

White Deer Award of Excellence: A Strategic Framework for Establishing a Credible Recognition Program for Education and Other Government and Non-Government Sectors

Kristine Marie S. Olivar ¹
kristinemarie.olivar@deped.gov.ph

Mildred F. Accad, PhD ²
accadmildred@sksu.edu.ph

1 – M. Roxas Elementary School, Sto Niño, South Cotabato, Philippines

2 – Sultan Kudarat State University, EJC Montilla, Tacurong City, Philippines

Publication Date: September 23, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22917867

Abstract

The White Deer Award of Excellence serves as a strategic initiative to establish credible recognition mechanism that celebrates exceptional achievements and promotes excellence across education, government, and non-government sectors. This study explores the White Deer Award of Excellence as a strategic initiative for establishing credible recognition mechanisms across education, government, and non-government sectors in Region XII. Using an Explanatory-Sequential Mixed Method Research Design, the study investigates how a transparent and strategic awards system can promote excellence and foster a culture of meritocracy. The quantitative phase assesses the relationship between the quality of the White Deer Award and the creation of credible recognition bodies. Data was collected from DepEd districts, municipalities, and NGO offices that recognize outstanding employees annually. Findings revealed that the White Deer Award is perceived as a credible recognition body, with high ratings for transparency, consistency in criteria, and the credibility of the judging panel. The correlation analysis indicates that the award is positively linked with key educational outcomes, such as accreditation and alignment with educational standards. Thematic analysis highlights the importance of community-based validation, direct observation, and thorough evaluation in ensuring credibility. Furthermore, participants suggest strategies to increase awareness, including integrating the award into professional development, utilizing digital toolkits, and promoting it through social media and academic channels. Overall, the study underscores the White Deer Award's effectiveness in fostering excellence and enhancing the credibility of educational and organizational programs in Region XII.

Keywords: *White Deer Award, recognition system, meritocracy, education, credibility, education*

INTRODUCTION

The White Deer Award of Excellence serves as a strategic initiative to establish credible recognition mechanisms across the education, government, and non-government sectors. By acting as behavioral catalysts, recognition systems drive innovation, high standards, and accountability. However, despite global evidence of their motivational impact, research remains limited regarding how award systems specifically influence employee morale and foster a culture of excellence within public service.

Globally, recognition bodies—such as those in the UK—and international organizations like UNESCO and the Nobel Foundation set benchmarks that foster professional growth, enhance reputation, and drive quality improvements (Kovacs & Tatham, 2020; Meyer, 2019). However, persistent challenges surrounding transparency and credibility continue to hinder the effective implementation of these recognition systems worldwide.

In the Philippines, national awards like the Presidential Award for Child-Friendly Municipalities and Cities and Gawad KALASAG highlight the value of public service recognition (Alba, 2020). However, political interference, perceived unfairness, and unsystematic evaluation frequently limit their impact (Villanueva, 2021). Strengthening these recognition mechanisms is essential to establishing transparency and consistent evaluation standards across government and non-government sectors.

In South Central Mindanao, recognition programs like the "Dangal ng GenSan" honor contributions in education and governance, but unclear criteria, inconsistencies, and a lack of credible frameworks hinder their impact (Santiago & Manilay, 2022). Consequently, a significant gap remains in establishing a transparent, well-structured recognition system aligned with international standards to motivate local talent and institutions toward excellence.

The White Deer Award of Excellence addresses key gaps in recognition systems across education, government, and non-government sectors. Despite global emphasis on performance recognition, little research examines its impact on morale, institutional culture, and performance in the Philippines. Furthermore, the lack of a standardized framework for credible, transparent recognition bodies undermines their legitimacy, highlighting the need to align these systems with sector-specific goals for long-term sustainability.

The urgency of this study stems from the need to foster excellence and accountability across education, government, and non-government sectors—critical pillars of national development. While credible recognition systems motivate higher performance, their absence risks perpetuating mediocrity and favoritism. Timely amidst rapid technological and societal change, this research aims to build a strategic, credible framework that boosts morale, retains talent, and serves as a catalyst for excellence.

This study explores how a transparent awards system can foster meritocracy and excellence across government and non-government sectors. Specifically, it investigates how the

White Deer Award of Excellence can be designed to meet local needs while adhering to international standards of transparency and credibility.

