

Students' Perception of School Accreditation, Quality Instruction, and Academic Performance at University of Perpetual Help System Manila

Sheryl B. Gamboa¹, Dr. Remedios M. Dela Rosa²,
Dr. Rosalina R. Pangilinan³

¹Program Coordinator, Junior High School Department, University of Perpetual Help System Manila

²Professor, Graduate School, University of Perpetual Help System Laguna

³School Director, University of Perpetual Help System Manila

Abstract

School accreditation and instructional quality are essential components of educational quality assurance, yet their relationship with students' academic performance remains insufficiently examined in the Junior High School context. This study investigated the relationship among students' perception of school accreditation, quality of instruction, and academic performance at the University of Perpetual Help System Manila (UPHSM). A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, involving 138 Junior High School students selected through stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a validated researcher-made questionnaire and students' General Weighted Average (GWA). Statistical tools used included weighted mean, frequency, percentage, and Pearson's correlation coefficient.

Findings revealed that students had a very positive perception of school accreditation (WM = 3.34), while the quality of instruction was rated very high (WM = 3.26). In terms of academic performance, most students belonged to the Advanced and Proficient categories based on their GWA. Correlation analysis showed a strong and significant relationship between perception of accreditation and quality of instruction ($r = 0.700$, $p < 0.001$). However, no significant relationships were found between perception of accreditation and academic performance ($r = 0.073$, $p = 0.396$), nor between quality of instruction and academic performance ($r = -0.010$, $p = 0.904$).

The study concludes that while students perceive accreditation and instructional quality positively, these factors do not significantly influence academic performance. This suggests that academic outcomes may be shaped by other personal, environmental, and behavioral factors beyond institutional accreditation and instructional practices. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening institutional awareness and instructional strategies to further enhance the learning environment.

Keywords: school accreditation, instructional quality, academic performance, Junior High School, descriptive-correlational design

1. Introduction

School accreditation is widely recognized as a formal mechanism for ensuring quality assurance, institutional accountability, and continuous improvement in educational institutions. It serves as a

framework for evaluating whether schools meet established standards in curriculum delivery, instructional quality, facilities, and student services [1, 21]. In both basic and higher education contexts, accreditation has been associated with improved institutional performance and enhanced educational outcomes [2, 3].

In the Philippine educational system, accreditation plays a critical role in maintaining quality standards and promoting continuous institutional development. The Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU) emphasizes that accreditation fosters a culture of self-evaluation and continuous improvement among academic institutions [28, 7]. However, students' perceptions of accreditation remain understudied, despite their direct exposure to institutional quality through teaching and learning processes.

Instructional quality is a key determinant of students' academic experiences. It includes clarity of instruction, classroom management, teaching strategies, feedback mechanisms, and learner support [9, 30]. Research shows that high-quality instruction is strongly associated with improved student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement [5, 11]. However, instructional quality is a multidimensional construct influenced by teacher competence, classroom environment, and institutional support systems [6].

Academic performance, commonly measured through General Weighted Average (GWA) or similar grading systems, remains a central indicator of student success. Studies indicate that academic performance is influenced by a combination of cognitive, environmental, and behavioral factors rather than a single determinant [4, 14]. While both accreditation and instructional quality are expected to contribute to academic performance, empirical findings show inconsistent relationships across different educational contexts [17, 16].

Despite growing literature on accreditation and instructional quality, limited studies have explored how students' perceptions of school accreditation relate to instructional quality and academic performance, particularly in the Junior High School context. Most existing studies focus on institutional or faculty perspectives rather than student-centered evaluations, leaving a gap in understanding how accreditation is experienced at the learner level [10, 25].

To address this gap, this study examines the relationship among students' perception of school accreditation, quality of instruction, and academic performance at the University of Perpetual Help System Manila (UPHSM). Specifically, it aims to determine the level of students' perception of accreditation, assess the quality of instruction as experienced by students, and evaluate academic performance based on General Weighted Average (GWA). It also analyzes the significant relationships among these variables.

