International Research Journal of Education and Technology

Peer Reviewed Journal, **ISSN: 2581-7795**

The Role of Social Interaction in Enhancing Student Learning Outcomes

Narayan Chandra Kapat

Abstract

Social interaction is a central mechanism through which students construct knowledge, sustain motivation, and improve academic performance. This review-based article synthesizes evidence from ten influential studies and meta-analyses on peer interaction, teacher–student relationships, classroom social networks, and online learning interactions. Across the literature, positive social interaction is consistently associated with better engagement, stronger motivation, and improved academic outcomes. Meta-analytic findings show moderate positive effects of peer interaction and teacher–student relationship quality on learning, while recent studies demonstrate that these effects are often mediated by social presence, learning engagement, and perceived usefulness of learning environments. The evidence also suggests that the *quality* and *structure* of interaction matter: dialogic, supportive, and consensus-oriented interactions are more beneficial than superficial or conflictual exchanges. The review concludes that schools and educators should intentionally design socially rich learning environments—both face-to-face and online—to maximize student learning outcomes.

Keywords: social interaction, student learning outcomes, peer interaction, teacher–student relationship, engagement, academic achievement, social presence

1. Introduction

Student learning is not only an individual cognitive process; it is also a social process shaped by interactions with teachers and peers. Contemporary educational research shows that students learn more effectively when they participate in supportive, dialogic, and collaborative classroom environments. This pattern appears across age groups and learning contexts, including traditional classrooms, inclusive settings, and online learning environments.

Large-scale reviews and meta-analyses indicate that social interaction influences learning through several pathways: increased engagement, stronger motivation, better classroom belonging, and improved opportunities for feedback and co-construction of knowledge. At the same time, negative or conflictual relationships can suppress participation and weaken achievement outcomes.

Given the growing emphasis on collaborative learning and digital education, it is important to synthesize what research says about *how* social interaction improves student learning outcomes and under what conditions these effects are strongest.

2. Review of Literature

1) Cornelius-White (2007): Learner-Centered Teacher–Student Relationships

Cornelius-White's meta-analysis synthesized 119 studies (1,450 findings; 355,325 students) and found that positive, learner-centered teacher–student relationships were associated with better cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes. The overall mean correlation was r =

0.31, indicating a meaningful positive relationship between relationship quality and student outcomes.

2) Roorda, Koomen, Spilt, & Oort (2011): Affective Teacher–Student Relationships

Roorda and colleagues conducted a meta-analysis based on 99 studies (with a total sample over 129,000 students) examining affective teacher–student relationships, engagement, and achievement. They found that positive and negative teacher–student relationships were significantly related to both engagement and achievement, with stronger effects for engagement than achievement. They also noted that negative relationship effects were especially strong in primary school.

3) Göktas & Kaya (2023): Second-Order Meta-Analysis on Teacher Relationships

In a second-order meta-analysis (combining prior meta-analyses), Göktas and Kaya reviewed 17 first-order meta-analyses and found that positive teacher–student relationships had a medium positive relationship with academic achievement. They also reported that negative teacher–student relationships were negatively associated with achievement. This strengthens the evidence base by aggregating results across multiple prior syntheses.

4) Tenenbaum, Winstone, Leman, & Avery (2020): Peer Interaction Meta-Analysis

Tenenbaum et al. analyzed 62 articles / 71 studies with 7,103 participants (ages 4–18) and found that peer interaction significantly improved learning compared with non-interactive learning conditions (Hedges' $g = 0.40$). They also found peer interaction was more effective when students were explicitly instructed to reach consensus.

5) Hurst, Wallace, & Nixon (2013): Social Interaction in Higher Education Classrooms

Hurst and colleagues studied students in three literacy teacher-preparation courses and found that students perceived daily social interaction as improving learning. Students reported gains in literacy/teaching knowledge as well as stronger critical thinking and problem-solving. This study is important because it highlights student-perceived learning benefits in highly interactive classroom designs.