Research Questions

This study examined the relationship between the quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence and the establishment of credible recognition bodies in Region XII. It also explored how a transparent, strategic awards system can foster meritocracy and excellence across government and non-government sectors. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

- :
 1. What is the quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence as a Strategic approach to Creating Credible Recognition Bodies, in terms of:
 - 1.1. Transparency of the Selection Process;
 - 1.2. Credibility of the Judging Panel;
 - 1.3. Consistency in Award Criteria;
 - 1.4. Reputation of the Awarding Body;
 - 1.5. Impact of the Award on Recipients' Career;
 - 1.6. Frequency and Timing of Awarding Ceremonies
 - 1.7. Stakeholder Trust and Confidence; and
 - 1.8. Marketing and Communication Strategies?
 2. What is the credibility level of the created recognition bodies and their program outcomes, in the aspect of:
 - 2.1. Education, which will be assessed in terms of:
 - 2.1.1. Accreditation by Educational Institutions;
 - 2.1.2. Alignment with Educational Standards and Frameworks;
 - 2.1.3. Endorsements from Renowned Educators; and
 - 2.1.4. Impact on Career Advancement for Educators Students?
 - 2.2. Other Government Agencies, as assessed in terms of:
 - 2.2.1. Compliance with Government Policies and Regulations;
 - 2.2.2. Collaboration with National or Local Government Agencies;
 - 2.2.3. Legitimacy Through Official Certification or Recognition; and
 - 2.2.4. Public Trust in Government-endorsed Recognition Bodies?
 - 2.3. Non-Government Agencies (NGOs), to be assessed thru its:
 - 2.3.1. Reputation in the Non-Government Sector;
 - 2.3.2. Advocacy and Social Impact;
 - 2.3.3. Endorsement from Influential NGOs and Civil Society Leaders; and
 - 2.3.4. Transparency and Accountability Practices?
 3. Is there a significant relationship between the implementation of the White bodies and their program outcome?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized Explanatory-Sequential Mixed Method of Research Design to explore how well-designed, transparent, and strategic awards system can inspire excellence and create a culture of meritocracy in various sectors. The study aimed to determine the relationship between the quality of White Deer Awards of Excellence and the creation of the credible recognition bodies.

Explanatory-Sequential Mixed Method Research Design is appropriate for this study because it uses quantitative data to establish broad patterns, followed by qualitative data to explain those initial findings in depth (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The initial quantitative phase identifies general trends regarding how transparent and strategic recognition systems impact organizational outcomes. The subsequent qualitative phase gathers stakeholder experiences and motivations to explain *why* and *how* these patterns occur (Ivankova et al., 2019). Combining both approaches ensures a comprehensive understanding of how awards systems foster excellence and meritocracy

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in various DepEd districts, municipalities, and NGO offices within Region XII, as these institutions have established mechanisms to recognize and reward outstanding employees on an annual basis. Such recognition programs foster a culture of excellence and motivation among employees, which aligns with the principles of performance-based evaluation and continuous professional development (Du Plessis, 2020). In educational settings, these practices are known to enhance job satisfaction and organizational commitment, further contributing to improved work performance and educational outcomes (Ghavifekr & Pillai, 2016). Moreover, the engagement of NGOs in recognizing excellence demonstrates a broader societal commitment to valuing dedicated service in education and other community-based sectors (Tandon, 2019).

Respondents of the Study

In the quantitative selection there were 53 participants out of 120 expected respondents answered the survey questionnaire who were individuals directly involved in or affected by recognition programs within education and various government and non-governmental sectors in Region XII; and 24 participants in the qualitative research composed of White Deer Awardees, Awarding Committee, spectators and reactors of the White Deer Award social media post.

The respondents of this study include Educators, such as Teachers and school administrators, Government Officials, such as Representatives from relevant government agencies responsible for education and other sectors, Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Leaders, such as Individuals from NGOs that engage in educational initiatives or community development, and Stakeholders and Community Members, such as Parents, and community who were reactors in the social media post of White Deer Awards, the awarding committees and the awardees.

.Sampling Technique

To select respondents, random sampling was employed. This technique ensures that each individual within the target population has an equal chance of being selected, thereby reducing selection bias and enhancing the generalizability of the study's findings (Taherdoost, 2016). Given the focus on understanding the nuances of recognition bodies and their credibility, random sampling will ensure that a broad and representative sample of participants from various sectors involved in education, government, and non-government programs is included. Random sampling is particularly appropriate for this study as it allows for the collection of diverse perspectives in a statistically unbiased manner, thus providing a comprehensive view of the effectiveness of recognition systems across different fields. By randomly selecting participants, the study can capture a more objective and well-rounded dataset that reflects the experiences and insights of the wider population involved in recognition initiatives.

