful in the classroom (Li & Yang, 2021; Xie & Derakhshan, 2021). In contrast, a negative teacher-student relationship will cause the students' psychological and subjective health to suffer adversely. Fredricks et al. (2018), Hernández et al. (2016), and León & Liew (2017) found that students with a weaker relationship with teachers have less peer support and are often more negatively viewed by classmates.

In general, there seems to be a decline in teacher-child closeness amongst children as they get older, as the need for adult caregivers decreases (Jerome et al., 2009; Ansari et al., 2020). It is that smaller closeness that is more prevalent in schools (Ettekal & Shi, 2020), while it is still not certain what type of importance teacher attachment is given to this, as it is also based on the structure of secondary education (Spilt & Koomen, 2022).

As well negatively associated relationships hinder students' cognition and their motivation towards academic activities and routines (Woodis, 2019). Darling-Hammond (2006) points out, "teaching is in the service of students, which leads educators to feel the expectancy that they have to grasp how students learn and students need to be taught for them to learn more successfully and learn effectively, so education needs to make an adjustment of this expectation (Darling-Hammond 2006). Moreover, O'Connor et al. (2011) stated in the teacher education chapter that their study "proves elementary school teachers' perception about the role we play in children's relationship life and informs teachers about providing students with strategies towards developing meaningful relationships with them."

Psychologists call positive functioning an optimal mechanism: optimal performance when looking at physical, social, mental, and emotional factors through an overall positive model which prioritizes individual behaviour, positive feeling of feelings and the need to be in a positive environment and good place of social and financial experiences to develop the level of well-being of individuals (Wang et al., 2021; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2014). Well-being in psychology is often measured by objective measures of learner well-being as indicators of good traits and characteristics, positive characteristics and qualities, well-being that does not distress in sadness, worry, and anxiety (Kern et al., 2015). Well-being is a central educational objective, one in which a school system should be able to see into the future of a future student in their own classroom (Opre et al, 2018).

Teachers' knowledge of learners' well-being in educational settings is fundamental, considering their emotional, social, and physical well-being (Anderson & Graham, 2016). Classrooms should contribute to safeguarding this well-being, and we should establish a supportive and inclusive environment (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). Mensah and Koomson (2020) found that students are more accomplished if their educators are seen as supportive. Although a good teacher-student relationship makes for academic preparation and achievement and academic achievement, it may be harmful in the end (Mensah & Koomson, 2020). Ansari et al.'s further work is needed. Teachers who enjoy good relationships with their students are also said to report an overall moderate academic success in their classes (Ansari et al., 2020). Bad interactions can also lead to student underperformance (Ansari et al., 2020), and how students develop relationships with their teachers and teachers is difficult to determine.

Baños et al. (2019) noted that they observe that strong and positive relationships between teachers and students raise their motivation to succeed in the classroom very much to. However, students' social and cultural background, personality, learning style, and relationship with their teachers are very closely related to their abilities in academic achievements (Bhatti et al. 2020). An excellent school-to-school relationship between educators and students is inextricably linked (Mabunda and Mulovhedzi, 2020). As Lammers and Byrd (2019)

found, positive connections between teachers and students promote better success; students with better relations get higher grades. However, they reported that "their results do not compare significantly to those of students who experience good instructor relationships over time" (Lammers & Byrd, 2019).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This literature has dealt with a descriptive-quantitative research style with the job of describing historical and present phenomena, but in some cases, it may provide information to a new generation of researchers via data collection. Descriptive research is one that takes the process of simply observing, describing, and documenting events (Polit & Hungler, 1999). It is a way to collect data to give a vivid account of people, groups, or scenarios. For such data collection, questionnaires, structured conversations, and observation checklists are typical. In this particular study, data were collected using survey questionnaires.

This method fits nicely into the pragmatic worldview held by the researcher who naturally gravitates toward outcomes and "what works" (Patton, 1990) as opposed to the conditions that concern many other worldviews. Within this pragmatic worldview, it is understood that researchers need to be "free to choose the methods, techniques, and procedures of research that best meet their needs" and that they look to the "what and the how" based on its intended consequences (Creswell, 2007, p. 23).

The purposive sampling technique was implemented in this study. Purposive sampling is a technique used to select individuals who may purposefully contribute to answering research questions (Creswell, 2007). Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI) Student Questionnaire (Wubbels, 1993) was used to measure the student-teacher interpersonal relationship. Wei et al.'s (2009) study, using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), tested the two independent dimensions behind the 48-item QTI among a convenience sample of 160 Grade 8 students in China. The findings of the study showed reasonable model fit (CFI = 0.98; TLI = 0.96).

The Multidimensional Student Life Satisfaction Scale (MSLSS) (Huebner et al., 2003) was utilized to assess participants' life satisfaction. The instrument will offer five self-reported questions and answers that are questions that have been asked to assess youth satisfaction in the many stages of development. The readers reported being satisfied with family interactions, peer interactions, educational experiences, self-perception, self-esteem, and life. A 7-point scale was used to measure responses: 1 for a strong disagreement and 7 for a strong agreement. The coefficient alphas for the Total score (the sum of respondents' ratings across the five items) have been reported at .75 for middle school students and .81 for high school students (Seligson et al., 2003). Zullig et al. (2001) reported that alpha coefficients range from .80 to .85.

Student school well-being was measured using the Subjective School Well-being Questionnaire (SSWQ) (Renshaw, 2015). The SSWQ is a 16-item self-report behavior rating scale for measuring two classes of school-specific private well-being behavior: school connectedness, the joy of learning, and educational purpose, and one class of public well-being behavior (academic efficacy) (Renshaw, 2015a; Renshaw et al., 2015). The scale reliability first-order factors were strong indicators of a second-order factor (Student Subjective Well-being) that was also internally reliable, with .71-.93; .92.

