

# The Link between Student-Teacher Interpersonal Relationship, Psychological and Subjective Well-Being, and Academic Performance of Secondary School Students

<sup>1</sup>ThankGod Amukele Mahel, PhD., <sup>2</sup>Christian Ndede, PhD Candidate

<sup>1</sup>Adventist University of the Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Cavite State University, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300519>

Received: 14 March 2026; Accepted: 20 March 2026; Published: 15 April 2026

## ABSTRACT

This empirical research study examined student-teacher interpersonal relationships as a factor in psychological quality and their impact on students' educational performance. This study is of great importance given that evidence supports a connection that teacher-student relationships are critical in high school student life development, including the achievement of academic success, acceptance in society, and satisfaction of students learning about society. The descriptive-correlation research design, purposive sampling, and stratified sampling techniques assisted in stratifying the respondents based on their sex, grade levels, and schools. The descriptive-correlational and inferential statistics aided in the discussion of the findings. SPSS version 21 helped with data analysis, whereas Pearson  $r$  and  $t$ -test tools assisted in the data treatment, and tables helped to visualize the results. The results showed a positive and significant correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationship constructs and the subjective and objective psychological well-being indicators. The findings also revealed significant negative associations with family and belief in self. Also, the findings revealed significant mean differences between teacher-student interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to sex and school affiliations. The research findings' theoretical implications amplify the interpersonal and relational theories anchored in positive psychology approaches in connecting interpersonal relationships in high school and basic education, daily teaching, and learning pedagogies. The practical and social implications are that teacher education programs should emphasize the ability of educators to develop and foster positive interpersonal and interactional classroom cultural behaviors that empower students to assimilate respectful relationships with teachers and schoolmates.

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

## INTRODUCTION

Adolescents' psychological well-being and subjective well-being are the bedrock of students' learning success. This is important because students need functional mental, emotional, and social well-being to assimilate information learned in the classroom. But teachers do play a substantial role in making students enjoy their classes, or they may experience dissatisfaction with their academics and professors. Personal engagement and interaction are crucial for educators to foster a supportive environment where students can assist one another. School teachers need to encourage and facilitate these learning relationships. The quality of interpersonal connections between teachers and students significantly impacts their overall life satisfaction, mental well-being, and academic success. For example, the study by Newland et al. (2019) and other scholars disclosed that students' ability to connect in positive relationships have immense impact on their well-being (Nicholson & Putwain, 2018; Power et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2018). Also, positive, warm, and supportive teacher-student relationships have been associated with successful classroom management (Marzano et al., 2003; Wubbels et al., 2015).

According to Saxer et al. (2024), there is a link between interpersonal relationships and student well-being, which varies based on specific well-being aspects and individual characteristics such as gender, migration background, and socio-economic status. Teacher-student relationships (TSR) can be assessed using self-reports from either educators or pupils, as noted by Roza et al. (2021). The findings of Roza et al. (2021) and Endedijk et al. (2021) suggest that student insights offer a more detailed understanding of classroom relationship dynamics when taking into account both TSR and the impact of peer interactions. However, there is a high lack of literature on teacher-student interpersonal relationships. This was echoed by Tobbell and O'Donnell (2013), who called for more focused research that explores the nature of learning relationships.

Therefore, to close these gaps in the literature, this study investigated the teacher-student interpersonal relationship and its influence on the psychological (objective) and subjective well-being, and academic performance of high school students in public and private schools in Cavite, Philippines.

### Research Problems

1. Is there any significant relationship between the student-teacher interpersonal relationship and the student's well-being, as assessed by behavioral well-being as measured by Huebner *et al.* (2003) collaborative academic, social, and emotional well-being scale?
2. Is there any significant relationship between the student-teacher interpersonal relationship and the student's well-being as assessed by Renshaw *et al.* (2015) subjective student well-being scale?
3. Is there any significant relationship between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being as assessed by Diener et. al.'s (2009) psychological flourishing scale?
4. Is there a significant relationship between interpersonal relationships and student academic performance?
5. Is there a significant difference in the rating of the respondents on student-teacher interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to sex and school affiliation?

### Theoretical perspectives

Theoretically, the study was anchored on interpersonal theory and dynamic systems theory (Wubbels et al., 1985, 2011). The underlying theoretical framework of interpersonal theory (Wubbels et al., 2011) holds two basic conceptual elements, control (Agency) and affiliation (Communion). The concept of agency reflects the degree of dominance, power, and control. This can imply that the behavioral display of teachers, where they take matters into their hands, has power and control over students in the classroom. Conversely, the element of communion is the degree of love, friendliness, and affiliation shown during interactions. This happens in the classroom when teachers show love, friendliness, and affiliation instead of resentment (Gurtman, 2009).

This study utilized the Interpersonal Theory, as articulated by Wubbels and his team across various years (1985, 2006, 2012). The Questionnaire on Teacher-Student Interaction (QTI) serves to gauge the perceptions of teacher-student relationships through a framework that examines Control and Affiliation dimensions. It categorizes teacher behaviors into eight types based on these dimensions: leadership, understanding, uncertain student, admonishing, helpful/friendly, responsibility/freedom, dissatisfied, and strict behaviors (Wubbels et al., 1985; 2006).

Besides, another theory conceptualized in this study is the Dynamic Systems Theory (Thelen & Smith, 1994; Samuelson & Gilligan, 2014). This theory is used to bridge the gap between immediate interactions and long-term relationship outcomes. It helps in analyzing the relationship between these levels by connecting a micro-social or moment-to-moment scale (teacher-student interaction) and a macro-social or outcome scale (Samuelson & Gilligan, 2014). The theory aims to understand the changing patterns of moment-to-moment interactions in relation to changes in outcome patterns.

Consequently, these individual interactions can be seen as fundamental to forming interaction patterns within the social systems of schools and classrooms (Hollenstein, 2007). The interpersonal theory emphasizes the significance of warmth and agency in teacher-student relationships and suggests that these relationships are influenced by various classroom processes (Zijlstra et al., 2013). In this research, the interpersonal theory provided insights into the common interpersonal meanings that students associate with their interactions with teachers, reflecting their perceptions of the teacher-student relationship (Wubbels et al., 2006, 2014).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships as assessed by the respondents in terms of leadership, understanding, uncertain student, admonishing, helpful/friendly, responsibility/freedom, dissatisfaction, and strictness.

### Correlational Analysis

#### Problem 1: Assessment of the significant relationship between the student-teacher interpersonal relationship and the student well-being as assessed by behavioral well-being.