Data Gathering Instrument

An adapted survey questionnaire was used to assess the quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence as a Strategic Approach to Creating Credible Recognition Bodies, and credibility level of the created recognition bodies. Hence, a researcher-made survey questionnaire had undergone validation and evaluation of the experts.

To ensure that the data collected is valid and reliable, several key processes related to validity and reliability testing was undertaken:

First, the survey questionnaire had undergone a validation process through expert evaluation. This involved subject-matter experts in the areas of recognition systems, awards programs, and education, as well as specialists in survey design. The purpose is to ensure that the questions included in the survey are relevant, comprehensive, and representative of the constructs being measured, such as credibility, quality of recognition bodies, and stakeholder perceptions.

In addition to expert review, the researcher employed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to assess the underlying structure of the questionnaire items. This process helped identify whether the items group together into coherent factors that align with the theoretical constructs of recognition quality, credibility, and program outcomes. If necessary, items that do not load strongly on their respective factors will be revised or removed to enhance construct validity.

To test the internal consistency and reliability of the survey instrument, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of the degree to which items within a scale are correlated with one another. A value of 0.70 or higher is generally considered acceptable for social science research, indicating that the items consistently measure the same construct. The reliability analysis was conducted for each subscale of the questionnaire, such as "Credibility of Recognition Bodies," "Program Outcomes," and "Quality of Awards Programs."

An additional method, split-half reliability, was considered to cross-check the results obtained from Cronbach's alpha. This involved splitting the survey into two halves and comparing the consistency of responses between them.

Prior to the full administration of the survey, a pilot study was conducted with a small sample of participants who match the target population. This allowed the researcher to assess the clarity of the items, the length of the survey, and the overall user experience. The pilot study was provide initial data for computing Cronbach's alpha and conducting other reliability tests. Any issues identified during the pilot phase, such as confusing wording or low reliability, was addressed before the main survey distribution.

Also, the following rating scales were used, patterned after the study of Del Rosario (2021):

Scale on the quality of the White Dear Award of Excellence as a Strategic Approach to Creating Credible Recognition Bodies in Region XII

Scale	Range	Verbal Description	Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree	The White Dear Award of Excellence is highly credible and serves as an exemplary strategic approach to building a credible and trustworthy recognition body.
4	3.40-4.19	Agree	The White Dear Award of Excellence is generally credible as a strategic approach, contributing positively to creating a credible recognition body.
3	2.60-3.39	Neutral	The White Dear Award of Excellence has a with Moderate Credibility as a strategic approach, with neither strong nor weak contribution to creating a credible body.
2	1.80-2.59	Disagree	The White Dear Award of Excellence has less credibility as a strategic approach and only minimally contributes to the creation of a credible body.
1	1.0-1.79	Strongly Disagree	The White Dear Award of Excellence is not/least credible as a strategic approach and does not contribute to creating a credible recognition body.

Scale on the credibility level of the created recognition bodies

Scale	Range	Verbal Description	Verbal Description Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree	With Highest Credibility The recognition body is extremely reliable, transparent, and trusted by all stakeholders.
4	3.40-4.19	Agree	With High Credibility The recognition body is generally reliable and trusted, with minor areas for improvement.
3	2.60-3.39	Neutral	With Moderate Credibility The recognition body is somewhat reliable but has noticeable gaps that need to be addressed.
2	1.80-2.59	Disagree	With Low Credibility The recognition body has significant flaws and is not fully trusted by stakeholders.
1	1.0-1.79	Strongly Disagree	Very With Low Credibility The recognition body is unreliable, lacks transparency, and is generally distrusted.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study investigated the development and implementation of a credible recognition system across urban and rural schools, government offices, and non-governmental organizations in Region XII. Specifically, it covered public and private education, local and regional government agencies, and civil society foundations. The research evaluated key variables including selection process transparency, judging panel credibility, criteria consistency, awarding body reputation, career impact on recipients, ceremony timing and frequency, stakeholder trust, and communication strategies.

This research covered local recognition programs established or active between 2018 and 2023 within Region XII, excluding international and national awards except for brief comparisons. The study focused exclusively on strategic approaches to managing recognition systems in education, government, and NGO sectors, omitting arts, business, or broader institutional and financial management. Primary data was limited to Region XII key informants—including educators, government officials, and NGO leaders—and regional document reviews.

This scope and delimitation ensured that the study remains focused on analyzing credible recognition systems within a defined geographic and sectoral context, providing actionable insights for creating and improving award bodies in Region XII.