The participants' positive and objective psychological well-being was evaluated using the concise Flourishing Scale developed by Diener and colleagues in 2006. This scale demonstrated high reliability and strong convergence with related measures. It showed substantial correlation with the combined scores of other psychological well-being scales, with coefficients of .78 and .73, respectively.

Student achievement data were gathered from the local school district for the 2015-2016 academic school year, two quarterly (semesters) periodical class exams. The local district uses the E-Class Record system developed by the Department of Education (DepEd) to gather data in the areas of student general academic performance. Student scores, for this norm-referenced assessment, were reported on an equal-interval scale called the RIT scale, which is continuous across grades and, thus, ideal for studying growth over time.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This explored the teacher-student interpersonal relationship and its influence on the psychological and subjective well-being, and academic performance and achievements of secondary school students. However, this paper presents the descriptive findings of the research study. The correlational analysis findings are targeted to be presented in the next publication.

Table 1 Demographic profile assessment of the respondents

Frequency on Sex, Age, and School demographic profile (1 missing item)				
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent (%)**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Male	145	35.4	35.4	35.4
Female	265	64.6	100.0	100.0
Total	410	100.00	100.0	
Age				
10-12 Years old	35	8.5	8.6	8.6
13-15 Years old	268	65.4	65.5	74.1
16-18 Years old	100	24.4	24.4	98.3
19 and Above Years old	7	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	410	100.0	100.0	
Schools				
School 1 (public)	265	64.6	64.6	64.6
School 2 (private)	145	35.4	35.4	100.0
Total	410	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 displays the study on the demographic profile indicators examined. Accordingly, the findings reveal that females were more represented by gender, with a frequency of 265 (65.4%). However, the males were 145 (35.4%). In the same manner, in terms of age ranges of the respondents, 15-15 years old were 268 (65.4%). However, those 19 years old and above were the lowest with a frequency of 7 (1.7%). School-wise, the frequency findings showed that schools were the highest with a frequency of 265 (64.6), while schools were the lowest with a frequency of 145 (35.4%), respectively.

Table 2 The summary descriptive statistics rating in teacher-student interactional behaviors on leadership, understanding, uncertain, admonishing, helpful/friendly, student responsibility, dissatisfaction, and strictness.

Summary of descriptive statistics on teacher-student interpersonal relationships			
Scale Indicators	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Verbal Interpretation**
Leadership	2.99	.665	Average

Understanding	2.83	.712	Average
Uncertain	1.67	.805	Very Low
Admonishing	1.92	.721	Low
Helpful/friendly	2.79	.704	Average
Student Responsibility	1.87	.687	Low
Dissatisfied	1.53	.833	Very Low
Strict	2.24	.619	Low

Legend 1.00 – 1.79 Never Very Low

1.80 – 2.59 Rarely True Low

2.60 – 3.39 Sometimes True Average

3.40 – 4.19 Often True High

4.20 – 5.00 Always True Very High

Table 2 results indicated that leadership had a mean score of (m=2.99, SD. = .665), understanding (m=2.83, SD. = .712), and helpful/friendly (m-2.79, SD. = .704), respectively. These findings imply an average mean score, which suggests a moderate level of teacher-student interpersonal relationships. Conversely, the results equally showed that admonishing had a mean rating score of (m=1.92, SD. = .721), students' responsibility had a mean rating score of (m=1.87, SD. = .687), and strict had a mean rating score of (m=2.24, SD. = .619), which implies a low level of teacher-student interpersonal relationships. Likewise, the results showed that the uncertain construct had a mean rating score of (m=1.67, SD. = .805) and the dissatisfied got a mean rating score of (m= 1.53, SD. = .833), indicating a very low level of the teacher-student relationships.

The study findings suggest that students, as co-observers of the classroom practices, were aware of the kind of relationships their teachers showed them. Consequently, the findings indicate that the teacher-student interpersonal relationships need the immediate attention of school administrators to encourage teachers to ameliorate the study findings by embracing positive teacher-student relationships and interactions. This is significant because students know that good teachers are friendly, caring, trustworthy, and supportive, show respect to students, and treat students as individuals (Krane et al., 2017; Power et al., 2018; Raufelder et al., 2016).

Conversely, a bad teacher is noted to be disrespectful, inconsistent, untrustworthy, and unfair to students (Krane et al., 2017; Power et al., 2018; Raufelder et al., 2016). Besides, these findings practically show an implication that could affect the school's social interactional culture and the psychological and subjective well-being of the students. Likewise, the findings demonstrate that the low levels of interpersonal relationships could equally influence students' behaviors adversely. The findings were congruent with past studies illustrating the impact of teachers' negative relationships on students' academic performance/achievement (Fredricks et al., 2018).

Moreover, these findings suggest that if nothing is done to foster a positive relationship between teachers and students, the classroom environment might adversely affect the essence of teaching and learning because of negative emotions permeating the classroom and student achievement (Adewale et al., 2021). That may also affect the goals of students and their parents' choice to enroll them in the respective schools.

This study's findings were in collaboration with Baker (2006), who suggested that solid teacher-student relationships could be one important environmental factor in changing an adolescent's learning pathway.

Therefore, teachers and school leaders should remember that healthy teacher-student relationships are unavoidable factors in yielding functional psychological well-being and effective productivity and academic performance of students (Fan, 2012).