Anchored on quality assurance theory and instructional effectiveness frameworks, this study provides empirical evidence on how institutional accreditation and instructional processes are perceived by students and how these relate to academic outcomes [29, 35]. The findings are expected to contribute to strengthening institutional practices, improving instructional quality, and enhancing student academic engagement.

2. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive–correlational research design to determine the relationships among students' perceptions of school accreditation, quality of instruction, and academic performance in Junior High School at the University of Perpetual Help System Manila (UPHSM). A structured researcher-

made questionnaire was used as the primary data collection instrument, consisting of three parts measuring students’ perception of school accreditation, quality of instruction, and academic performance based on General Weighted Average (GWA) obtained from official school records. The study involved a total population of 193 Junior High School students from Grades 7 to 10. Using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation, a final sample of 138 validated respondents was obtained. The instrument underwent expert validation to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives and was pilot-tested prior to full administration. Reliability testing using Cronbach’s Alpha yielded coefficients of 0.883 for perception of accreditation, 0.907 for quality of instruction, and 0.890 for academic performance, indicating good to excellent internal consistency. Responses were measured using a 4-point Likert scale, while academic performance was categorized using standard GWA descriptive equivalents.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study, including securing permission from the school administration, obtaining informed consent, and ensuring confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation of respondents. Data collection was carried out in coordination with class advisers after approval was granted, and questionnaires were administered to the selected respondents. Completed responses were checked for completeness, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics such as weighted mean and standard deviation were used to describe the levels of students’ perception of school accreditation and quality of instruction, while frequency and percentage were used to describe academic performance. Inferential statistics, specifically Pearson’s product–moment correlation coefficient, were used to determine the relationships among the variables at a 0.05 level of significance.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the study and interprets the findings in relation to relevant literature and previous empirical studies. It examines the levels of students’ perception of school accreditation, quality of instruction, and academic performance, as well as the relationships among these variables. The data were analyzed using weighted mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage, and Pearson’s product–moment correlation coefficient. The discussion highlights similarities, differences, and possible explanations of the results in relation to existing studies on school accreditation, instructional quality, and academic performance.

Table 1. Level of Students’ Perception of School Accreditation

Indicators	WM	SD	Interpretation
1. I am aware that my school is accredited by an external organization.	3.24	.681	Positive
2. I believe that accreditation helps improve the quality of education in our school.	3.42	.626	Very Positive
3. I think that accreditation ensures that the school follows high standards in teaching and learning.	3.42	.648	Very Positive
4. I believe that accreditation helps improve school facilities and learning resources.	3.45	.541	Very Positive
5. I think that accreditation ensures that teachers are qualified and competent.	3.39	.645	Very Positive

6. I believe that accreditation helps improve the overall learning environment of the school.	3.40	.646	Very Positive
7. I feel that studying in an accredited school benefits my academic development.	3.32	.695	Very Positive
8. I believe that accreditation helps the school continuously improve its programs and services.	3.32	.736	Very Positive
9. I trust that the school maintains quality education because of accreditation.	3.23	.778	Positive
10. I feel confident that my school provides quality education because it is accredited.	3.18	.766	Positive
Average Weighted Mean	3.34	.474	Very Positive

Note. Scoring Range: 3.25 – 4.00 (Very Positive); 2.50 – 3.24 (Positive); 1.75 – 2.49 (Negative); 1.00 – 1.74 (Very Negative)

Table 1 presents the level of students' perception of school accreditation at the University of Perpetual Help System Manila. The findings reveal that the overall perception of students toward school accreditation obtained an average weighted mean of 3.34 (SD = .474), interpreted as Very Positive. This indicates that students generally perceive accreditation as an important mechanism for ensuring educational quality and institutional improvement.

Among the indicators, the statement "I believe that accreditation helps improve school facilities and learning resources" obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.45 (SD = .541), interpreted as Very Positive. This suggests that students strongly associate accreditation with improvements in school facilities, learning resources, and overall institutional development. The high rating further implies that accreditation is perceived as contributing positively to the learning environment and educational services provided by the institution [1, 21].