Table 1 Correlation between Teacher-student Interpersonal Relationships and Psychological and Subjective Well-being Variables

Variables	PWB (SL)	Pearson-r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
TSIR Leadership	Family	.264**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Friends	.265**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.307**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.226**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.260**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Understanding	Family	.253**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Friends	.258**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.287**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.192**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.242**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Uncertain	Family	-.076	.125	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Friends	.126*	.011	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.179**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.180**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.033	.505	Accept H0	Not Significant
Administration	Family	-.086	.083	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Friends	.145**	.003	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.142**	.004	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.249**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.077	.117	Accept H0	Not Significant

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

This section presents the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships as assessed by the respondents in terms of leadership, understanding, uncertain student, admonishing, helpful/friendly, responsibility/freedom, dissatisfaction, and strictness.

Table 1 shows the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being. The results indicate a positive and significant relationship between teacher-student interpersonal relationships in terms of leadership construct and family ( $r = .264^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), friends ( $r = .265^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), school ( $r = .307^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), neighbor ( $r = .226^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), self belief ( $r = .260^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This implies that teacher leadership behavior influences students' psychological well-being.

Also, the findings found a positive and significant association between teacher understanding behavior and construct and family ( $r= .253^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), friends ( $r= .258^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), school ( $r= .287^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), neighbor ( $r= .192^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), self belief ( $r= .242^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Similarly, a positive and significant relationship was found between the uncertain construct and friends ( $r= .126^*$ ,  $p<.011$ ), school ( $r= .179^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and neighbor ( $r=.180^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The findings indicate that understanding permeating between teachers and students is important in positively influencing the psychological well-being of students.

However, no significant relationship was found between uncertainty and family ( $r= -.076$ ,  $p<.125$ ), and belief in self ( $r= .033$ ,  $p<.505$ ). This implies that family and belief in self are not influenced by the concept of understanding in the realm of teacher-student interpersonal relationships. Additionally, a positive and significant correlation was found between administration construct and friends ( $r= .145^{**}$ ,  $p<.0003$ ), school ( $r= .142^{**}$ ,  $p<.0004$ ), neighbor ( $r= .249^{**}$ ,  $p<.0001$ ), but no significant relationship was found between administration and family ( $r=-.086$ ,  $P<.083$ ) and self-belief ( $r= .077$ ,  $p<.177$ ) with an interpretation of accept.

The study findings showed a significant positive relationship between teachers' leadership, understanding, uncertainty, and administration, and psychological well-being (family, friends, neighbors, school, and belief in self). Jones's (2015) study aligns with findings that emphasize the significant impact of a school's culture and the relationships students build with teachers and peers on their overall happiness. Similarly, Borgonovi (2015) found that students who experience positive interactions with their teachers tend to have a greater level of happiness at school.

Besides, relationships generate mutual satisfaction by contributing to students' experiences of relatedness to their social partners in the classroom, to their competence as learners, and to their shared ownership (with their teachers and peers) of creating a caring learning community dedicated to important academic work. According to Furrer et al. (2014), teachers have a special responsibility to support student motivation and learning through the provision of warmth and involvement, optimal structure, and support for autonomy.

Conversely, the results equally revealed a negative relationship between teachers' uncertain behavior and administration and students' family relationships. This indicates that the teachers were not connecting with the students' families. This finding implies that fewer teacher-student-parent relationships could undermine the efforts of students to achieve academically. That could equally retard students' psychological perceptions and appreciation of the teachers.

Furthermore, research has identified notable links between how students perceive their relationships with teachers and their emotional, behavioral, and academic competencies. These include attitudes towards school, their motivation to learn, and overall academic performance (Mikk et al., 2016; Roorda et al., 2011; Wubbels et al., 2016). Hence, the need for teachers to optimize their leadership skills, promote certainty in their interpersonal relationships with their students, and adopt administrative principles that foster the psychological functioning of students.

Table 2 Correlation between Independent and Dependent Variables

TSIR Indicators	PWB (SL)	Pearson-r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Helpful/Friendly	Family	.225**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Friends	.275**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.327**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.188**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Self	.296**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Students Responsibility	Family	-.048	.332	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Friends	.165**	.001	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.191**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.242**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.093	.060	Accept H0	Not Significant

Dissatisfied	Family	-.148**	.003	Reject H0	Significant
	Friends	.080	.107	Reject H0	Not Significant
	School	.072	.148	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Neighbor	.202**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	-.039	.439	Accept H0	Not Significant
Strict	Family	.062	.209	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Friends	.203**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School	.239**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Neighbor	.245**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	Belief in Self	.143**	.004	Reject H0	Significant

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being.

Also, the findings found a positive and significant association between teacher helpful/friendly teacher behavior construct and family ( $r = 0.225^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), friends ( $r = 0.275^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), school ( $r = 0.327^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), neighbor ( $r = 0.188^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and self-belief ( $r = 0.296^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Similarly, a positive and significant relationship was found between the student responsibility construct and friends ( $r = 0.126^{*}$ ,  $p < 0.011$ ), school ( $r = 0.179^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and neighbor ( $r = 0.180^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). There was no correlation between student responsibility and family ( $r = -0.048$ ,  $p < 0.332$ ) and self-belief ( $r = 0.093$ ,  $p < 0.060$ ), assuming that the null hypothesis holds. Nevertheless, our data shows that relationships between teachers and students are good and significant for students' well-being.

We also found a favorable and significant association between dissatisfied construct and family ( $r = -0.148^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.003$ ) and neighbor ( $r = 0.188^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), school ( $r = 0.072$ ,  $p < 0.148$ ), and self-belief ( $r = -0.039$ ,  $p < 0.439$ ), but not for friends. There were also positive and significant relations between strict construct and friends ( $r = 0.203^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and school ( $r = 0.239^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), neighbor ( $r = 0.245^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and self-belief ( $r = 0.143^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.004$ ) but not for family ( $r = 0.062$ ,  $p < 0.209$ ). These findings underscore the importance of teacher-student interpersonal relationships for students' psychological well-being.

The findings are consistent with recent studies showing a significant positive link between quality teacher-student relationships and students' psychological well-being, with supportive interactions fostering emotional health (Xu et al., 2024). Also, in Brazil, teacher-student relationships accounted for an additional 9% of the variance in psychological flourishing, underscoring their importance for student development (Reis & Cunha, 2023). Similarly, the positive and significant interactions observed collaborate with close teacher-student relationships, which can improve adolescents' health and well-being by reducing verbal, financial, and physical bullying victimization. In contrast, conflictual teacher-student relationships were associated with an increase in bullying victimization, which adversely affected adolescents' health and well-being (Ye et al., 2025).