Table 3 The summary mean rating on satisfaction with life in terms of family, friends, school, living environment, and belief in self correspondingly

Summary, mean rating, descriptive statistics on satisfaction with life			
Scale Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Family	4.88	.912	Very High
Friends	4.38	.700	Very High
School	4.22	.615	High
Living Environment (Neighbor)	4.18	.746	High
Belief in Self	4.63	.791	Very High

Legend 1.00 – 1.83 Strongly Disagree (SD) Extremely Low

1.84 – 2.67 Moderately (MD) Very Low

2.68 – 3.51 Mildly Disagree (MlD) Low

3.52 – 4.35 Mildly Agree (MIA) High

4.36 – 5.19 Moderately Agree (MA) Very High

5.20 – 6.00 Strongly Agree (SA) Extremely High

According to Table 3, families with a mean rating score of (m=4.88, SD. =.912), friends with a mean rating of (m=4.38, SD. =.700), and belief in self with a mean rating of (m=4.63, SD. =.791) had the largest scores. These results signify a high level of satisfaction with the people in the family in general (your friends) and you self to life. School got a mean rating (m=4.22, SD. =.615), while the living environment got a mean rating (m=4.18, SD. =.746). These results show that students were very satisfied with their school and living environment (Huebner et al., 2003). These findings show the respondents think their families are mostly better than the rest.

The respondents spend their time with their parents, and they are friends with their friends (Huebner et al., 2003) as well. The respondents felt they had good friends, and were happy to have them to help them in hard times, even come around. Also, the findings showed strongly that young adults trusted themselves, as well, and that they are willing to try a lot of new stuff. Similarly, respondents were okay with the neighborhood of homes to have and wished there was a large diversity of people living there. The respondents are highly happy with their lives, and the fact that family and friends also play a role in adolescents' lives is confirmed in their findings in this study. The research did show that the life satisfaction of high school students is decreasing as grade increases, but Dogan and Celik (2014) also found that students who live in school dormitories are more satisfied compared to those residing with their families (Dogan & Celik, 2014).

Such findings seem to imply a practical message that a student with a high level of life satisfaction is able to cope with life better and study. It aligns well with research for students who become very satisfied that they engage in school and find it easier for students to do well, as shown by Antaramian & Lee (2017), and are academically more sound in student achievement (low life satisfaction students). School authorities must consider sports more as a social forum through which students grow spiritually and socially. The results suggest

this because people with happy lived off lives become better at their work and also better equipped for physical health due to the health and social security they are able to receive.

Moreover, the high mean life satisfaction scores are positive: this demonstrates that students were generally satisfied as well. These responses are also consistent with previous research from Gilman and Huebner (2006), who found that students with higher life satisfaction were more positive when it comes to school and teachers. So, the very high levels of life satisfaction are not only borne out of positive life experience and personality traits, but there are many other benefits given to those students who tend to be more satisfied (Huebner et al. 2003).

Life satisfaction refers to subjective perception of positive well-being, not just an empty feeling (King et al., 2003), and has a correlation with positive results for students, including their student-teacher relations and health and education (King et al., 2003). Conversely, low levels of life satisfaction correlate with bad lives, including mental and physical health problems (Frisch, 2000). What is more is that this study differs from McCullough et al. (2000), which found that most adolescents in secondary schools had quite high life satisfaction.

Yet the findings highlight the positive role of family, friends, neighborhood, school environment, and self-confidence in helping students with their happiness with life and psychological well-being. The teacher-student interpersonal relationships could provide the building blocks that students require to build friends and feel at home and not so bored in school, so this might mean loneliness and boredom, which will make students less happy and therefore less successful in terms of study. This is in line with Sari et al.'s (2007) study result that student friendships have been associated with life satisfaction. As Bilgiç (2009) shows in her study, the impact of students interacting with their friends on themselves is also relevant.

Table 4

Summary: mean rating of school subjective well-being			
Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Educational Purpose	3.24	.583	Very High
School connectedness	3.06	.604	High
Joy for learning	3.24	.593	Very High
Academic Efficacy	3.03	.602	High

Mean Legend

5. Strongly agree	3.20 – 4.00	Very high
4. Agree	2.40 – 3.19	High
3. Neutral	1.60 – 2.39	Moderate
2. Disagree	0.80 – 1.59	Low
1. Strongly disagree	0.00 – 0.79	Very low

The table shows the results of the study regarding student well-being (school connectedness, joy for learning, and academic efficacy).

The findings show that educational purpose (m=3.24, SD.=.583), and joy for learning (m=3.24, SD.=.593) had an extremely high mean score; whereas school connectedness of students (m=3.06, SD.=.604) and academic

efficacy (m=3.03, SD.=.602) also scored high. This indicates that students' understanding of the purpose of education leads to joy for learning and is enhanced by positive school connectedness, and thus helps to enhance students' academic ability. With these results, students think about the things they do at school as essential, very much, the study reported for school matters. Additionally, the students recognized that they belonged at their school. This was to make students interested in learning new things in school, and in terms of the fact that they thought school would get them more in life.

Notably, the findings offer positive encouragement that the students perceived themselves as having good and productive lives at school. That is in synch with the theoretical suggestion by Renshaw et al. (2015) that adolescent and young child subjective well-being and improvement in social identity play a key role. The findings suggest that students perceived educational motivation, feeling a sense of accomplishment, as well as the fact that school connects all of us, are important for studying (Renshaw et al., 2015). However, these findings were contrary to the study of You et al. (2014), which found that youths' subjective well-being is significantly correlated with emotional and behavioral disorders (hyperactivity and attention, internal learning, and school problems) and predictability (You et al., 2014). Another piece showed that students who had a higher level of subjective well-being had lower levels of cumulative risk and cumulative assets (Renshaw, 2015).

Moreover, studies have shown that students' subjective well-being in school is related to student self-report of academic achievement (Renshaw & Arslan, 2016; Renshaw & Bolognino, 2016; Furlong et al., 2014). That means school administrators have good intentions to support the school culture of students getting the meaning and purpose, and being connected to the team and their peers, with others to achieve great joy in education. If that occurs, it will assist students to be academically good and achieve well academically, as well as if this can be made. Quinn & Duckworth (2007) stated that students with higher subjective well-being were more likely to get better grades, and better grades indicated subjective well-being (Quinn & Duckworth, 2007). These findings also accord with an earlier study showing that basic psychological needs satisfaction at school (Tian et al., 2016) had a positive overall influence on students' subjective well-being, which was related to school performance (Mortenson and Brown, 2016).