This is followed by the indicators stating that accreditation helps improve the quality of education in the school and ensures high standards in teaching and learning, both obtaining a weighted mean of 3.42, interpreted as Very Positive. These findings indicate that students recognize accreditation as a process that promotes academic excellence, quality assurance, and institutional accountability [28, 7].

On the other hand, the indicator "I feel confident that my school provides quality education because it is accredited" obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.18 (SD = .766), interpreted as Positive. This indicates that although students generally have favorable perceptions toward accreditation, some students may not fully experience or directly observe the effects of accreditation in their academic experiences. The relatively lower mean suggests the need for stronger awareness and communication regarding the benefits and outcomes of accreditation [10].

To summarize, students demonstrated a very positive perception of school accreditation, suggesting that accreditation contributes positively to students' views of institutional quality, academic standards, and learning conditions. The findings imply that accreditation plays a significant role in strengthening students' confidence in the institution and its educational practices.

These findings support the claims of the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities that accreditation promotes continuous improvement and quality assurance in educational institutions [28]. Similarly, Cagape and Prado (2025) emphasized that accreditation enhances institutional accountability and strengthens adherence to academic standards [7]. Furthermore, Ta et al.

(2023) found that students who are aware of quality assurance practices tend to develop more favorable perceptions toward their schools and educational environment [10].

Table 2. Level of Quality of Instruction

Indicators	WM	SD	Interpretation
1. Teachers clearly explain lessons and concepts in a way I can understand.	3.32	.750	Very High
2. Teachers organize the lesson well and follow a clear sequence.	3.36	.714	Very High
3. Teachers encourage students to participate and ask questions in class.	3.34	.679	Very High
4. Teachers manage the classroom effectively, minimizing distractions.	3.21	.719	High
5. Teachers provide helpful feedback on my work and performance.	3.17	.827	High
6. Teachers use teaching strategies that help me understand difficult topics.	3.31	.799	Very High
7. Teachers support me when I face learning difficulties.	3.03	.840	High
8. Teachers stimulate critical thinking and problem-solving during lessons.	3.39	.688	Very High
9. Teachers integrate relevant materials or activities that relate to real-life situations.	3.33	.697	Very High
10. Overall, I feel that the quality of instruction helps me achieve better academic outcomes.	3.27	.799	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	3.26	.556	Very High

Note. Scoring Range: 3.25 – 4.00 (Very High); 2.50 – 3.24 (High); 1.75 – 2.49 (Low); 1.00 – 1.74 (Very Low)

Table 2 presents the level of quality of instruction as assessed by the respondents at the University of Perpetual Help System Manila. The findings show that the overall quality of instruction obtained an average weighted mean of 3.26 (SD = .556), interpreted as Very High. This indicates that students generally perceive the quality of instruction in the institution as highly effective and conducive to learning.

Among the indicators, the statement “Teachers stimulate critical thinking and problem-solving during lessons” obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.39 (SD = .688), interpreted as Very High. This suggests that teachers are highly effective in promoting higher-order thinking skills and encouraging students to engage actively in meaningful learning experiences. The high rating further implies that instructional practices in the institution support analytical thinking and student engagement [5, 11].

This is followed by the indicator “Teachers organize the lesson well and follow a clear sequence,” which obtained a weighted mean of 3.36 (SD = .714), interpreted as Very High. Similarly, the indicator “Teachers encourage students to participate and ask questions in class” obtained a weighted mean of 3.34 (SD = .679), also interpreted as Very High. These findings indicate that teachers demonstrate strong classroom organization and encourage active participation among students, contributing positively to the learning process [30, 35].

On the other hand, the indicator “Teachers support me when I face learning difficulties” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.03 (SD = .840), interpreted as High. Although still positively evaluated, the relatively lower mean suggests that some students may perceive the need for additional academic support and assistance when experiencing learning challenges. This may indicate opportunities for strengthening intervention strategies and learner support systems within the institution [6].