Therefore, teachers need to model behaviors that allow students to express themselves in the classroom. Similarly, the results are essential for the effective functioning of physical, social, mental, and emotional health (Wang et al., 2021). This underscores the importance of fostering positive characteristics in individuals, encouraging beneficial emotions and experiences, and enhancing the supportive role of the environment and institutions in promoting personal well-being (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2014). This study aligns with studies that indicate a significant relationship between teacher connection and flourishing among early adolescents across 25 countries, including the Philippines (Whitaker et al., 2023). Subsequently, these findings demonstrate that having higher teacher connection scores correlates with increased prevalence of flourishing, suggesting a positive impact on psychological well-being (Whitaker et al., 2023).

**Problem 2: Assessment of the significant relationship between the student-teacher interpersonal relationship and student well-being, as assessed by Renshaw *et al.* (2015), subjective student well-being.**

Table 3 Correlation between Teacher-student Interpersonal Relationships and Subjective Well-being Variables

Variables	PWB (SL)	Pearson-r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
TSIR Leadership	EP	.300**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	SC	.321**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.314**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	AE	.189**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Understanding	EP	.232**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	SC	.296**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.231**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	AE	.161**	.001	Reject H0	Significant
Uncertain	EP	-.030	.540	Accept H0	Not Significant
	SC	.135**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.050	.314	Accept H0	Not Significant
	AE	.110*	.027	Reject H0	Significant
Administration	EP	-.022	.659	Accept H0	Not Significant
	SC	.096	.051	Accept H0	Not Significant
	JL	.023	.800	Accept H0	Not Significant
	AE	.071	.149	Accept H0	Not Significant

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
 \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 shows the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being. Accordingly, the findings found a positive and significant association between leadership teacher behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = .300^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .321^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), joy of learning ( $r = .314^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .189^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Also, a positive and significant association between teacher understanding behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = .232^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .296^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), joy of learning ( $r = .231^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .161^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Similarly, a positive and significant association between the uncertain teacher behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = -.030$ ,  $p < .540$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .135^{**}$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the joy of learning ( $r = .050$ ,  $p < .314$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .110^{*}$ ,  $p < .027$ ). Besides, there was no positive and significant association between admonition teacher behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = -.022$ ,  $p < .659$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .096$ ,  $p < .051$ ), the joy of learning ( $r = .023$ ,  $p < .800$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .071$ ,  $p < .149$ ). This means that the administration construct of the teacher-student interpersonal relationship does not influence the subjective well-being of the students.

However, this study's findings are critical for the promotion of teacher-student interpersonal relationships in secondary schools. The findings were congruent with Farhah et al.'s (2021) study, which found a significant relationship between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and subjective well-being. Based on the social power model, the findings emphasize the importance of teachers' behaviors and strategies in utilizing coercive, manipulative, expert, and likability behaviors to improve classroom relationships (Alderman & Green, 2011). Additionally, teachers' positive relational and interactive behaviors, such as showing affection, maintaining proximity, offering praise, establishing credibility, providing affirmation, ensuring clarity, building friendships with students, using humor, and giving compliments, are effective communication practices that can enhance students' subjective well-being and academic performance (Frisby, 2019).

The favorable outcomes of this research concerning leadership, comprehension, and reducing untrustworthy behaviors hold considerable significance for student education, school engagement, and enhancing students' enjoyment of learning (Wubbels et al., 2012). These constructive traits help establish a solid foundation within educational environments by fostering positive, high-caliber relationships between students and educators, which frequently facilitates more effective exploration, participation, and learning of academic content (McCormick et al., 2013).

From an environmental perspective, the research underscores the importance of cultivating a learning community that acknowledges student well-being as an integral part of educational settings. This approach considers the dynamic nature of learners' emotional, social, physical, and mental states, which are affected by the fulfillment of their respective needs (van der Kaap-Deeder et al., 2017). This concept is consistent with attachment theory, which posits that a supportive school environment significantly impacts students' motivation and academic achievement. It highlights that positive and emotionally engaging teacher-student relationships provide the necessary security for students to develop a genuine interest in education and actively participate in learning activities (Carmona-Halty et al., 2019). Furthermore, research indicates that positive relationships between educators and their pupils can boost students' overall happiness while simultaneously cultivating a greater sense of inclusion and academic drive (Nikolaus, 2025; Zhou & Li, 2025). Moreover, the strength of the teacher-student connection equips students with essential psychological benefits, including hope, competence, resilience, and optimism (Carmona-Halty et al., 2019). Consequently, educators in secondary schools ought to foster an environment characterized by mutual trust, respect, friendship, and the absence of conflict (Aldrup et al., 2018).

By extension, the non-significant finding on the teacher administrative construct of the teacher-student interpersonal relationship does not influence students' subjective well-being. This finding harmonizes with Saxer et al.'s (2025) recent research outcomes, indicating no significant associations between student well-being, teacher-student closeness, and peer cohesion. These results highlight the impact of teacher-student conflict on student well-being and suggest that enhancing the academic self-concept could help mitigate such conflicts (Saxer et al., 2025). However, previous studies attest that teacher-student conflict is positively associated with physical complaints and social problems (Keane et al., 2023). The implication is that poor administrative roles tend to cause disharmony and misunderstanding in the classroom and social entities. The same is true with teacher-student conflict, engendering more aggressive and rule-breaking behaviors of students (Keane et al., 2023).

Nevertheless, literature shows that effective communication between teachers and students is crucial for understanding students' needs, which can lead to improved academic performance and emotional support (Zhou & Li, 2025). Conversely, some research suggests that the administrative aspects of these relationships may not always translate into improved subjective well-being, particularly if the emotional connection is lacking or if teachers face cognitive biases towards students. The findings contribute to the management of basic education schools, which serve as the mining of adolescents' psychological developments and functioning deemed essential for their overall well-being and the safety of the school community.

Likewise, the findings suggest that interventions that promote stress management and positive teacher-student relationships may reduce adjustment problems concurrently and over time, strengthen subjective and positive well-being among early adolescents (Keane et al., 2023). Additionally, administrative efficiency can reduce anxiety about deadlines, but it doesn't necessarily foster the "warmth" that buffers against stress (Li et al., 2024). It follows that the high school period of education constitutes the transition stage of adolescence, where students face many physical, emotional, and cognitive challenges (Csikszentmihalyi, 2024).

Besides, literature confirms that adolescence as a whole brings emotional fluctuations that may include emotional problems such as anxiety and depression (Armitage et al., 2024). Hence, the relevance of administrative empathy and care to be modeled by teachers to sustain interpersonal relationships with students. Research in educational psychology often highlights that administrative competence and relational depth are two different tracks. When the emotional bridge is missing or when biases cloud a teacher's perception, the benefits of the relationship can become superficial or even detrimental.