Similarly, Kaya et al. (2014) found that high school students have a positive view of the future and high subjective well-being, in which they are well. High school students' attitudes toward the future were not very positive and low on subjective well-being. At, the same time is associated with the future but also the high school students' attitudes of high school students were poor (Bodur et al. 2014). Furthermore, higher subjective well-being of students suggests a likelihood of achieving school-level academic success, especially for students who teach from poor schools (Voight et al., 2013), and as such, students' subjective well-being practices are more focused on the pedagogical world today.

Although their origins are varied, in this study, our work was further reinforced by Fredrickson's broaden-and-build theory (2013): students' subjective well-being leads to a broad awareness of what's happening as a whole, facilitating creativity, problem-solving, and other skills that are relevant to good school performance. These results suggest that students' school subjective well-being is well integrated with the educational purpose, joy for learning, connectedness, and academic efficacy in the teenage population. This finding has implications for education and school-based mental health services (e.g., guidance and counseling support systems).

Table 5 The respondents' assessment of the psychological flourishing construct

S/N	Psychological Flourishing Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1	I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.	5.34	1.635	Extremely High
2	My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.	5.17	1.471	Very High
3	I am engaged and interested in my daily activities.	4.81	1.744	Very High

4	I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.	5.40	1.374	Extremely High
5	I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.	5.50	1.411	Extremely High
6	I am a good person and live a good life.	5.60	1.474	Extremely High
7	My material life (income, housing, etc.) is sufficient for my needs.	5.13	1.446	Very High
8	I generally trust others and feel part of my community.	5.19	1.463	Very High
9	I am satisfied with my religious or spiritual life.	5.91	1.431	Extremely High
10	I am optimistic about the future.	5.64	1.447	Extremely High
11	I have no addictions, such as to alcohol, illicit drugs, or gambling.	5.65	2.102	Extremely High
12	People respect me.	5.23	1.463	Extremely High
	Overall Mean	64.57	11.848	Extremely High

Legend 1.00 – 1.83 Strongly Disagree (SD) Extremely Low

1.84 – 2.67 Moderately (MD) Very Low

2.68 – 3.51 Mildly Disagree (MlD) Low

3.52 – 4.35 Mildly Agree (MIA) High

4.36 – 5.19 Moderately Agree (MA) Very High

5.20 – 6.00 Strongly Agree (SA) Extremely High

Table 5 displays the results on the psychological flourishing of the respondents, whereby items 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 had the highest mean score, ranging from (m= 5.91-5.23). However, items 2, 3, 7, and 8 had an exceptionally high mean score in terms of score (m=5.19-4.81). These results show that they felt satisfied with their religious and spiritual life, and they had no additional addictions (e.g., alcohol, illicit drugs, or gambling). The survey data support the findings that respondents were optimistic regarding the future and are participating in life purposefully and meaningfully. These findings corroborate previous research evidence that flourishing is linked with emotional, psychological, and social well-being (Diener et al., 2010). Similarly, this study is substantiated by past studies that have found flourishing to be positively associated with personal development, relations with others (teachers and peers), and life purposes (Telef, 2011).

Nevertheless, Eralan-Capan's (2016) results indicated that hopelessness partially mediated the relation between flourishing and social connectedness and that social connectedness predicts flourishing through hopelessness. In other words, it implies that low levels of social connectedness are likely to lead to hopelessness, which results in low flourishing (Eralan-Capan, 2016). Besides, flourishing has been negatively associated with maladaptive indices such as loneliness (Diener et. al., 2010), depression (Wood & Joseph, 2010), self-judgment, isolation, and over-identification (Satici et al., 2013).

Ostensibly, this study's findings are consistent indirectly with past extant studies because past researchers confirm that a lack of interpersonal relationships with others and poor psychological and subjective well-being increase the risk for suicidal thoughts and disruptive behaviors (Daniel & Goldston, 2012). Moreover, poor

teacher-student interpersonal relationships could result in a lack of connectedness, which pertains to a lack of support accessible to an individual through social ties, poor interaction in a social system, or an awareness of separation from others (Kaminski et al., et al. 2010).

Similarly, connectedness is associated with hopelessness and despair (Bolland et al., 2005; Eraslan-Capan, 2016). They have no way to receive feedback from their environment, so they do not know themselves, and they view themselves negatively as they perceive that they are less valuable than others. Also, when they perceive their environment as hostile, threatening, and unfriendly (Lee & Robbins, 1998), they would be at risk of losing their mental flourishing potential and self-esteem with respect to this, and less academic performance could occur.

All of that aside, the teacher-student relationships are critical to facilitating students' psychological development. Additionally, the findings revealed that there will always be room to be social and allow the students to communicate and interact not only with their teachers but also with people outside of the classroom, which if an open interaction can happen, the students will benefit from this learning atmosphere which is also reflected in the weighted grading as per our scores at the end of the year. In addition, the results of this study suggest that psychological flourishing programs may be applied by high school administrators, especially guidance and counseling professionals, to make students realize that pursuing a purposeful and meaningful life and friends with teachers and people in the school community might help develop a stronger affinity between students and adults.

CONCLUSION

This research contributes significantly to the empirical literature on teacher-student interpersonal relationships and to high school students' positive and subjective psychological status, which leads to students' health, social, and academic well-being. Further, it's also observed at a secondary classroom level that teachers need to improve their interface and interactions with students to maintain relationships with them. But the study tells us about life satisfaction of students is important not just for psychological well-being but also for their academic performance. Likewise, abstracting from the findings, educators and school administrators in Cavite need to strengthen teacher-student rapport. This can be achieved by introducing a "Check-In Rituals". such as teachers positively greeting students by their names and asking about their well-being and personal interests (non-academic interactions).