To summarize, the respondents assessed the quality of instruction as Very High, suggesting that teachers effectively facilitate learning through organized instruction, student engagement, and critical thinking activities. The findings imply that instructional quality contributes positively to students’ classroom experiences and overall learning environment.

These findings support the study of Meng and Zhang (2023), which emphasized that effective instructional practices contribute significantly to student engagement and learning outcomes [22]. Similarly, Teig and Nilsen (2022) found that high-quality instruction positively influences student motivation and academic development [35]. Furthermore, Engida et al. (2024) highlighted that instructional quality plays a significant role in improving students’ educational experiences and academic achievement [11].

Table 3. Level of Academic Performance Based on General Weighted Average

Grades	Frequency	Percentage
90-100 (Advanced)	55	39.9
85-89 (Proficient)	45	32.6
80-84 (Approaching Proficient)	32	23.2
75-79 (Developing)	6	4.3
74 and below (Beginning)	-	-

N=138

Table 3 presents the level of academic performance of the respondents based on their General Weighted Average (GWA). The findings reveal that the largest proportion of students, comprising 55 respondents or 39.9% of the total population, obtained grades ranging from 90–100, interpreted as Advanced. This indicates that a considerable number of students demonstrate outstanding academic achievement and consistently perform well in their academic requirements.

This is followed by 45 respondents or 32.6% who obtained grades ranging from 85–89, interpreted as Proficient. The result suggests that many students are able to meet academic standards effectively and demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the expected learning competencies. In addition, 32 respondents or 23.2% were classified under the Approaching Proficient level, indicating that these students are progressing toward the expected academic standards.

On the other hand, only 6 respondents or 4.3% belonged to the Developing level, while no respondents were categorized under the Beginning level. The low percentage of students in the Developing category and the absence of students in the Beginning level indicate that the majority of respondents are performing at satisfactory to outstanding levels academically.

To summarize, the findings indicate that most respondents demonstrated favorable academic performance, as evidenced by the large proportion of students classified under the Advanced and Proficient levels. These results imply that students generally exhibit strong academic achievement and are able to meet the educational standards expected by the institution.

These findings are consistent with studies emphasizing that academic grades serve as important indicators of students’ learning achievement and educational attainment [15]. Similarly, research explains that academic performance reflects students’ mastery of learning competencies and achievement of academic standards as measured through official school records [23].

Table 4. Relationship Between Students’ Perception of School Accreditation and Quality of Instruction

Independent	Dependent	Pearson’s r^a	p -value	Interpretation ^b
Perception of accreditation	Quality of instruction	.700 (strong)	< .001	Significant

Note. ^aCorrelation: 0.00 – 0.19 (very weak); 0.20 – 0.39 (weak); 0.40 – 0.59 (moderate); 0.60 – 0.79 (strong); 0.80 – 1.00 (very strong). (Evans, 1996) ^bSignificant at <.05.

Table 4 presents the relationship between students’ perception of school accreditation and quality of instruction. The findings reveal that there is a strong positive relationship between the two variables, with a Pearson’s r value of .700 and a p -value of less than .001, interpreted as Significant. Since the p -value is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The result indicates that students who have more positive perceptions of school accreditation also tend to assess the quality of instruction more favorably. This suggests that students associate accreditation with effective teaching practices, organized instruction, and improved learning experiences within the institution. The strong correlation further implies that accreditation may contribute to strengthening instructional standards and enhancing the overall quality of education experienced by students.

The findings also suggest that accreditation is not merely viewed as a formal institutional requirement but is reflected in students’ actual classroom experiences and perceptions of teaching effectiveness. This implies that institutional quality assurance mechanisms may positively influence how students evaluate instructional delivery and educational practices within the school environment.

These findings support the study of Shal and Ghamrawi (2024), which emphasized that accreditation contributes to school improvement and enhances perceptions of educational quality among stakeholders. Similarly, Siddiqui and Lento (2022) found that accreditation strengthens teaching effectiveness and promotes quality learning environments. Furthermore, Ta et al. (2023) revealed that students who are aware of institutional quality assurance practices tend to develop more positive evaluations of educational experiences and instructional processes.