Table 4 Correlation between Independent and Dependent Variables

TSIR Indicators	PWB (SL)	Pearson-r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Helpful/ Friendly	EP	.293**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	SC	.232**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.251**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	AE	.149**	.002	Reject H0	Significant
Students Responsibility	EP	.036	.464	Accept H0	Not Significant
	SC	.197**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.074	.114	Accept H0	Not Significant
	AE	.154**	.002	Reject H0	Significant
Dissatisfied	EP	-.147**	.003	Reject H0	Significant
	SC	.020	.681	Accept H0	Not Significant
	JL	-.053	.288	Accept H0	Not Significant
	AE	.029	.561	Accept H0	Not Significant
Strict	EP	.132**	.008	Reject H0	Significant
	SC	.157**	.001	Reject H0	Significant
	JL	.103*	.038	Reject H0	Significant
	AE	.086	.081	Accept H0	Not Significant

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
 \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 shows the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and Behavioral well-being (Subjective well-being).

The results disclosed a positive and significant association between teacher helpful/friendly teacher behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = .293^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .232^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), joy of learning ( $r = .251^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), academic efficacy ( $r = .149^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.002$ ). Also, a positive and significant association between student responsibility behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = .036$ ,  $p < .464$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .197$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the joy of learning ( $r = .074$ ,  $p < .114$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .154^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.002$ ).

Likewise, a negative and significant association between dissatisfied teacher-student behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = -.147^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.003$ ), but there was no significant association between dissatisfied construct and school connectedness ( $r = .020$ ,  $p < .681$ ), joy of learning ( $r = -.053$ ,  $p < .288$ ), and academic efficacy ( $r = .029$ ,  $p < .561$ ). Moreover, positive and significant association of the strict teacher-student behavior construct and educational purpose ( $r = .132$ ,  $p < 0.008$ ), school connectedness ( $r = .157$ ,  $p < .001$ ), pleasure of the learning ( $r = .103$ ,  $p < .038$ ), and academic effectiveness ( $r = .086$ ,  $p < .081$ ). These findings indicate the involvement of teacher-student interactions and their effect on the students' well-being, which would affect their performance in school. This is consistent with recent research revealing significant relationships observed between school belonging and subjective well-being, student-teacher relationship and subjective well-being, and school climate and subjective well-being (Anderson, 2025).

Our research partially corroborated earlier studies on the impact of teacher-learner relationships on educational success. It highlights that students thrive academically when they feel a sense of belonging. Additionally, emotional factors like grit, well-being, self-efficacy, academic engagement, motivation, and enjoyment in learning a foreign language were identified as mediators in the connection between these interpersonal relationships and academic achievement (Zhang, 2022).

Similarly, this study's findings align with Mainhard et al. (2018), emphasizing that teacher agency—characterized by interactive dominance or influence—and empathy, defined as warmth or intimacy, are critical for fostering positive emotions such as enjoyment in learners. Likewise, Goetz et al. (2021) highlighted that a high-quality teacher-learner interpersonal relationship is associated with increased enjoyment. They suggested

that when learners commit to a high level of relational intimacy with their teacher, it enhances their ability to handle situations, thereby influencing their level of enjoyment (Goetz et al., 2021).

Moreover, it is widely accepted that the interactions students cultivate in educational settings with teachers, classmates, and school leaders contribute to their personal, academic, and social growth (Pakarinen et al., 2018). Fundamentally, this suggests that as students embark on their educational activities, the relationships they form with their educators increasingly influence their academic success (Heatly & Votruba-Drzal, 2017).

**Problem 3: Assessment of the significant relationship between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being, as assessed by Diener et. al. (2009), psychological flourishing scale**

Table 5 Correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being (PFS)

TSIR Indicators	PWB (PFS)	Pearson-r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership	PFS	299**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Understanding	PFS	301**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Uncertain	PFS	-.056	.264	Accept H0	Not Significant
Admonishing	PFS	-.019	.696	Accept H0	Not Significant
Helpful/Friendly	PFS	290**	.000	Reject H0	Significant
Students responsibility	PFS	.035	.478	Accept H0	Not Significant
Dissatisfied	PFS	-.130**	.009	Reject H0	Significant
Strictness	PFS	103*	.037	Reject H0	Significant

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 5 shows the correlation between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being. Thus, the findings found a positive and significant association between leadership teacher behavior construct and psychological flourishing ( $r= 299^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), teacher understanding behavior construct and psychological flourishing ( $r= 301^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), helpful/friendly and psychological flourishing ( $r= .290^{**}$ ,  $p<.001$ ), dissatisfied and psychological flourishing ( $r= -.130^{**}$ ,  $p<.009$ ), and strict and psychological flourishing ( $r= .103^{**}$ ,  $p<.037$ ). However, there was no significant relationship between uncertain behaviors and psychological flourishing ( $r= -.056$ ,  $p <.264$ ), admonishment and psychological flourishing ( $r= -.019$ ,  $p <.696$ ), and student responsibility and psychological flourishing ( $r= .035$ ,  $p <.474$ ).

The findings indicate there is a positive and significant relationship between teacher-student interpersonal relationships and the psychological flourishing of the students. This agrees with Reis and Cunha's (2023) findings that the quality of teacher-student relationships significantly contributed to student psychological flourishing. The findings equally imply that the higher the teacher-student interpersonal relationships, the higher the psychological flourishing of the respondents (Vander Weele, 2017; Prati et al., 2017; Shephard et al., 2023). These findings necessitate a conscious creation of a quality of relationships in the school environment that has been linked to desirable outcomes, such as enhanced well-being, including robust interpersonal relationships, subjective well-being, sustained engagement, the presence of positive emotions, meaningful achievements, a sense of purpose, and self-efficacy (Diener et al., 2009; Van Zyl & Stander, 2019).

Moreover, this study's findings, in agreement with existing literature, expand the dynamic person-environment interactions (Rosa & Tudge, 2021; Tong & An, 2023), reinforcing its relevance in examining school-based influences on the subjective well-being of high school students (Anderson, 2025). Furthermore, studies by Bradshaw et al. (2021) and Ebbert and Luthar (2021) reinforce these results, emphasizing that a supportive school climate can reduce disruptive behaviors, foster a culture of respect and inclusion, and ultimately enhance student engagement and academic success.