Also, to bridge relationship gaps, teachers can intentionally focus on active listening to ease the emotional confusion of students. This is indispensable because it creates a non-judgmental safe space for students to vent grievances, build trust, and reduce feelings of helplessness. Additionally, teachers can purposefully humanize the classroom by sharing appropriate stories or interests to foster a sense of similarity, which research confirms buffers relationships. Humanizing relationships helps in showing students that they are respected and acknowledged as individuals. That equally creates a sense of care and support essential for motivating and building a positive and conducive learning environment (García-Moya et al., 2020).

Moreover, the findings suggest the need for enhancing the positive and subjective well-being of students. This can be institutionalized by creating and integrating a social-emotional learning culture (SEL) into the curriculum to teach emotional regulation, resilience, and mindfulness to maintain the extremely high flourishing found in this study, which is an essential tool in helping students to navigate stress that undermines their academic performance.

Similarly, family, friends, and belief in oneself influence the ability for students to participate in their development to functional, real-life, objective, and subjective well-being development, as shown here. Thus, it is an important duty to create the conditions and school and classroom environments in which children are able to interact with each other in the same manner as to encourage them in schools and be helpful in life to others. Teachers are so kind in the classroom, while people work hard for the school.

Implications

The results in this study highlight that positive and constructive teacher/staff relationships play a meaningful role in basic educational daily life. So, the work draws upon interpersonal and relational theories as educators by embedding them within programmatic teaching to deepen pedagogical learning processes for educators. Socially, school administrators can stimulate interactional school culture and school-based community facilities such as sports amenities, technology, internet facilities, and activities that promote social interpersonal relationships between teachers and student bodies. Policy-wise, the findings suggest the role of policymakers, administrators, educators, and parental collaborative synergy in making teacher-student relationships central to educational programs. Also, future researchers can explore the continuity of teacher-student positive relationships through the lens of teachers and students simultaneously.

REFERENCES

1. Adewale, B., Jegede, F., Okubote, F., & Olagbadegun, M. (2021). Impact Of Classroom Environments on the Academic Performance of Architecture Students in Covenant University. IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 665, 12017. doi:10.1088/1755-1315/665/1/012017.
2. Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., and Trautwein, U. (2018). Student misbehavior and teacher well-being: testing the mediating role of the teacher-student relationship. Learn. Instr. 58, 126–136. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.05.006.
3. Ali, M. R., Ashraf, B. N., & Shuai, C. (2019). Teachers' Conflict-Inducing Attitudes and Their Repercussions on Students' Psychological Health and Learning Outcomes. International journal of environmental research and public health, 16(14), 2534. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16142534.
4. Anderson D., Graham A. (2016). Improving student well-being: having a say at school. Sch. Eff. Sch. Improv. 27, 348–366. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2015.1084336.
5. Ansari, A., Hofkens, T. L., & Pianta, R. C. (2020). Teacher-student relationships across the first seven years of education and adolescent outcomes. J. Appl. Dev. Psychol. 71, 101–120. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101200.
6. Antaramian, S., & Lee, J. (2017). The importance of very high life satisfaction for students' academic success. Cogent Education, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.130762.
7. Baker, J. A. (2006). Contributions of teacher-child relationship to positive school adjustment during elementary school. Journal of School Psychology, 44(3), 211-229.
8. Baños, J. H., Noah, J. P., & Harada, C. N. (2019). Predictors of student engagement in learning communities. J. Med. Edu. Curr. Dev. 6, 1–6. doi: 10.1177/2382120519840330.
9. Bhatti, A., Pathan, H., Ahmad, A., & Hassan, A. (2020). Impact of learner-learner rapport on L2 learning: a study of public sector universities in Sindh. Pak. Asian EFL J. 27, 204–226.
10. Bilgiç, S. (2009). İlköğretim öğrencilerinde okul yaşam kalitesi algısının arkadaşlara bağlılık ve empatik sınıf atmosferi değişkenleriyle ilişkisinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey). Retrieved from http://tez2.yok.gov.tr.
11. Brookhart, S., Guskey, T., Bowers, A. J., McMillan, J., Smith, L., Smith, J., & Welsh, M. (2016). A century of grading research: Meaning and value in the Most common educational measure. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 803–848.
12. Bodur, H.O., Gao, T., & Grohmann, B. (2014), The ethical attribute stigma: Understanding when ethical attributes ımprove consumer responses to product evaluations. Journal of Business Ethics, 122(1), 167-177.
13. Carmona-Halty, M., Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2019). Good relationships, good performance: The mediating role of psychological capital–a three-wave study among students. Front. Psychol. 10, 306–320. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00306.
14. Cavioni, V. & Zanetti, M.A. (2015). Social-emotional learning and students' transition from kindergarten to primary school in Italy. In H. Askell-Williams (Ed.), Transforming the Future of Learning with Educational Research (pp. 241-258). IGI Global.
15. Cefai, C., Clouder, C., Antognazza, D., Cavioni, Cavioni, V., Heys, B., . . . Solborg, C. (2014). From Pisa to Santander: A statement on children's growth and well-being. The International Journal of Emotional Education, 6(2), 86-89.