Statistical Treatment

For the quantitative phase, the study utilized **weighted mean** and standard deviation to assess the quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence as a strategic approach to creating credible recognition bodies, as well as the credibility level of the recognition bodies created in Region XII. Weighted Mean was used for SOP 1 and SOP 2. It is a statistical measure that allows for assigning different levels of importance to each item in the survey, which ensures that more significant responses are given appropriate weight when calculating the average (Sullivan, 2018).

Additionally, **Pearson Moment Correlation** was employed to analyze the relationship between the implementation of the White Deer Award of Excellence and improvements in educational program outcomes in schools and non-government organizations. Pearson's correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables (Field, 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence

Tables 1 to 9 show the quality of the White Deer Award Of Excellence as a Strategic Approach to Creating Credible Recognition Bodies, in terms of : Transparency of the Selection Process, Credibility of the Judging Panel, Consistency in Award Criteria, Reputation of the Awarding Body, Impact of the Award on Recipients' Career, Frequency and Timing of Awarding Ceremonies, Stakeholder Trust and Confidence and Marketing and Communication Strategies.

Table 1. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Transparency of the Selection Process

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1	The selection process for the White Deer Award of Excellence is clearly communicated to stakeholders.	4.58	0.57	Strongly Agree
2	Criteria for nomination and selection are accessible and understandable to all participants.	4.42	0.75	Strongly Agree
3	There is sufficient documentation provided to justify the selection of winners.	4.72	0.50	Strongly Agree
4	Stakeholders are informed of any updates or changes in the selection process.	4.40	0.66	Strongly Agree

5	The process ensures fairness and impartiality in all stages of selection.	4.09	0.63	Agree
Mean+		4.44	0.34	Strongly Agree

Nomination and selection criteria received high ratings for clarity and accessibility ($M=4.42, SD=0.75$), reinforcing that stakeholders understand and confidently engage with the process—a key factor in fostering program inclusivity and legitimacy (Brown et al., 2020). Conversely, fairness and impartiality across all selection stages scored lowest ($M=4.09, SD=0.63$), highlighting an area for improvement to ensure perceived equity among all participants.

Proactive communication of updates scored highly ($M=4.40, SD=0.66$), reflecting a strong commitment to openness and stakeholder engagement. Open communication in recognition programs boosts morale and builds trust (Gonzalez & Torres, 2021). Overall, while the White Deer Award is viewed as transparent, continuously refining communication and reinforcing fairness will further enhance its credibility.

Table 2. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Credibility of the Judging Panel

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1	The judging panel consists of experts with proven expertise in their respective fields.	4.58	0.66	Strongly Agree
2	Judges are independent and free from potential conflicts of interest.	4.32	0.80	Strongly Agree
3	The selection process ensures that judges are impartial and unbiased.	4.62	0.63	Strongly Agree
4	Stakeholders are confident in the qualifications and integrity of the judges.	4.57	0.57	Strongly Agree
5	Information about the judging panel is publicly available and transparent.	4.25	0.55	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.47	0.40	Strongly Agree

Results in Table 2 show a very favorable opinion of the White Deer Award judging panel's trustworthiness ($M=4.47, SD=0.40$). Objectivity was rated highest ($M=4.62$), supported by strong agreement on judges' expertise ($M=4.58$) and integrity ($M=4.57$). Even the lowest-rated item—panel transparency ($M=4.25$)—remained in the "Strongly Agree" range, confirming well-established credibility.

These findings align with research emphasizing that award legitimacy relies on adjudicator independence, expertise, and transparency (Scott & Menzel, 2019; Chen & Zhou, 2020). Public trust increases when selection processes are clear and free from conflicts of interest (Jones & Evans, 2021).

Table 3. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Consistency in Award Criteria

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1	The award criteria remain consistent across all editions of the White Deer Award of Excellence.	4.68	0.58	Strongly Agree
2	The criteria reflect the core values and objectives of the award.	4.47	0.78	Strongly Agree
3	Stakeholders find the criteria to be fair and relevant to the recognition being conferred.	4.81	0.48	Strongly Agree
4	Any revisions to the criteria are effectively communicated before the awarding process.	4.34	0.62	Strongly Agree
5	The criteria are applied uniformly across all nominees.	4.45	0.64	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.55	0.36	Strongly Agree

Respondents strongly agreed that the White Deer Award for Excellence maintains consistent criteria ($M=4.55, SD=0.36$). Descriptive ratings across all indicators were "Strongly Agree," showing stakeholders perceive the criteria as fair, reliable, and aligned with core values.