6) Garrote, Felder, Meyer, & Moser Opitz (2020): Social Acceptance and Academic Outcomes

In an inclusive education context, Garrote et al. examined 506 first-grade children in 29 Swiss classrooms. They reported that class-level peer acceptance and friendship levels were positively related to academic outcomes, suggesting that classroom social climate matters beyond individual student characteristics.

7) Pan, Ishak, & Qin (2024): Moore's Online Learning Interactions Model (SOR Framework)

Pan et al. (Heliyon) studied 397 higher education students in China and found that online learning interactions improved learning outcomes through students' perceptions (usefulness and ease of use) within a Stimulus–Organism–Response (SOR) framework. Their findings support the idea that interaction quality shapes learners' internal perceptions, which then influence outcomes.

8) Gao, Wang, Xie, & Hong (2024): Online Learning Efficiency and Social Presence

Gao et al. studied 344 middle school students and found that both learner–learner and learner–instructor interactions were linked to better online learning efficiency. Importantly, the relationship was mediated by social presence and learning engagement, showing that interaction helps learning partly by making students feel socially connected and cognitively involved.

9) Shao, Kang, Lu, Zhang, & Li (2024): Peer Relationships, Motivation, and Engagement

Shao et al. investigated 717 junior high school students and found that peer relationships had both direct and indirect effects on academic achievement. The strongest indirect pathway was through learning motivation, followed by learning engagement, and a chain mediation effect (peer relationships → motivation → engagement → achievement).

10) Lenard et al. (2025): Informal Social Interaction and Academic Performance

Lenard and colleagues used random assignment to classes and residence halls to estimate causal effects of informal social interaction in higher education. They found that greater interaction with peers was associated with higher academic performance (reported as a 0.11 standard deviation increase in GPA for a one-standard-deviation increase in interaction), offering strong causal evidence that social interaction can improve learning outcomes.

3. Objectives

1. To examine the role of social interaction in improving student learning outcomes.
2. To review empirical and meta-analytic evidence on peer interaction and teacher–student relationships.
3. To identify mechanisms (e.g., motivation, engagement, social presence) through which social interaction affects learning.
4. To derive practical implications for classroom and online teaching.

4. Results and Discussion

This section synthesizes the reviewed evidence around the four objectives and presents percentage-based summary tables (as requested). Because the reviewed studies use different statistics (e.g., *r*, Hedges' *g*, β coefficients, indirect effects, ICC percentages), the percentage tables below are presented as review-synthesis proportions (e.g., % of reviewed studies supporting a mechanism), plus a separate table of reported percentage indicators from the original studies. This avoids forcing unlike metrics into one misleading pooled percentage.

4.1 Objective 1: Role of Social Interaction in Improving Student Learning Outcomes

Across the reviewed evidence, the overall pattern is clear: social interaction is positively associated with student learning outcomes, but the strength of this relationship depends on the *type* and *quality* of interaction. Large-scale meta-analytic studies show that teacher–student relationship quality and peer interaction are reliably linked to academic, behavioral, and affective outcomes. For example, Cornelius-White's meta-analysis synthesized 119 studies (355,325 students) and reported an average correlation of r = .31 between learner-centered

teacher variables and student outcomes. Tenenbaum et al.'s meta-analysis (71 studies; 7,103 participants) found peer interaction improved learning relative to other conditions with Hedges' g = 0.40, indicating a moderate positive effect.

Teacher–student relationships show similar consistency. Roorda et al. (2011) reported results from 99 studies, with associations between affective teacher–student relationships and outcomes strongest for engagement and somewhat smaller (but still meaningful) for achievement. The update by Roorda et al. (2017), spanning 189 studies and 249,198 students, further strengthened this conclusion and showed that engagement partially mediates achievement effects. Together, these meta-analytic findings indicate that social interaction is not a peripheral classroom variable; it is a core determinant of learning conditions.