Table 5. Relationship Between Students’ Perception of School Accreditation and Academic Performance

Independent	Dependent	Pearson’s r^a	p -value	Interpretation ^b
Perception of accreditation	Academic Performance	.073 (very weak)	.396	Not Significant

Note. ^aCorrelation: 0.00 – 0.19 (very weak); 0.20 – 0.39 (weak); 0.40 – 0.59 (moderate); 0.60 – 0.79 (strong); 0.80 – 1.00 (very strong). (Evans, 1996) ^bSignificant at <.05.

Table 5 presents the relationship between students’ perception of school accreditation and academic performance. The findings reveal that there is a very weak positive relationship between the two

variables, with a Pearson’s r value of .073 and a p -value of .396, interpreted as Not Significant. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The result indicates that students’ perception of school accreditation does not significantly relate to their academic performance based on their General Weighted Average (GWA). Although students generally demonstrated positive perceptions toward accreditation, these perceptions do not necessarily correspond to higher academic achievement. The very weak correlation further suggests that accreditation may have minimal direct influence on students’ grades and overall academic outcomes.

The findings imply that academic performance may be influenced by other factors beyond students’ perception of accreditation, such as study habits, motivation, family support, learning environment, and individual academic abilities. While accreditation contributes to institutional quality assurance and educational improvement, its effects on academic performance may be indirect rather than immediately reflected in students’ academic records.

These findings are consistent with studies emphasizing that academic success is influenced by multiple interconnected factors beyond institutional systems alone [34]. Similarly, research explains that motivation, engagement, and personal learning behaviors play significant roles in determining students’ academic achievement [38]. Furthermore, environmental and individual factors are often found to have stronger direct effects on academic performance than institutional perceptions alone [27].

Table 6. Relationship Between Quality of Instruction and Academic Performance

Independent	Dependent	Pearson’s r^a	p -value	Interpretation ^b
Quality of Instruction	Academic Performance	-.010 (very weak)	.904	Not Significant

Note. ^aCorrelation: 0.00 – 0.19 (very weak); 0.20 – 0.39 (weak); 0.40 – 0.59 (moderate); 0.60 – 0.79 (strong); 0.80 – 1.00 (very strong). (Evans, 1996) ^bSignificant at <.05.

Table 6 presents the relationship between the quality of instruction and academic performance. The findings reveal that there is a very weak negative relationship between the two variables, with a Pearson’s r value of $-.010$ and a p -value of .904, interpreted as Not Significant. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The result indicates that students’ perceived quality of instruction does not significantly relate to their academic performance based on their General Weighted Average (GWA). Although respondents generally assessed the quality of instruction as very high, these positive evaluations do not necessarily correspond to higher academic achievement. The very weak negative correlation further suggests that the relationship between the variables is negligible.

The findings imply that academic performance may be influenced by several factors beyond instructional quality, including students’ motivation, study habits, learning environment, family support, and individual learning abilities. While quality instruction remains an important component of the educational process, its direct influence on academic performance may not always be immediately reflected in students’ grades.

These findings are consistent with studies emphasizing that academic achievement is shaped by multiple psychological, behavioral, and environmental factors [38]. Similarly, research shows that although instructional quality supports engagement and learning, academic performance is also strongly influenced by students’ self-efficacy and motivation [22]. Furthermore, institutional and environmental

factors collectively contribute to students' academic outcomes rather than instructional quality alone [27].

4. Conclusion/Recommendations

This study concludes that students of the University of Perpetual Help System Manila generally have a very positive perception of school accreditation and assess the quality of instruction as very high. These findings indicate that students recognize accreditation as an important mechanism for ensuring educational quality, institutional improvement, and compliance with academic standards. Likewise, the high rating of instructional quality suggests that teachers effectively deliver lessons, encourage student participation, and promote meaningful learning experiences.