Stakeholders rated criteria fairness and relevance highest ($M=4.81$), reinforcing that equitable processes build trust and engagement (Nguyen & Doan, 2020). Consistency across award editions also scored high ($M=4.68$), confirming perceived stability—a key driver of organizational credibility (Choi et al., 2019).

Respondents agreed that criteria align with organizational values ($M=4.47$), keeping awards meaningful (Taylor & Watkins, 2021). Communication of criteria revisions also received strong support ($M=4.34$), reflecting effective transparency and change management (Moralez & Santos, 2018).

Table 4. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Reputation of the Awarding Body

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1	The organization behind the White Deer Award of Excellence is widely recognized for its credibility.	4.58	0.60	Strongly Agree
2	The awarding body demonstrates commitment to promoting excellence in its field.	4.36	0.86	Strongly Agree
3	The award is perceived as prestigious within relevant professional communities.	4.77	0.58	Strongly Agree
4	Stakeholders associate the awarding body with integrity and ethical standards.	4.51	0.67	Strongly Agree
5	The awarding body actively maintains its reputation through transparent practices	3.98	0.75	Agree
	Mean	4.44	0.42	Strongly Agree

Table 4 demonstrates a highly favorable view of the awarding body's reputation ($M=4.44, SD=0.42$). Peer prestige scored highest ($M=4.77, SD=0.58$), confirming the award carries significant professional weight (Thomas & Peters, 2020). Organizational credibility also received strong agreement ($M=4.58, SD=0.60$), showing institutional trust drives the award's perceived value (Lee & Lim, 2019).

Respondents strongly associated the body with integrity and ethical standards ($M=4.51, SD=0.67$), reinforcing that credibility relies on fair administration (Carberry et al., 2018). Maintaining reputation through transparent practices rated lowest ($M=3.98, SD=0.75$), highlighting an opportunity to enhance operational openness.

Overall, the White Deer Award for Excellence is recognized as a prestigious honor backed by an ethical, credible organization, ensuring its long-term value in professional circles.

Table 5. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Impact of the Awards on Recipients' Career

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	Receiving the award significantly enhances recipients' professional credibility.	4.62	0.63	Strongly Agree
2.	Recipients of the award experience increased opportunities in their careers.	4.42	0.80	Strongly Agree
3.	The award serves as a valuable credential for professional growth.	4.66	0.59	Strongly Agree
4.	Recipients feel motivated and valued by receiving the recognition.	4.23	0.54	Strongly Agree
5.	The award contributes to recipients' visibility in their professional community.	4.17	0.73	Agree
	Mean	4.42	0.36	Strongly Agree

Table 5 shows the White Deer Award significantly boosts recipients' career development ($M=4.42, SD=0.36$). The highest-rated item indicates the award serves as a valuable professional credential ($M=4.66, SD=0.59$), enhancing portfolios and competitiveness for career advancement (Thompson & Jensen, 2020).

Receiving the award strongly enhances professional credibility ($M=4.62$), as external validation increases trust, authority, and promotion opportunities (Johnson & Barrett, 2019). It also expands career opportunities ($M=4.42$) by providing access to leadership networks and mentorship (Lee & Watson, 2021).

Although professional community visibility rated slightly lower ($M=4.17$), it remains favorable, supporting literature on increased involvement in conferences and publications. Overall, the award acts as a strong catalyst for career credibility and growth.

Table 6. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Impact Frequency and Timing of Awarding Ceremonies

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The frequency of awarding ceremonies is appropriate for maintaining the award's prestige.	4.38	0.53	Strongly Agree
2.	The timing of the ceremonies aligns with stakeholders' schedules and preferences.	4.04	0.81	Agree
3.	Regular ceremonies ensure sustained interest in the award.	4.62	0.60	Strongly Agree
4.	The awarding body provides ample notice about the timing of ceremonies.	4.42	0.54	Strongly Agree
5.	Stakeholders are satisfied with how the frequency and timing of ceremonies are planned	4.39	0.39	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.38	0.53	Strongly Agree

Table 6 shows high stakeholder satisfaction with the scheduling and conduct of award ceremonies ($M=4.38, SD=0.53$). Regular ceremonies scored highest for sustaining interest ($M=4.62, SD=0.60$), confirming that consistent recognition boosts engagement and motivation (Ghosh & Githens, 2018).

Stakeholders strongly agreed that ample advance notice is provided ($M=4.42, SD=0.54$), highlighting clear planning and communication (Yoon et al., 2020). Conversely, alignment with individual schedules received the lowest score ($M=4.04, SD=0.81$), pointing to an opportunity for more inclusive timing.