16. Chamizo-Nieto, M. T., Arrivillaga, C., Rey, L., & Extremera, N. (2021). The role of emotional intelligence, the teacher-student relationship, and flourishing on academic performance in adolescents: a moderated mediation Study. Front. Psychol. 12:67. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.695067.
17. Chen, J. (2016). Understanding teacher emotions: the development of a teacher emotion inventory. Teach. Teach. Educ. 55, 68–77. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.001.
18. Costello, E. J., He, J. P., Sampson, N. A., Kessler, R. C., & Merikangas, K. R. (2014). Services for adolescents with psychiatric disorders: 12-month data from the National Comorbidity Survey-Adolescent. Psychiatric services (Washington, D.C.), 65(3), 359–366. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100518.
19. Creswell, J. W. (2007). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
20. Daniel, S. S., & Goldston, D. B. (2012). Hopelessness and Lack of Connectedness to Others as Risk Factors for Suicidal Behavior Across the Lifespan: Implications for Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment. Cognitive and Behavioral Practice. Volume 19, Issue 2, Pages 288-300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2011.05.003.
21. Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-Century teacher-education. Journal of Teacher Education, 57, 1-15.
22. Diener, E. D., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New Well-being Measures: Short Scales to Assess Flourishing and Positive and Negative Feelings. Soc Indic Res 97:143–156. DOI 10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y.
23. Diener, E., & Ryan, K. (2009). Subjective well-being: A general overview. S. Afr. J. Psychol. 39, 391–406. doi: 10.1177/008124630903900402.
24. Diener, E. D., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. N. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: Revising the adaptation theory of well-being. American Psychologist, 61(4), 305-314. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research/921.
25. Dogan, U., & Celik, E. (2014). Examining the factors contributing to students' life satisfaction. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice.14 (6). Educational Consultancy and Research Center. DOI: 10.12738/estp.2014.6.2058.
26. Engels, M. C., Pakarinen, E., Lerkkanen, M.-K. K., & Verschueren, K. (2019). Students' academic and emotional adjustment during the transition from primary to secondary school: a cross-lagged study. J. Sch. Psychol. 76, 140–158. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2019.07.012
27. Ettekal, I., & Shi, Q. (2020). Developmental trajectories of teacher-student relationships and longitudinal associations with children's conduct problems from Grades 1 to 12. J. Sch. Psychol. 82, 17–35. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2020.07.004.
28. Eraslan-Capan, B. (2016). Social Connectedness and Flourishing: The Mediating Role of Hopelessness. Universal Journal of Educational Research 4(5): 933-940, 2016 http://www.hrpub.org DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2016.040501.
29. Fan, F.A. (2012). Teacher: students' interpersonal relationships and students' academic achievements in social studies. Teachers and Teaching Theory and Practice. Vol.18:4, 483-490. DOI: 10.1080/13540602.2012.696048.
30. Farhah, I., Saleh, A. Y., & Safitri, S. (2021). The role of student-teacher relationship to teacher subjective well-being as moderated by teaching experience. Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn) Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 267~274 ISSN: 2089-9823 DOI: 10.11591/edulearn.v15i2.18330.
31. Fredricks, J.A., Hofkens, T., Wang, M.T., Mortenson, E., & Scott, P. (2018). Supporting girls' and boys' engagement in math and science learning: A mixed methods study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 55 (2), pp. 271-298. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21419.
32. Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Updated thinking on positivity ratios. American Psychologist, 68, 814 – 822. doi:10.1037/a0033584.
33. Frisch, M. B. (2000). Improving mental and physical health care through quality of life therapy and assessment. In E. Diener & D. R. Rahtz (eds.) Advances in quality of life theory and research, 207-241. Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
34. Frisby, B. N. (2019). The influence of emotional contagion on student perceptions of instructor rapport, emotional support, emotion work, valence, and cognitive learning. Commun. Stud. 70, 492–506. doi: 10.1080/10510974.2019.1622584.

35. Furlong, M. J., You, S., Renshaw, T. L., Smith, D. C., & O'Malley, M. D. (2014). Preliminary development and validation of the Social and Emotional Health Survey for secondary school students. Social Indicators Research. Advanced online publication. doi:10.1007/ s11205-013-0373-0.
36. García-Moya, I., Brooks, F., & Moreno, C. (2020). Humanizing and conducive to learning: An adolescent students' perspective on the central attributes of positive relationships with teachers. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 35(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00413-z.
37. Georgiades, K., Duncan, L., Wang, L., Comeau, J., Boyle, M. H., & 2014 Ontario Child Health Study Team (2019). Six-Month Prevalence of Mental Disorders and Service Contacts among Children and Youth in Ontario: Evidence from the 2014 Ontario Child Health Study. Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie, 64(4), 246–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719830024.
38. Gilman, R., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Characteristics of adolescents who report very high life satisfaction. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35(3), 293–301.
39. Green, J. G. McLaughlin, K. A., Alegria, M., et al. (2013). School mental health resources and adolescent mental health service use. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. Volume 52, Issue 5, Pages 501-510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2013.03.002.
40. Heatly, M. C., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2017). Parent-and teacher-child relationships and engagement at school entry: mediating, interactive, and transactional associations across contexts. Developmental Psychology. 53, 1042–1062. doi: 10.1037/ dev0000310.
41. Hernandez, P. R., Estrada, M., Woodcock, A., & Schultz, P. W. (2016). Protégé perceptions of high mentorship quality depend on shared values more than on demographic match. The Journal of Experimental Education, 85(3), 450-468. doi:10.1080/00220973.2016.1246405.
42. Huebner, E. S., Suldo, S. M., & Valois, R. F. (2003). Psychometric properties of two brief measures of children's life satisfaction: The students' life satisfaction scale (SLSS) and the brief multidimensional students' life satisfaction scale (BMSLSS). For Indicators of Positive Development Conference March 12-13.
43. Jerome, E. M., Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2009). Teacher–child relationships from kindergarten to sixth grade: early childhood predictors of teacher-perceived conflict and closeness. Soc. Dev. 18, 915–945. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00508.x.
44. Kaminski, J., Puddy, R., Hall, D., Cashman, S., Crosby, A., & Ortega, L. (2010). The relative influence of different domains of social connectedness on self-directed violence in adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 39, 460–473.
45. Kaya, H. Bodur, G., & Yalniz, N. (2014). The relationship between high school students' attitudes toward future and subjective well-being. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 116, 3869–3873. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.857.
46. Kern M. L., Waters L. E., Aldler A., White M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: application of the PERMA framework. J. Posit. Psychol. 10, 262–271. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2014.936962.
47. Kidger J., Brockman R., Tilling K., Campbell R., Ford T., Araya R., King M., & Gunnell D. (2016). Teachers' wellbeing and depressive symptoms, and associated risk factors: A large cross-sectional study in English secondary schools. J. Affect. Disord. 192:76–82. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2015.11.054.
48. King, L., Lyubormirsky, S., & Diener, E. (2003). The benefits of happiness. Manuscript submitted for publication.
49. Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk M., & Doolaard, S. (2016). Gender differences in the motivational profiles of students in mathematics, physics, and language courses. Educational Research and Evaluation. 22(3-4):214-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611 .2016.1243216.
50. Krane, V., Ness, O., Holter-Sorensen, N., Karlsson, B., & Binder, P.-E. (2017). "'You Notice that There Is Something Positive about Going to School': How Teachers' Kindness Can Promote Positive Teacher-Student Relationships in Upper Secondary School." International Journal of Adolescence and Youth 22 (4): 377–389. doi:10.1080/02673843.2016.1202843.
51. Kristjánsson, Á.L, & Einarsdóttir, J. (2018). Gender differences in the association between student-teacher relationships and student well-being during school lessons. Educational Psychology. 38(7):853-871. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410 .2018.1469469.
52. Lammers, W. J., & Byrd, A. A. (2019). Student gender and instructor gender as predictors of instructor-student rapport. Teach. Psychol. 46, 127–134.