Primary studies reinforce the same pattern in both face-to-face and online settings. Hurst et al. (2013) found that students in three highly interactive literacy courses perceived social interaction as improving learning, especially in literacy knowledge, critical thinking, and problem-solving. In inclusive classrooms, Garrote et al. (2020) showed that teacher classroom management (a social-ecological interaction factor) predicted classroom-level social acceptance, which is closely tied to academic and socio-emotional development. In online learning, Pan et al. (2024) and Gao et al. (2024) both show that interaction predicts learning outcomes/efficiency through mediated pathways, indicating the social effect persists even when learning is technology-mediated.

Table 4.1. Evidence profile of the 10 reviewed studies (percentage-based synthesis)

Category	Count (n=10)	Percentage
Meta-analytic / synthesis studies	5	50%
Primary empirical studies	5	50%
School-age (K–12) focused evidence	7	70%
Higher education focused evidence	2	20%
Broad/mixed educational levels	1	10%
Face-to-face / classroom-centered contexts	8	80%
Online learning contexts	2	20%
Studies showing positive or conditionally positive interaction effects	10	100%
Studies reporting important moderators/caveats (quality, level, pathway differences)	7	70%

The table shows a balanced evidence base (50% synthesis, 50% primary studies), with most studies concentrated in K–12 settings (70%) and classroom contexts (80%). Most importantly, 100% of reviewed studies report either positive or conditionally positive effects,

meaning no study fundamentally contradicted the proposition that social interaction matters. At the same time, 70% reported caveats or moderators, which supports a more nuanced interpretation: the question is not simply whether interaction matters, but *what kind* of interaction produces better learning.

4.2 Objective 2: Empirical and Meta-Analytic Evidence on Peer Interaction and Teacher–Student Relationships

4.2.1 Peer interaction evidence

Peer interaction is one of the strongest recurring themes. Tenenbaum et al. found peer interaction benefits learning (g = 0.40), and importantly, it works best when students are explicitly guided to reach consensus. This is a crucial design insight: interaction alone is not enough; it must be structured.

Shao et al. (2024) extends this finding to junior high school students (N = 717), showing peer relationships directly predict academic achievement and also indirectly affect achievement through learning motivation and learning engagement. The authors explicitly report that the pathway peer relationship → learning motivation → academic achievement had the strongest indirect effect. This helps explain why some peer-based activities succeed while others fail: strong peer relationships likely increase willingness to invest effort before measurable performance rises.

4.2.2 Teacher–student relationship evidence

Teacher-related interaction evidence is especially robust because it appears in multiple meta-analytic layers:

- Cornelius-White (2007): learner-centered teacher–student relationships show a meaningful average correlation (r = .31) with student outcomes across affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains.
- Roorda et al. (2011): affective teacher–student relationships relate to both engagement and achievement; engagement effects tend to be stronger than achievement effects.
- Roorda et al. (2017): meta-analytic SEM confirms partial mediation through engagement, meaning teacher relationships influence achievement both directly and through increased student engagement.

Göktaş and Kaya (2023) broadens the teacher interaction frame from teacher–student relations alone to teacher intrapersonal, teacher–student, and teacher–school community relationships. Their second-order meta-analysis reports an overall positive mean effect size of ES = .24 for positive teacher relationship types, while negative teacher relationship types show a negative mean effect of ES = −.16. They also show that positive teacher–school community relationships produced the largest positive relationship estimate (ES = .41) among positive relationship categories. This finding is especially important because it suggests the social environment around teachers (not just direct teacher–student ties) can matter for student achievement.

Table 4.2. Reported quantitative indicators from reviewed studies (including percentages)

Study	Key quantitative finding	Reported % / proportion
Gao et al. (2024)	Middle school online learning study sample: N = 344	56.68% women
Garrote et al. (2020)	Classroom-level variance in social acceptance (ICC1)	17.6% (t2), 11.7% (t1)
Göktaş & Kaya (2023)	Variance explained by positive teacher relationship subtypes	3.2% (positive intrapersonal), 4.4% (teacher–student), 16.8% (teacher–school community)
Göktaş & Kaya (2023)	Variance explained by negative teacher relationship subtypes	5.8% (negative intrapersonal), 2.0% (negative teacher–student)
Roorda et al. (2011)	Studies on positive TSR + engagement	61/99 = 61.6% of included studies
Roorda et al. (2011)	Studies on positive TSR + achievement	61/99 = 61.6% of included studies
Roorda et al. (2011)	Studies on negative TSR + achievement	28/99 = 28.3% of included studies
Roorda et al. (2011)	Studies on negative TSR + engagement	18/99 = 18.2% of included studies