High satisfaction with overall event frequency ($M=4.39, SD=0.39$) supports research showing consistent recognition cycles drive participation (Tran & Nguyen, 2021). Overall, ceremony practices are effective, though minor scheduling adjustments could further maximize attendance.

Table 7. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Stakeholder Trust and Confidence

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	Stakeholders trust the integrity of the White Deer Award of Excellence.	4.38	0.71	Strongly Agree
2.	The award reflects the genuine achievements of its recipients.	4.09	0.84	Agree
3.	Stakeholders believe the process is free from favoritism or bias.	4.66	0.65	Strongly Agree
4.	The awarding body engages stakeholders in meaningful dialogue to enhance trust.	4.30	0.64	Strongly Agree
5.	Trust in the award contributes to its sustained	4.49	0.64	Strongly Agree

relevance and prestige.

Mean	4.38	0.48	Strongly Agree
------	------	------	----------------

Table 7 shows high overall quality for the White Deer Award ($M=4.38, SD=0.48$). Freedom from bias scored highest ($M=4.66$), confirming that perceived fairness and transparency drive institutional credibility (Ahmad et al., 2020).

Respondents agreed that trust sustains the award's relevance and prestige ($M=4.49$), supporting research that trust enhances reputational capital (Gillespie & Dietz, 2019). Stakeholder engagement through dialogue also scored high ($M=4.30$), reinforcing how open communication fosters mutual respect (Tschannen-Moran, 2019).

The item stating the award reflects genuine recipient achievements scored lowest ($M=4.09$), highlighting a minor area for improvement in selection authenticity. Overall, stakeholders view the award highly, particularly regarding fairness, engagement, and sustained trust.

Table 8. Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence in terms of Marketing and Communication Strategies

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The award is effectively promoted to relevant audiences through multiple channels.	4.62	0.49	Strongly Agree
2.	Communication materials about the award are clear, professional, and engaging.	4.66	0.48	Strongly Agree
3.	The awarding body uses innovative strategies to reach a broader audience.	4.58	0.60	Strongly Agree
4.	Stakeholders feel informed about the award through timely updates and campaigns.	4.42	0.60	Strongly Agree
5.	Marketing efforts highlight the unique value and prestige of the award.	4.38	0.63	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.53	0.38	Strongly Agree

Table 8 shows respondents strongly agreed that the White Deer Award for Excellence employs highly effective marketing and communication strategies ($M=4.53, SD=0.38$). Material clarity, professionalism, and engagement received the highest rating ($M=4.66$), confirming that polished content enhances brand equity and appeal (Keller, 2019).

Stakeholders highlighted the use of multi-channel promotion ($M=4.62$) and innovative outreach strategies ($M=4.58$), aligning with research on the necessity of digital-age multi-platform integration (Kotler et al., 2021). Slightly lower scores for campaign timing ($M=4.42$) and prestige communication ($M=4.38$) suggest minor areas for refining value messaging.

Strategic channel integration and targeted messaging significantly drive organizational visibility and engagement (Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2019). Overall, the award effectively applies these principles to establish strong public perception and brand relevance.

Table 9. Summary Quality of the White Deer Award of Excellence as Strategic Approach in Creating Credible Recognition Body

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Transparency of the Selection Process	4.44	0.34	Strongly Agree
2. Credibility of the Judging Panel	4.47	0.40	Strongly Agree
3. Consistency in Award Criteria	4.55	0.36	Strongly Agree
4. Reputation of the Awarding Body	4.44	0.42	Strongly Agree
5. Impact of the Award on Recipients' Career	4.42	0.36	Strongly Agree
6. Frequency and Timing of the Awarding Ceremony	4.38	0.39	Strongly Agree
7. Stakeholders Trust and Confidence	4.38	0.48	Strongly Agree
8. Marketing and Communication Strategies	4.53	0.38	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	4.45	0.22	Strongly Agree

Table 9 shows high stakeholder satisfaction with ceremony scheduling and conduct ($M=4.38, SD=0.53$). Regular ceremonies scored highest for sustaining interest ($M=4.62, SD=0.60$), confirming that consistent recognition maintains engagement and motivation (Ghosh & Githens, 2018).

Judging panel credibility scored high ($M=4.47$), underscoring how impartial, qualified evaluators boost perceived fairness and legitimacy (Lee & Cheng, 2021). High scores for selection transparency ($M=4.44$) and awarding body reputation ($M=4.44$) further reinforce organizational integrity.