**Problem 4: Assessment of the significant relationship between interpersonal relationships and student academic performance**

Table 6 Correlation between TSIR and Student Academic Performance (GPA)

TSIR	GPA	Pearson r	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership	GPA	.028	.576	Accept H0	Not Significant
Understanding	GPA	.008	.872	Accept H0	Not Significant
Uncertain	GPA	-.030	.550	Accept H0	Not Significant
Admonishing	GPA	-.076	.123	Accept H0	Not Significant
Helpful/Friendly	GPA	.029	.553	Accept H0	Not Significant
Students responsibility	GPA	-.085	.086	Accept H0	Not Significant
Dissatisfied	GPA	-.168**	.001	Reject H0	Significant
Strictness	GPA	-.039	.432	Accept H0	Not Significant

As shown in Table 6, teacher-student relationships affect academic proficiency.

Accordingly, we found a positive and significant relation among leadership teacher behavior construct and academic performance ( $r = .028, p < .576$ ), teacher understanding behavior construct and academic performance ( $r = .008, p < .872$ ), unclear behaviors and academic performance ( $r = -.030, p < .550$ ), admonishing and academic performance ( $r = -.076, p < .123$ ), helpful/friendly behavior and academic performance ( $r = -.029, p < .553$ ), student responsibility and academic performance ( $r = -.085, p < .086$ ) and strict and academic performance ( $r = -.039, p < .432$ ), except the dissatisfied behavior construct with a negative significant relationship between academic performance ( $r = -.168^{**}, p < .001$ ).

Obviously, an additional reason why summative GPA results are not a function of achievement is that they depend also on affective factors (e.g., teacher expectations and beliefs) (Brookhart et al., 2016). For instance, Li et al. (2023) research suggests that students' academic achievement was primarily driven by their learning scores, future ambitions, and the quality of support received from both peers and family. Additionally, a secondary but notable influence was linked to a broad range of internal factors, including cognitive growth, self-regulation, personal values, and overall behavioral engagement. These findings explain the intricacies associated with student academic performance trajectories. It implies that relationships that permeate with teachers and students alone are insufficient to boost their academic success.

Besides, non-significant results suggest that other peculiar factors could be responsible for interfering with teacher-student interpersonal relationships and student academic performance. Existing literature shared that high motivation and high norms (cognitive and emotional factors) had high academic achievement and high overall happiness (Lee et al., 2022; Hong et al., 2017). On the other hand, this study's findings are inconsistent with research by Fischbach (2023), which demonstrates that the quality of teacher-student connections plays a pivotal role in a wide array of educational outcomes. These relationships are significantly linked to academic performance and motivation, as well as internal factors like executive functioning, self-regulation, and emotional well-being. Furthermore, they influence behavioral patterns ranging from classroom engagement to the prevalence of conduct issues and foster a stronger sense of school belonging (Fischbach, 2023).

Additionally, Liu (2024) observed that the teacher-student relationship is indirectly and positively associated with academic engagement through perceived social support and academic pressure. These results indicate that perceived social support and academic pressure mediate the effect of teacher-student relationship on academic engagement.

Roorda et al. (2019) found that teacher-learner immediacy positively impacts the students' academic performance and that these students' success is attributed to teacher/student interactions. Engels & colleagues (2019) found that poor engagement with the teachers may result in disjuncts in the studies and have a negative influence on students' academic completion. Tawana (2020) investigated teacher-student relationships in secondary education to the point where teachers' understanding of teacher-student dynamics is relevant in the learning of students, so that they can be more involved and have a greater emotional connection.

In a study by Chamizo-Nieto et al. (2021), it was demonstrated that the relationship between teachers and students is crucial to the relationship between emotional intelligence and academic success. Teachers and learners are able to foster meaningful relationships that boost students with high emotional intelligence academically, the findings indicate. Another positive connection of the teacher-student relationship was proven by Mensah and Koomson (2020), who found that if I see my teacher as supportive, I have the best academic success. They found that those students who have closer connections score higher. But they wrote, “These answers are not substantially better than those of students whose relations with teachers gradually improved.”

For the academic context of teachers and students, we find a strong association between teacher-student relationships in social studies (Fan, 2012). This supports social and relational structures of our education and shows that the psychological state of the student, a sense of belonging, the degree to which we as teachers empathize, and the good teacher-student interactions are at the core of what matters to achieve the school’s success (Roorda et al., 2011; Short, 2017). Even for students in relation to cognitive development, it is clear from the students’ perception of student-teacher relations and their grades that their social and cognitive engagement also has an impact on their behavior and school performance (McGrath & Bergen, 2015; Mikk et al., 2016).

Research in McGrath and Van Bergen (2015) shows how student-teacher conflicts or too much students' dependence on teachers in terms of faculty involvement can have a detrimental effect on students' academic performance. These results support Schimmelpenninck (2025), noting that the influence of the teacher-student relationship on academic progress lacks a discernible or steady pattern across its various facets.

Moreover, we found that dissatisfaction in the teacher-student relationship is negatively associated with lower academic success. This agrees with empirical evidence showing that dissatisfaction in the teacher-student relationship negatively impacts academic success (Angwaomaodoko, 2023). These findings highlight that trust, communication, support, and engagement are crucial components, and their absence can lead to lower educational outcomes for students. Also, the results suggest that dissatisfaction in these relationships negatively impacts students' academic success, highlighting the need to prioritize fostering supportive interactions in educational settings (Zainullah et al., 2023).

**Problem 5: Assessment of the significant difference in the rating of the respondents on student-teacher interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to gender and school**

Table 7 Significant mean differences in TSIR when grouped and compared according to sex

IV Indicators	Sex	Mean-Variance	T-Test	Sig.	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership	Male	3.01 (.625)	.303	.762	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Female	2.98 (.687)				
Understanding	Male	2.88 (.668)	.964	.336	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Female	2.81 (.734)				
Uncertain	Male	1.79 (.833)	2.233	.026	Reject H0	Significant
	Female	1.60 (.784)				
Admonition	Male	2.03 (.750)	2.254	.025	Reject H0	Significant
	Female	1.86 (.700)				
Helpful/Friendly	Male	2.81 (.655)	.463	.643	Accept H0	Not Significant
	Female	2.78 (.730)				
Students Responsibility	Male	1.96 (.725)	2.038	.042	Reject H0	Significant
	Female	1.82 (.662)				
Dissatisfied	Male	1.70 (.868)	3.113	.003	Reject H0	Significant
	Female	1.44 (.799)				
Strictness	Male	2.34 (.615)	2.611	.009	Reject H0	Significant
	Female	2.18 (.614)				

Table 7 depicts the comparison of the respondents’ assessment of the mean difference in teacher-student interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to sex (t-test). Based on the results, there is

a significant difference between the teacher-student interpersonal relationships on uncertain ( $t = 2.233, p = .026$ ), admonition ( $t = 2.254, p = .025$ ), student responsibility ( $t = 2.036, p = .042$ ), dissatisfied ( $t = 3.113, p = .003$ ), and strict ( $t = 2.611, p = .009$ ). Besides, the results disclosed that there is no significant difference between the teacher-student interpersonal relationships on leadership ( $t = .303, p = .762$ ), understanding ( $t = .964, p = .336$ ), and helpful/friendly ( $t = .463, p = .643$ ).