This table shows two things. First, some studies provide direct percentage indicators (e.g., sample composition, ICC variance, variance explained), while others are better summarized using proportions of included studies. Second, the Göktaş & Kaya results are especially informative for practice: the largest explained variance (16.8%) came from teacher–school community relationships, suggesting that improving school relational climate may produce broader academic gains than focusing on teacher behavior alone. The Garrote ICC values (17.6% and 11.7%) also show that classroom-level social climate is not trivial; a meaningful share of social acceptance variance sits at the classroom level and is therefore potentially improvable through teaching practice.

4.3 Objective 3: Mechanisms Through Which Social Interaction Affects Learning

The reviewed studies converge around three main mechanisms: motivation, engagement, and social presence/perception.

4.3.1 Motivation pathway

Motivation appears as a central mechanism in peer interaction research. Shao et al. (2024) found that peer relationships improve achievement partly through learning motivation, and this was the strongest indirect pathway in their model. Cornelius-White's meta-analysis also

supports this pattern at a broader level, reporting meaningful associations between learner-centered teacher variables and outcomes including positive motivation.

Interpretation: Social interaction may first change how students *feel about learning* (interest, confidence, willingness to invest effort), which then influences performance. This is why relational interventions often produce visible changes in participation before grades improve.

4.3.2 Engagement pathway

Engagement is the most consistently supported mechanism across teacher and peer studies. Roorda et al. (2011) found stronger associations of teacher–student relationships with engagement than with achievement, and the authors discuss achievement effects as likely operating partly through engagement. Roorda et al. (2017) then directly tested this with meta-analytic SEM and found partial mediation by engagement for both positive and negative affective teacher–student relationships. Shao et al. (2024) also identified learning engagement as an indirect pathway linking peer relationships to achievement.

In online settings, Gao et al. (2024) provides especially strong mechanism evidence: both learner–learner and learner–instructor interactions predicted learning efficiency, and learning engagement was a significant mediator in both pathways.

Interpretation: Engagement is the "conversion mechanism" that translates social interaction into academic outcomes. Good relationships make students show up cognitively and behaviorally; engagement then produces achievement.

4.3.3 Social presence and learner perceptions in online learning

Online learning studies refine the mechanism picture. Gao et al. (2024) shows social presence and learning engagement act in serial mediation, especially for learner–learner and learner–instructor interactions. Pan et al. (2024) finds a related but slightly different mechanism: online interactions improve learners' perceived usefulness and ease of use, which then affect outcomes; interestingly, perceived usefulness shows a negative mediation, while perceived ease of use shows a positive mediation.

This is a valuable nuance: in online environments, interaction is not only social-emotional; it also shapes how manageable and useful the learning platform feels. When the platform feels easier to use, outcomes improve more consistently.

Table 4.3. Mechanism prevalence across the 10 reviewed studies (review-synthesis percentages)

Mechanism / pattern (coded from reviewed studies)	Studies supporting it	Percentage
Engagement as mediator/outcome pathway	4	40%
Motivation as mediator/outcome pathway	2	20%
Social presence / learner perception (online mediation)	2	20%
Interaction quality/structure matters (not just quantity)	7	70%

Social interaction linked to achievement directly or indirectly	10	100%

The strongest recurring pattern is not a single mediator but a broader principle: interaction quality and structure (70%) consistently shape whether social interaction becomes academically productive. Engagement (40%) is the most common direct mechanism reported across studies, while motivation and social presence/perception each appear in 20% of the reviewed set (reflecting the fact that fewer studies test these mechanisms explicitly, not that they are unimportant).

4.4 Objective 4: Practical Implications for Classroom and Online Teaching

The evidence supports four clear implications.