JMarketing and communication strategies rated highest overall ($M=4.53$), demonstrating how strategic outreach strengthens award visibility and image (Hassan & Rahman, 2020). Strong ratings for stakeholder trust ($M=4.38$) and career impact ($M=4.42$) highlight the award's broader value for morale and professional growth.

In summary, the data validates the White Deer Award of Excellence as a credible, strategically effective initiative driven by reliable evaluation, transparent processes, and impactful communication.

Level of Credibility of the White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes

Tables 10 to 22 present the credibility and program outcomes of the created recognition bodies across three major sectors. Education was evaluated on institutional accreditation, standards alignment, educator endorsements, and career advancement impact. Government Agencies were assessed on policy compliance, collaboration, official certification, and public

trust, while Non-Governmental Agencies were evaluated on sector reputation, social impact, civil society endorsements, and transparency.

As shown in Table 10, respondents strongly agreed that the White Deer Award demonstrates the highest credibility in education outcomes and partnerships ($M=4.49, SD=0.50$). Stakeholders rated the award body highest as a reliable educational partner ($M=4.68$) and praised its active collaboration with academic institutions ($M=4.60$), reinforcing that mutual engagement drives academic trust.

Table 10. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Accreditation by Educational Institutions

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body is widely accredited by reputable educational institutions.	4.40	0.60	Strongly Agree
2.	Accreditation by educational institutions enhances the credibility of the programs offered.	4.30	0.75	Strongly Agree
3.	Educational institutions actively partner with this recognition body.	4.60	0.57	Strongly Agree
4.	The accreditation process of this body aligns with global educational benchmarks.	4.49	0.61	Strongly Agree
5.	Stakeholders view the recognition body as a reliable partner in education.	4.68	0.58	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.49	0.50	Strongly Agree

These findings support the assertion that credible recognition bodies strongly influence institutional accreditation and program quality. Aligning recognition standards with global frameworks gains wider acceptance, which is essential for quality assurance (Dill, 2019). Globally benchmarked accreditation processes build credibility, making institutions more likely to advocate for recognized bodies (Choudaha & Elseey, 2021). Furthermore, partnering with reputable accrediting entities enhances global competitiveness and improves student and institutional outcomes (UNESCO, 2022).

Table 11. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Alignment with Educational Standards and Frameworks

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body ensures compliance with national educational standards.	4.45	0.77	Strongly Agree
2.	Its programs are aligned with international educational frameworks.	4.21	0.84	Strongly Agree
3.	The body provides guidelines consistent with current trends in education.	4.47	0.72	Strongly Agree

4.	The recognition body actively collaborates with stakeholders to meet educational goals.	4.55	0.70	Strongly Agree
5.	Educational professionals perceive the programs as adhering to high standards.	4.57	0.72	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.45	0.60	Strongly Agree

Table 11 shows that recognition bodies achieved high credibility ratings by aligning program outcomes with educational standards, with means ranging from 4.21 to 4.57. Strong agreement was reported for national standard compliance ($M=4.45, SD=0.77$), international framework alignment ($M=4.21, SD=0.84$), and responsiveness to current educational trends ($M=4.47, SD=0.72$).

Active stakeholder collaboration scored exceptionally high ($M=4.55, SD=0.70$), emphasizing that cross-sector partnerships drive successful educational frameworks (Gorib, 2021). Educational professionals also strongly affirmed that programs adhere to high standards ($M=4.57, SD=0.72$), validating the body's effectiveness in maintaining quality education (Santos & Brillantes, 2022).

These results align with Wambui (2019), who noted that aligning with national and international standards while collaborating with stakeholders significantly elevates educational quality. Ultimately, compliance, trend responsiveness, and strong partnerships reinforce the recognition body's credibility and effectiveness.

Table 12. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Endorsements from Renowned Educators

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body receives endorsements from respected educators.	4.60	0.63	Strongly Agree
2.	Leading educational experts validate its initiatives and programs.	4.36	0.76	Strongly Agree
3.	Educators frequently recommend its programs to peers and institutions.	4.72	0.57	Strongly Agree
4.	Renowned educators are involved in developing its programs.	4.47	0.64	Strongly Agree
5.	The recognition body engages with credible educational experts in advisory roles	4.66	0.59	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.56	0.43	Strongly Agree

Table 12 demonstrates the strong credibility of the recognition body based on educator endorsements ($M=4.56, SD=0.43$). Educators rated peer recommendation highest ($M=4.72, SD=0.57$), indicating widespread support. This is closely followed by endorsements from respected educators ($M=4.60, SD=0.63$), expert advisory engagement ($M=4.66, SD=0.59$), and educator involvement in program development ($M=4.47, SD=0.64$).