53. León, J., & Liew, J. (2017). Profiles of adolescents' peer and teacher relatedness: Differences in well-being and academic achievement across latent groups. Learning and Individual Differences, 54 (2) (2017), pp. 41-50. Doi.10.1016/j.lindif.2017.01.009.
54. Lewis, A. D. (2010). Facilitating student engagement: The importance of life satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, College of Arts and Sciences, Columbia). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3402795).
55. Li, L., & Yang, S. (2021). Exploring the influence of teacher-student interaction on university students' self-efficacy in the flipped classroom. J. Educ. Learn. 10, 84–90. doi: 10.5539/jel.v10n2p84.
56. Mainhard, T., Oudman, S., Hornstra, L., Bosker, R. J., & Goetz, T. (2018). Student emotions in class: the relative importance of teachers and their interpersonal relations with students. Learn. Instruct. 53, 109–119. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc. 2017.07.011.
57. Mabunda, N. R., & Mulovhedzi, S. A. (2020). The impact of teacher-learners' interpersonal relationship on learners' academic success in a primary school of Soutpansberg West Circuit. Gender Behav. 18, 16034–16041.
58. McCormick, M. P., O'Connor, E. E., Cappella, E., & McClowry, S. G. (2013). Teacher-child relationships and academic achievement: A multilevel propensity score model approach. J. Sch. Psychol. 51, 611–624. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2013.05.001.
59. McCullough, G., Huebner, E. S., & Laughlin, J. E. (2000). Life events, self-concept, and adolescents' positive subjective well-being. Psychology in the Schools, 37(3), 281–290.
60. Mensah, B., & Koomson, E. (2020). Linking teacher-student relationship to academic achievement of senior high school students. Soc. Edu. Res. 2, 102–108. doi: 10.37256/ser.122020140.
61. O'Connor, E. E., Dearing, E., & Collins, B. A. (2011). Teacher-child relationship and behavior problem trajectories in elementary school. American Educational Research Journal, 48:1,120-162.
62. Opre D., Pintea S., Opre A., & Bertea M. (2018). Measuring adolescents' subjective well-being in an educational context: development and validation of a multidimensional instrument. Journal of Evidence-Based Psychotherapies 18, 161–180. doi: 10.24193/jebp.2018.2.20.
63. Ornaghi, V., Pepe, A., & Grazzani, I. (2016). False-belief understanding and language ability mediate the relationship between emotion comprehension and prosocial orientation in preschoolers. Frontiers in Psychology, 7, 1534. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01534.
64. Pakarinen, E., Silinskas, G., Hamre, B. K., Metsäpelto, R. L., Lerkkanen, M. K., Poikkeus, A. M., et al. (2018). Cross-lagged associations between problem behaviors and teacher-student relationships in early adolescence. Journal of. Early Adolescent. 38, 1100–1141. doi: 10.1177/0272431617714328.
65. Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
66. Polit, D. F., & Hungler, P. B. (1999) Nursing Research: Principles and Methods. 6th Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, PA.
67. Power, M. A., Graham, A., Fitzgerald, R., Thomas, N., & White, N. E. (2018). Well-being in Schools: What Do Students Tell Us? Australian Educational Researcher 45 (4): 515–531. doi:10.1007/s13384-018-0273-z.
68. Prati, G., Cicognani, E., & Albanesi, C. (2017). The Impact of Sense of Community in the School, Social Skills, and Exposure to Aggression and Victimization on Students' Well-Being. Social Indicators Research. 2017; 140(2):637-651. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205- 017-1808-9.
69. Quinn, P. D., & Duckworth, A. (2007). Happiness and Academic Achievement: Evidence for Reciprocal Causality. In The Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Society, 24 (27.5), p. 2007.
70. Raufelder, D., Nitsche, L., Breitmeyer, S., Keßler, S., Herrmann, E., & Regner. N. (2016). "Students' Perception of 'Good' and 'Bad' Teachers: Results of a Qualitative Thematic Analysis with German Adolescents." International Journal of Educational Research 75: 31–44. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2015.11.004.
71. Renshaw, T. L. (2015). A replication of the technical adequacy of the Student Subjective Wellbeing Questionnaire. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 33(8), 757-768.
72. Renshaw, T. L., & Arslan, G. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Student Subjective Wellbeing Questionnaire with Turkish adolescents: A generalizability study. Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 31(2), 139-151.
73. Renshaw, T. L., & Bolognino, S. J. (2016). The College Student Subjective Wellbeing Questionnaire: A brief, multidimensional measure of undergraduate's co-vitality. Journal of Happiness Studies, 17(2), 463-484.