In terms of academic performance, the results show that most students fall under the Advanced and Proficient levels based on their General Weighted Average, indicating generally strong academic achievement among the respondents. This suggests that students are performing well academically within the institution, although a smaller proportion still falls under lower performance levels.

The correlational analysis further reveals a significant relationship between students' perception of school accreditation and quality of instruction. However, no significant relationships were found between perception of accreditation and academic performance, as well as between quality of instruction and academic performance. These findings imply that while institutional quality and instructional effectiveness are positively perceived, academic performance may be influenced more strongly by other personal and environmental factors beyond accreditation and instruction alone.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that the school strengthen programs that further increase students' awareness and understanding of school accreditation and its direct benefits to learners. Although perceptions are already very positive, deeper student engagement in quality assurance initiatives may further enhance institutional transparency and appreciation of accreditation processes. Additionally, continuous professional development programs for teachers should be sustained to maintain and further improve instructional quality, particularly in providing academic support to students who experience learning difficulties.

It is also recommended that future interventions focus on improving student academic support systems, such as tutoring programs, mentoring, and learning assistance initiatives, to help enhance academic performance.

Since academic performance was not significantly influenced by accreditation perception and instructional quality, additional studies may be conducted to identify other contributing factors such as motivation, study habits, and learning environment. Future researchers may also expand the scope of the study to include other grade levels or institutions to validate and strengthen the findings.

REFERENCES

1. Adiyaman, H., & Özmantar, Z. K. (2023). Impact of accreditation on schools: An examination in terms of open system elements. *Participatory Educational Research*, 10(2), 174–194. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.23.35.10.2>
2. Ahmed, S. N., Choudhry, L., Rasool, K., & Hamid, S. (2025). Examining the impact of accreditation on teacher education quality in Pakistan: Institutional performance and pre-service teacher outcomes. *Social Sciences Spectrum*, 4(4), 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.71085/sss.04.04.360>
3. Alenezi, S., Al-Eadhy, A., Barasain, R., AlWakeel, T. S., AlEidan, A., & Abohumid, H. N. (2023).

- Impact of external accreditation on students' performance: Insights from a full accreditation cycle. *Heliyon*, 9(5), e15815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15815>
4. Almerino, P. M., Ocampo, L. A., Abellana, D. P. M., et al. (2020). Evaluating the academic performance of K–12 students in the Philippines: A standardized evaluation approach. *Education Research International*, 2020, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8877712>
 5. Attig, M., Hoferichter, F., Steinmann, I., & Strietholt, R. (2024). Teaching quality and student reading outcomes: Evidence from a longitudinal study from grade 5 to 7. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 81, 101347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101347>
 6. Blömeke, S., Jentsch, A., Ross, N., Kaiser, G., & König, J. (2022). Opening up the black box: Teacher competence, instructional quality, and students' learning progress. *Learning and Instruction*, 79, 101600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101600>
 7. Cagape, P., & Prado, N. (2025). Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation: Its impact on the quality of higher education programs. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 35(3), 296–308. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.350307>
 8. Carroza-Pacheco, A., León-Del-Barco, B., & Molleda, C. B. (2025). Academic performance and resilience in secondary education students. *Journal of Intelligence*, 13(5), 56. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence13050056>
 9. Dalusong, M. T. B., Dones, V., & Grageda, M. E. (2024). Instructional quality in a blended teaching and learning approach and its dimensions: A literature review. *NRCP Research Journal*, 24(2), 48. <https://doi.org/10.63225/nrcp.rj.2025.0031>
 10. Davis, L. (2025). School effectiveness, equity, and multilingual learners: Examining multilingual learner education through school accreditation. *Ampersand*, 14, 100216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2024.100216>
 11. Engida, M. A., Iyasu, A. S., & Fentie, Y. M. (2024). Impact of teaching quality on student achievement: Student evidence. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1367317>
 12. Fryer, L. K., & Leenknecht, M. J. M. (2023). Toward an organizing theoretical model for teacher clarity, feedback, and self-efficacy in the classroom. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09787-5>
 13. Gyamfi, G., Hanna, B. E., & Khosravi, H. (2024). Impact of an instructional guide and examples on the quality of feedback: Insights from a randomized controlled study. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(3), 1419–1437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10346-0>
 14. Hailu, M., Abie, A., Mehari, M. G., et al. (2024). Magnitude of academic performance and its associated factors among health science students. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1), 1288. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06296-z>
 15. Hatos, A., & Gyarmati, B. F. (2023). The reliability of self-reported GPA in educational research. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională*, 15(4), 159–177. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.4/786>
 16. Huang, J. (2024). The impact of teaching quality on student academic performance. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 209, 01009. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202420901009>