The results suggest that male students tend to have more robust interpersonal relationships than their female counterparts. This contradicts research from Iceland, where classroom interactions during lessons revealed that boys reported lower levels of well-being than girls (Kristjánsson & Einarsdóttir, 2018). On the other hand, different research indicates that girls generally perceive their relationship with teachers more positively and have a better overall view of the school environment compared to boys (Korpershoek et al., 2016).

Table 8 Significant mean differences in TSIR when grouped and compared according to public and private schools

IV Indicators	Schools	Mean (SD) Variance	T-Test	Sig.	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership	School 1	3.06 (.636)	2.667	.008	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	2.87 (.702)				
Understanding	School 1	2.89 (.683)	2.167	.031	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	2.73 (.754)				
Uncertain	School 1	1.87 (.754)	7.140	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	1.31 (.772)				
Admonition	School 1	2.08 (.684)	6.129	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	1.64 (.705)				
Helpful/Friendly	School 1	2.87 (.639)	3.140	.002	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	2.64 (.791)				
Students' responsibility	School 1	2.00 (.704)	5.467	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	1.63 (.584)				
Dissatisfied	School 1	1.67 (.812)	4.752	.000	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	1.28 (.812)				
Strictness	School 1	2.31 (.589)	3.059	.002	Reject H0	Significant
	School 2	2.11 (.653)				

Table 8 shows the significant mean differences in teacher-student interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared by school (t-test). Based on the results, there is a significant difference between the teacher-student interpersonal relationships on leadership ( $t = 2.667, p = .008$ ), understanding ( $t = 2.167, p = .031$ ), uncertain ( $t = 7.140, p = .001$ ), admonition ( $t = 6.129, p = .001$ ), helpful/friendly ( $t = 3.140, p = .002$ ), student responsibility ( $t = 5.467, p = .001$ ), dissatisfied ( $t = 4.752, p = .001$ ), and strict ( $t = 3.059, p = .002$ ). This implies that public (school 1) and private (school 2) schools differ significantly in their approaches to and demonstrations of teacher-student interpersonal relationships.

The positive associations between teacher-student relationships are consistent with previous research that showed significant interactions with achievement in language and mathematics, as well as supporting, understanding, and compliance and achievement (Charalambous & Kokkinos, 2018). Likewise, these findings affirm that interpersonal relationship dimensions are positively related to cognitive or affective outcomes directly and indirectly.

Besides, this influential support was observed between agency being more strongly related to cognitive outcomes and communion being more strongly related to affective outcomes (den Brok et al., 2023). However, the paper by Formanowicz et al. (2023) indicated that agency and communion have a stable and equal strength relationship with humanness attribution, but it does not specifically address the differential influence of agency on cognitive outcomes and communion on affective outcomes.

Besides, these findings highlight the fundamental importance of interpersonal relationships as one of the main factors in classroom management, and as such, conditional to critical elements in teaching and the learning

environment in public or private high schools (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006; Fraser et al., 1987; van der Lans et al., 2020). Also, the findings designate their relevance to school empirical scholarship as perceptions of students are typically reliable and valid information for teacher-student interpersonal relationships (Fraser, 2014).

Further, the findings demonstrate the interpersonal meanings that students attach to their interactions with teachers, which are indicative of the perception of the relationship with their teacher (Wubbels et al., 2006, 2014). This could further imply that teachers need to be conscious and intentional in their classroom management practices, leadership, and behavioral characteristics to positively cascade a teaching and learning atmosphere that engenders purposeful support and care to students.

## CONCLUSION

These correlations showed a good teacher-student relationship and objective and subjective student academic performance, as it was found by our research. Students' relationships with their loved ones, educators, and classmates are the foundation on which the good of mental, social, emotional, and cognitive well-being, to their mental and academic development are built. Teacher-student-student interactions enhance students' confidence, self-awareness, and trust. The work of school administrators, students, and staff allows the community to thrive and, as a result, so do teachers and students, and so does the whole community of learners to live well.

## Implications

The results from this study should have major implications for policy orientation in education and social learning and will also help improve the relationship between teachers and students. Likewise, the findings establish the crucial importance of establishing interpersonal relationship theory in improving teacher-student relationship capacity (Wubbels et al., 1985; Wubbels et al., 2006). And those who have learned to incorporate the dynamic systems theory make room for a focused practice of control and the setting up of classroom learning structures to create teacher-student connections based on the system (Thelen & Smith, 1994). They represent reality for students that are in the classroom setting or at work in the social system with poverty where access to education, access to learning, access to opportunities (Fraser et al., 2007; Wubbels et al., 2006), societies with social justice at the core and the creation of a school community that develops social justice when the results of the learning can be channeled into positive teacher-student relationships can be achieved in a meaningful manner (Zandvliet et al., 2014).

## Limitations observed in the study

The study's geographic confinement to Cavite and its focus on teacher-student interpersonal relationships present notable limitations that may affect the generalizability of the findings. While the research highlights the significant impact of these relationships on academic performance, the specific cultural and educational context of Cavite may not reflect broader trends observed in other regions. Besides, the impact of teacher-student interpersonal relationships on student academic performance was not explicitly addressed, potentially overlooking a significant factor influencing learning outcomes (Ereje & Ambag, 2020). Therefore, we recognize the limitations of the study, deeply entrenched in correlational analysis and overlooking issues of causal claims. Therefore, future studies can consider these limitations to expand the understanding and generalizability this study findings. Also, researchers extend this study's focus to other cities and regions in Calabarzon IV A, Philippines.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study emphasize the need for strong staff leader skills, empathy, and empathy and for managers and teachers to be strong in their leadership and lead with purpose so as not to flounder when looking to assist students. This type of learning environment is best nurtured when teachers are firmly teaching and providing advice about what is wrong (admonishment) with the help of an empathetic teacher, and do not get defensive or angry at students' actions. In addition, the teacher-students relationship is strengthened by the

classroom structure providing freedom, autonomy and the student taking charge over the students work independently, learning the best we can, and that the student and teacher will take part in the development of the environment by doing all they can without failing to see this student is not just as a parent, which also helps to develop the teaching behavior.