74. Renshaw T. L., Long A. C. J., Cook C. R. (2015). Assessing adolescents' positive psychological functioning at school: Development and validation of the Student Subjective Well-being Questionnaire. School Psychology Quarterly, 30, 534-552.
75. Renshaw T. L. (2015a). A replication of the technical adequacy of the Student Subjective Well-being Questionnaire. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 33, 757-768. doi:10.1177/0734282915580885.
76. Reis, F. A. & Cunha, J. M. (2023). Student-Teacher Relationships and Human Flourishing: Preliminary Findings from Brazil. Advances in Research Volume 24, Issue 6, Page 205-212. DOI: 10.9734/AIR/2023/v24i61002.
77. Roorda, D. L., Jorgensen, T. D., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2019). Different teachers, different relationships? Student-teacher relationships and engagement in secondary education. Learn. Ind. Diff. 75, 1–15. lindif.2019.101761 doi: 10. 1016/j.
78. Sarı, M., Ötünç, E., & Erceylan, H. (2007). Liselerde okul yaşam kalitesi: Adana ili örneği. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 13(2), 297-320.
79. Schonert-Reichl K. (2017). Social and emotional learning and teachers. Future of Children, 27, 137–155. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/44219025.pdf. doi: 10.1353/foc.2017.0007.
80. Seligman M. E., Csikszentmihalyi M. (2014). Positive Psychology: An Introduction. New York, NY: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8_18.
81. Shephard, D., Falk, D., & Mendenhall, M. (2023). My teachers make me feel alive: The contribution of student-teacher relationships to student well-being in accelerated education programs in South Sudan and Uganda. Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education. 31:1-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925 .2023.2170168.
82. Spilt, J. L., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2022). Teacher-Child Relationships: A Chronological Review of Prominent Attachment-Based Themes. Front. Educ. 7:920985. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2022.920985.
83. Satici, S.A Uysal R. & Akın. A. (2013). Investigating the relationship between flourishing and self-compassion: A structural equation modeling approach. Psychological Belgica, 4, 85-99.
84. Syahabuddin, K., Fhonna, R., & Maghfirah, U. (2020). Teacher-student relationships: an influence on the English teaching-learning process. Stud. English Lang. Educ. 7, 438–451. doi: 10.24815/siele.v7i2.16922.
85. Tawana, P. M. (2020). Teacher-learner relationships and the effect on student learning at selected secondary schools in the Khomas region. Doctoral dissertation. Windhoek: University of Namibia.
86. Telef, B. B. (2011). The adaptation of psychological well-being into Turkish: A validity and reliability study. Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 28(3), 374-384.
87. Tobbell, J. & O'Donnell, V. (2013). The formation of interpersonal and learning relationships in the transition from primary to secondary school: Students, teachers, and school context. International Journal of Educational Research, 59, 11–23.
88. Thorlacius, O., & Gudmundsson, E. (2019). The effectiveness of the children's emotional adjustment scale (ceas) in screening for mental health problems in middle childhood. School Mental Health, 11(3), 400-412.
89. Tian, L., Pi, L., Huebner, E. S., & Du, M. (2016) Gratitude and Adolescents' Subjective Well-Being in School: The Multiple Mediating Roles of Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction at School. Front. Psychol. 7:1409. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01409.
90. Van Zyl, L. E., & Stander, M. W. (2019). Flourishing Interventions 2.0: a practical guide to student development. Positive Psychological Intervention Design and Protocols for Multi-Cultural Contexts. 435-448. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3- 030-20020-6_20.
91. Vander Weele, T. J. (2017). On the promotion of human flourishing. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.;114(31): 8148-8156. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.170 2996114 7.
92. Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Soenens, B., & Mabbe, E. (2017). Children's daily well-being: The role of mothers', teachers', and siblings' autonomy support and psychological control. Dev. Psychol. 53, 237–251. doi: 10.1037/dev0000218.
93. Voight, A., Austin, G., & Hanson, T. (2013). A climate for academic success: How school climate distinguishes schools that are beating the achievement odds. San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org/.

94. Wang Y. L., Derakhshan A., Zhang L. J. (2021). Researching and practicing positive psychology in second/foreign language learning and teaching: The past, current status, and future directions. Front. Psychol. 12, 1–10. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731721.
95. Wei, M., Den Brok, P., & Zhou, Y. (2009). Teacher interpersonal behavior and student achievement in English as a Foreign Language classrooms in China. Learning Environments Research, 12, 157 – 174.
96. Wood, A. M., & Joseph, S. (2010). The absence of positive psychological (eudemonic) well-being as a risk factor for depression: A ten-year cohort study. Journal of Affective Disorders.Volume 122, Issue 3, Pages 213-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.06.032.
97. Woodis, C. A. (2019). Teacher-Student Relationships and Their Impact on Student Achievement in School [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/671.
98. Wubbels, T. (1993). Teacher-student relationships in mathematics and mathematics classes. (What research says to the mathematics and mathematics teacher, No. 11). Perth: National Key Centre for School Mathematics, Curtin University of Technology.
99. Xie, F., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). A conceptual review of positive teacher interpersonal communication behaviors in the instructional context. Front. Psychol. 12:2623. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.708490.
100. You, S., Furlong, M. J., Felix, E., & O'Malley, M. D. (2014). Validation of the Social and Emotional Health Survey for five sociocultural groups: Multigroup invariance and latent mean analyses. Manuscript under review.
101. Zhang, Q. (2022). The Role of Teachers' Interpersonal Behaviors in Learners' Academic Achievements. Front. Psychol. 13:921832. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921832.
102. Zheng, F. (2022). Fostering Students' Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Teacher Interpersonal Behavior and Student-Teacher Relationships. Front. Psychol. 12:796728. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.796728