17. Izaguirre, L. A., Rodríguez-Fernández, A., & Fernández-Zabala, A. (2022). Perceived academic performance explained by school climate and psychological variables. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 318–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12557>
18. Jani, A. (2025). Total quality management in education: A comparative study on students' perception and academic performance. *Vidya – A Journal of Gujarat University*, 4(2), 181–185. <https://doi.org/10.47413/gbv08a74>
19. Jarrar, M., Mohamed, R. B., Al-Bsheish, M., et al. (2022). Students' perception of quality of learning experience. *Healthcare*, 10(8), 1584. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10081584>
20. Khotimah, N. K., & Anggraini, H. W. (2025). Classroom participation and academic achievement. *Al-Muaddib Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Kependidikan*, 7(3), 264–273. <https://doi.org/10.46773/muaddib.v7i3.2022>
21. Kumar, A., Paliwal, J., Singh, M., et al. (2024). Focused literature review on accreditation and quality assurance. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 33(3), 376–392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-08-2024-0170>
22. Meng, Q., & Zhang, Q. (2023). Academic self-efficacy and academic performance. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5767. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075767>
23. Marini, J. P., Young, L., & Shaw, E. J. (2021). Accuracy of self-reported GPA. ACT Research Report.
24. Maslang, K. L. (2023). Predictors of academic performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4325530>
25. Mercado, D. J. (2024). Student perception and academic performance. *Journal of Research Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 14(2), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol14.2.2.2024>
26. Mustari, M., & Muhammad, I. (2023). Classroom management and learning quality. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(3), 3776–3784. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i3.2928>
27. Omweri, F. S. (2024). Institutional environment and academic performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-39>
28. Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities. (n.d.). What is accreditation? <https://paascu.org.ph/what-is-accreditation/>
29. Romanowski, M. H. (2022). Accreditation and governmentality in education. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2073631>
30. Senden, B., Nilsen, T., & Blömeke, S. (2022). Instructional quality review. In *Ways of Analyzing Teaching Quality*. <https://doi.org/10.18261/9788215045054-2021-05>
31. Senden, B., Nilsen, T., & Teig, N. (2023). Validity of teaching quality ratings. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 78, 101274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101274>
32. Shal, T., & Ghamrawi, N. (2024). Does accreditation improve schools? *SAGE Open*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244024128122>
33. Siddiqui, S., & Lento, C. (2022). Teaching effectiveness in accredited schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(4), 576–592. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-12-2021-0462>
34. Sundararaman, A., Baek, K., Gee, M., et al. (2025). Holistic student success. *Journal of Postsecondary Student Success*, 4(2), 24–47.

35. Teig, N., & Nilsen, T. (2022). Instructional quality and achievement. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 74, 101170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101170>
36. Teig, N., Ye, W., Caro, D., & April, D. (2026). Academic resilience and instructional clarity. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 89, 101604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2026.101604>
37. Toropova, A., Johansson, S., & Myrberg, E. (2019). Teacher characteristics and student achievement. *Education Inquiry*, 10(4), 275–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2019.1591844>
38. Vu, T., Magis-Weinberg, L., Jansen, B. R. J., et al. (2021). Motivation-achievement cycles in learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 39–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09616-7>
39. Zen, Z., Reflianto, Syamsuar, & Ariani, F. (2022). Academic achievement and engagement. *Heliyon*, 8(11), e11509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11509>