4.4.1 Use structured collaborative learning, not unstructured group work

Peer interaction is most effective when it is guided. Tenenbaum et al. specifically found stronger effects when students were instructed to reach consensus. This implies that teachers should use collaboration protocols (roles, prompts, discussion targets, consensus checks), rather than assuming any group activity will improve learning.

4.4.2 Prioritize relationship-centered teaching practices

Cornelius-White, Roorda et al., and Roorda et al. (update) collectively show that affective and learner-centered teacher relationships are tied to engagement and achievement across large samples and multiple school stages. Relationship-centered pedagogy is therefore not "soft" practice; it is evidence-based instructional design. This includes warmth, responsiveness, trust, and emotionally safe classroom communication.

4.4.3 Manage classroom social climate deliberately

Garrote et al. demonstrates that effective classroom management predicts classroom-level social acceptance, and classroom-level variance in social acceptance is substantial enough to matter (ICC1 = 17.6% at t2). Göktaş & Kaya also shows that broader teacher relationship systems (especially teacher–school community links) can have sizable associations with achievement. Schools should therefore treat social climate as a measurable instructional condition, not just a behavioral issue.

4.4.4 Design online learning for social presence and engagement

Both Pan et al. and Gao et al. show that online learning outcomes depend on interaction-mediated mechanisms: perceived ease/usefulness, social presence, and engagement. Practical design implications include:

- synchronous discussion moments,
- instructor feedback loops,
- peer response activities,

- clear interface/navigation design,
- collaborative tasks requiring interdependence.

This is especially important in middle school online learning, where Gao et al. found pathway differences between learner–learner and learner–instructor interaction. In practice, that means schools should not rely on only one interaction channel.

Concluding Remarks

In sum, the reviewed evidence strongly supports the proposition that social interaction enhances student learning outcomes, but it does so through specific relational and psychological pathways, not through mere contact. Meta-analytic evidence establishes the reliability of the relationship (teacher–student and peer interaction), while empirical studies clarify *how* the effect operates in classrooms and online settings. The practical takeaway is straightforward: schools and instructors should design learning environments where interaction is intentional, structured, and relationally supportive. When interaction improves motivation, engagement, and social presence, learning outcomes improve more consistently. When interaction is poorly structured or relationally weak, the academic benefits are smaller and less reliable. That is the central evidence-based interpretation of the reviewed literatur

References

- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). *Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis*. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 113–143.
- Garrote, A., Felder, F., Meyer, S., & Moser Opitz, E. (2020). *Social acceptance and academic outcomes in inclusive classrooms*. Frontiers in Education, 5, 549824.
- Gao, F., Wang, C., Xie, H., & Hong, J. (2024). *Social interaction and online learning efficiency for middle school students: The mediating role of social presence and learning engagement*. Behavioral Sciences, 14(10), 896. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100896
- Göktas, E., & Kaya, M. (2023). *The effects of teacher relationships on student academic achievement: A second order meta-analysis*. Participatory Educational Research, 10(1), 275–289.
- Hurst, B., Wallace, R., & Nixon, S. B. (2013). *The impact of social interaction on student learning*. Reading Horizons, 52(4), 375–398.
- Lenard, M. A., Sadoff, S., & Wagner, M. (2025). *The economics of social interaction in education*. The Economic Journal.
- Pan, J., Ishak, N. A., & Qin, Y. (2024). *The application of Moore's online learning interactions model in learning outcomes: The SOR (stimulus-organism-response)*

paradigm perspective. Heliyon, 10(7), e28505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28505

- Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). *The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach*. Review of Educational Research, 81, 493–529. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793
- Shao, Y., Kang, S., Lu, Q., Zhang, C., & Li, R. (2024). *How peer relationships affect academic achievement among junior high school students: The chain mediating roles of learning motivation and learning engagement*. BMC Psychology, 12, 278. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01780-z
- Tenenbaum, H. R., Winstone, N. E., Leman, P. J., & Avery, R. E. (2020). *How effective is peer interaction in facilitating learning? A meta-analysis*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 112(7), 1303–1319.