## REFERENCES

1. Alderman, G. L., & Green, S. K. (2011). Social Powers and Effective Classroom Management: Enhancing Teacher-Student Relationships. *Behavior Management*, 47(1), 39-44.
2. Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., & 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. Anderson, B. (2025). School Belonging, Student-Teacher Relationship, and School Climate: A Structural Equation Model on Subjective Well-Being. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Sciences*. Vol. 10, Issue 10. <https://dx.doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2025.10100000201>.
4. Angwaomaodoko, E. A. (2023). A Critical Study of the Impact of Teacher-Student Relationship on Academic Success. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10362181>.
5. Armitage, J. M., Collishaw, S., & Sellers, R. (2024). Explaining long-term trends in adolescent emotional problems: what we know from population-based studies. *Discov Soc Sci Health* 4, 14 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44155-024-00076-2>.
6. Borgonovi, F. (2015). Do teacher-student relations affect students' well-being at school? PISA in Focus. Retrieved from [http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisainfocus/PIF-50-%28eng%29\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisainfocus/PIF-50-%28eng%29_FINAL.pdf).
7. Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2021). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 14(1), 1-22.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Charalampous, K., & Kokkinos, C. M. (2018). The structure of pre-adolescents' perceptions of their teachers' interpersonal behaviors and their relation to pre-adolescents' learning outcomes. *Educational Studies*, 44(2), 167–189.
11. 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.
12. Csikszentmihalyi M. (2024). Adolescence. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/science/adolescence>.
13. den Brok, P., van Tartwijk, J., Mainhard, T. (2023). Effective Interpersonal Relationships: On the Association Between Teacher Agency and Communion with Student Outcomes. In: Maulana, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., Klassen, R.M. (eds) *Effective Teaching Around the World*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31678-4\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31678-4_22).
14. Diener, E., & Ryan, K. (2009). Subjective well-being: A general overview. *S. Afr. J. Psychol.* 39, 391–406. Doi: 10.1177/008124630903900402.
15. dos Reis, F. A., & da Cunha, J. M. (2023). Student-Teacher Relationships and Human Flourishing: Preliminary Findings from Brazil. *Advances in Research*. <https://doi.org/10.9734/air/2023/v24i61002>.
16. Ebbert, A. M., & Luthar, S. S. (2021). School climate, teacher-student relationships, and social-emotional development in adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(6), 969-982.
17. 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
18. Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertston & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 3–15). Erlbaum.

19. Endedijk, H. M., Breeman, L.D., van Lissa, C. J., Hendrickx, M.M.H.G., den Boer, L., & Mainhard, T. (2021). The teacher's invisible hand: A meta-analysis of the relevance of teacher-student relationship quality for peer relationships and the contribution of student behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 92 (3), pp. 370-412. Doi. 10.3102/00346543211051428.
20. Ereje, B. R., & Ambag, S. C. (2020). Teachers' Performance and Students' Learning Outcome in the Division of Cavite Province, Philippines. 2(2), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.31098/IJTAESE.V2I2.388>.
21. 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.
22. Farhah, I., Saleh, A. Y., & Safitri, S. (2021). The role of the 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.
23. Formanowicz, M., Bettinsoli, M. L., Pietraszkiewicz, A., & Saguy, T. (2023). The role of agency and communion in humanness conceptualization- a multi-measure and method approach. *Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2023.100151>.
24. Fraser, B. J. (2014). Classroom learning environments: Historical and contemporary perspectives. In N. Lederman & S. Abell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education volume II* (pp. 104–119). Routledge.
25. Frazier, T. W., Youngstrom, E. A., Glutting, J. J., & Watkins, M. W. (2007). ADHD and achievement: a meta-analysis of the child, adolescent, and adult literature and a concomitant study with college students. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 40(1), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194070400010401>
26. Fraser, B. J., Walberg, H. J., Welch, W. W., & Hattie, J. A. (1987). Syntheses of educational productivity research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 145–252.
27. 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.
28. Furrer, C. J., Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2014). The influence of teacher and peer relationships on students' classroom engagement and everyday motivational resilience. *National Society for the Study of Education*, 113(1), 101-123.
29. Goetz, T., Bieleke, M., Gogol, K., van Tartwijk, J., Mainhard, T., Lipnevich, A. A., & Pekrun, R. (2021). Getting along and feeling good: Reciprocal associations between student-teacher relationship quality and students' emotions. *Learning and Instruction*, 71, 101349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101349>.
30. Gurtman, M. B. (2009). Exploring personality with the interpersonal circumplex. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3(4), 601–619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00172.x>.
31. 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.
32. Hollenstein, T. (2007). State space grids: Analyzing dynamics across development. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 384 – 396.
33. Hong, J.-C., Hwang, M.-Y., Tai, K. H., & Tsai, C. R. (2017). An Exploration of Students' Science Learning Interest Related to Their Cognitive Anxiety, Cognitive Load, Self-Confidence, and Learning Progress Using Inquiry-Based Learning With an iPad. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9541-y>
34. Horowitz, L. M., & Strack, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of interpersonal psychology: Theory, research, assessment, and therapeutic interventions*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
35. Jones, V. (2015). Because I'm happy: An intriguing study notes a correlation between a student's level of happiness and GPA. Usable Knowledge. Retrieved from <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/15/03/becausei%E2%80%99mhappy>.
36. Keane, K., Evans, R. R., Orihuela, C. A., & Mrug, S. (2023). Teacher–student relationships, stress, and psychosocial functioning during early adolescence. *Psychology in the Schools*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23020>.
37. Kiesler, D. J. (1996). *Contemporary Interpersonal Theory and Research*. New York, NY: Wiley.

38. 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>.
39. Kristjánsson, Á.L., & Einarsson, 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>.
40. Lammers, W. J., & Byrd, A. A. (2019). Student gender and instructor gender as predictors of instructor-student rapport. *Teach. Psychol.* 46, 127–134.
41. Lee, J., Park, T., & Davis, R. O. (2022). What affects learner engagement in flipped learning, and what predicts its outcomes?. *Br J Educ Technol*. 53:211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12717>.
42. Li, X., Kuo, Y. L., & Huggins, T. J. (2024). Perceived feedback and school belonging: the mediating role of subjective well-being. *Frontiers in psychology*, 15, 1450788. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1450788>.
43. Li, J., Xue, E., Li, C., & He, Y. (2023). Investigating Latent Interactions between Students' Affective Cognition and Learning Performance: Meta-Analysis of Affective and Cognitive Factors. *Behavioral Sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, 13(7), 555. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070555>.
44. Liu X. (2024). Effect of teacher-student relationship on academic engagement: the mediating roles of perceived social support and academic pressure. *Frontiers in psychology*, 15, 1331667. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1331667>.
45. 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.
46. Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J., (2003). *Classroom Management That Works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
47. 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.
48. McGrath, K. F., & Van Bergen, P. (2015). Who, when, why, and to what end? Students at risk of negative student-teacher relationships and their outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 1-17.
49. Mensah, B., & Koomson, E. (2020). Linking the teacher-student relationship to the academic achievement of senior high school students. *Soc. Edu. Res.* 2, 102–108. doi: 10.37256/ser.122020140.
50. Mikk, J., Krips, H., Säälük, Ü., & Kalk, K. (2016). Relationships between student perception of teacher-student relations and PISA results in mathematics and science. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 14(8), 1437-1454.
51. Newland, L. A., Mourlam, D., Strouse, G., DeCino, D., & Hanson, C. (2019). A Phenomenological Exploration of Children's School Life and Well-Being. *Learning Environments Research* 22 (3): 311–323. doi:10.1007/s10984-019-09285-y.
52. Nicholson, L. J., & Putwain, D. W. (2018). The Importance of Psychological Need Satisfaction in Educational Re-Engagement. *Research Papers in Education* 33 (2): 169–186. doi:10.1080/02671522.2016.1271004.
53. 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.
54. 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.
55. 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>.
56. Renshaw, T. L. (2015). A replication of the technical adequacy of the Student Subjective Well-being Questionnaire. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 33(8), 757-768.
57. 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.

58. 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101761) Doi: 10. 1016/j.
59. Roorda, D.L., Koomen, H.M.Y., Spilt, J.L. & Oort, F.J. (2011). ‘The influence of effective teacher-student relationships on students’ school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, 81 (4), 493–529.
60. Rosa, E. M., & Tudge, J. (2021). Urie Bronfenbrenner’s theory of human development: Its evolution from ecology to bioecology. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(4), 243–258.
61. Roza, J. M. G., Frenzel, A. C., & Klassen, R. M. (2021). The teacher-class relationship: A mixed-methods approach to validating a new scale. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 36 (1–2), pp. 1–18. Doi. [10.1024/1010-0652/a000328](https://doi.org/10.1024/1010-0652/a000328).
62. Samuelson, L., & Galligan, M. (2014). Dynamic systems theory and language development. In *Encyclopedia of Language Development* (pp. 174-178). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483346441.n54>.
63. Saxer, K., Schnell, J., Mori, J., & Hascher, T. (2024). The role of teacher-student relationships and student-student relationships for secondary school students’ well-being in Switzerland. *International Journal of Educational Research Open Volume 6*, 100318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100318>.
64. Schimmelpfennig, F. (2025). Effects of the teacher-student relationship on the learning and achievement motivation of high-tracking school students in adolescence. *Eur J Psychol Educ* 40, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-025-00952-8>.
65. Seligman M. E., Csikszentmihalyi M. (2014). *Positive Psychology: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Springer. Doi: [10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8_18).
66. 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>.
67. Short, L. A. (2017). How high school students' perceptions of their teacher-student relationships relate to their academic achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
68. 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.
69. Thelen, E, & Smith, LB. (1994). *A dynamic systems approach to development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
70. 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.
71. Tong, P., & An, I. S. (2023). Review of studies applying Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory in international and intercultural education research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1233925.
72. 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](https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000218).
73. van der Lans, R., Cremers, J., Klugkist, I., & Zwart, R. (2020). Teachers’ interpersonal relationships and instructional expertise: How are they related? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66, 100902.
74. 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.1702996114> 7.
75. 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](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20020-6_20).
76. 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](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731721).
77. Whitaker, R. C., Dearth-Wesley, T., Herman, A. N., Benz, T. L., Saint-Hilaire, S. A., & Strup, D. D. (2023). The Association Between Teacher Connection and Flourishing Among Early Adolescents in 25 Countries. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02724316231190828>.

78. Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Mainhard, T., den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2016). Teacher-student relationships and student achievement. In K. R. Wentzel & G. B. Ramani (Eds.), *Handbook of social influences in school contexts: Social-emotional, motivation, and cognitive outcomes* (pages: 127-145). New York, NY: Routledge.
79. Wubbels, T., M. Brekelmans, P. D. Brok, L. Wijsman, & van Tartwijk, J. (2015). Teacher–Student Relationships and Classroom Management.” In *Handbook of Classroom Management*, edited by E. T. Emmer and E. J. Sabornie, 363–386. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
80. Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., den Brok, P., Wijsman, L., Mainhard, T., & van Tartwijk, J. (2014). Teacher-student relationships and classroom management. In E. T. Emmer, E. Sarbonie, C. Evertson, & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd ed., pp. 363–386). Taylor and Francis Publishers.
81. Wubbels, T. et al, (2012) Interpersonal relationships in education an overview of contemporary research. <https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/1407-interpersonal-relationships-in-education2.pdf>.
82. Wubbels, T. (2011). An international perspective on classroom management: what should prospective teachers learn? *Teaching Education*, 22(2), 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2011.567838>
83. Wubbels, T., Créton, H. A., & Hooymayers, H. P. (1985). Discipline problems of beginning teachers and interactional behavior are mapped out. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
84. Xu, Y., Zhu, Q., & Chen, Y. (2024). Teacher–student relationships and college students’ psychological well-being: The mediating role of supportive school climate. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 52(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1298>.
85. Ye, X., Wang, W., & Chen, X. (2025). Promoting adolescent health and well-being: The roles of close teacher–student relationships and decreased bullying victimization. *British Journal of Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcaf114>.
86. Yu, M. V. B., H. E. Johnson, N. L. Deutch, & Varga. S. M. (2018). She Calls Me by My Last Name: Exploring Adolescent Perceptions of Positive Teacher-Student Relationships.” *Journal of Adolescent Research* 33 (3): 332–362. doi:10.1177/0743558416684958.
87. Zainullah, Mahfud, M. Z., & Riniati, W. O. (2023). Exploring the Role of Teacher-Student Relationships in Academic Achievement: A Qualitative Study in Primary Schools. <https://doi.org/10.58812/esle.v1i02.111>.
88. Zandvliet, D., den Brok, P., Mainhard, T., & van Tartwijk, J. (2014). Interpersonal relationships in education: from theory to practice. *Advances in Learning Environment Research*. Volume 5.
89. Zhang, Q. (2022). The Role of Teachers’ Interpersonal Behaviors in Learners’ Academic Achievements. *Front. Psychol.* 13:921832. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921832.
90. Zijlstra, Z., Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2013). Teacher interpersonal behavior and associations with mathematics achievement in Dutch early grade classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113(4), 517–540.