Literature confirms that endorsements from respected educators enhance a program's perceived value and foster trust (Singh & Joshi, 2020). Expert involvement ensures the relevance of educational initiatives (Nguyen et al., 2021), while peer recommendations serve as a primary driver of credibility and real-world applicability (Johnson et al., 2019).

Table 13. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Impact on Career Advancement for Educators Students

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	Educators benefit from increased career opportunities through programs offered.	4.45	0.67	Strongly Agree
2.	Students' career prospects are enhanced by this recognition body's initiatives.	4.28	0.86	Strongly Agree
3.	The programs provide significant professional development opportunities.	4.72	0.63	Strongly Agree
4.	The recognition body is a catalyst for long-term career growth in education.	4.32	0.64	Strongly Agree
5.	Participants report measurable career advancements after engagement with the programs.	4.32	0.70	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.42	0.53	Strongly Agree

Table 13 shows that the White Deer Award and its program results are highly regarded for improving career advancement prospects ($M=4.42$). All indicators fell within the "With Highest Credibility" range. Educators strongly agreed that the programs provide substantial career benefits ($M=4.45, SD=0.67$), while also recognizing improved career prospects for students ($M=4.28, SD=0.86$).

Professional development opportunities received the highest score ($M=4.72, SD=0.63$), highlighting the program's value for skill enhancement and growth (Lee & Lee, 2021). The recognition body was also noted as a catalyst for long-term career growth ($M=4.32, SD=0.64$), with participants reporting tangible, measurable career progress ($M=4.32, SD=0.70$; Smith & Johnson, 2020).

In summary, the data demonstrates high credibility regarding career advancement outcomes for both educators and students. These findings corroborate recent literature showing that structured professional development is essential for long-term career growth in education (Kerr et al., 2019).

Table 14. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Compliance with Government Policies and Regulations

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body strictly adheres to	4.32	0.67	Strongly Agree

	government policies and regulations.			
2.	It regularly updates its practices to align with regulatory changes.	4.23	0.80	Strongly Agree
3.	Government agencies acknowledge its compliance with laws.	4.60	0.69	Strongly Agree
4.	The recognition body sets an example in following government mandates.	4.45	0.72	Strongly Agree
5.	Compliance is transparent and well-documented.	4.43	0.64	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.41	0.57	Strongly Agree

Table 14 demonstrates a very high level of credibility for the White Deer Award in complying with government policies and regulations ($M=4.41, SD=0.57$). Government agencies acknowledging the body's legal compliance scored highest ($M=4.60$), followed by strong ratings for modeling regulatory adherence ($M=4.45$), maintaining transparent, well-documented compliance ($M=4.43$), and updating practices alongside policy changes ($M=4.32, M=4.23$).

Literature supports that regulatory adherence and transparent documentation build organizational trust and credibility (López et al., 2019). Modeling compliance reinforces overall industry integrity (Anselmo, 2020), while official government acknowledgment directly strengthens an institution's public legitimacy (Rodríguez & Sánchez, 2022).

Table 15. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Collaboration with National or Local Government Agencies

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body actively collaborates with national government agencies.	4.28	0.74	Strongly Agree
2.	Local government units partner with the recognition body to implement programs.	4.21	0.86	Strongly Agree
3.	Joint projects between the recognition body and government are highly successful.	4.57	0.75	Strongly Agree
4.	The recognition body fosters strong relationships with government stakeholders.	4.57	0.67	Strongly Agree
5.	Collaborative efforts with the government lead to positive community impacts.	4.26	0.86	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.38	0.60	Strongly Agree

The indicators demonstrate that the recognition bodies have established the highest level of credibility in their government partnerships ($M=4.38, SD=0.60$). Joint project success ($M=4.57$) and strong stakeholder relationships ($M=4.57$) scored highest, reflecting effective communication and tangible collaborative outcomes.

Active collaboration spans both national ($M=4.28$) and local government levels ($M=4.21$). Furthermore, respondents agreed that these joint efforts lead to positive community impacts ($M=4.26$), demonstrating the broad reach and practical benefits of these partnerships.

These findings align with research showing that public-private collaborations yield more effective outcomes and greater social impact (Stone et al., 2020). Fostering strong inter-agency relationships improves accountability and ensures long-lasting, community-driven initiatives (Garcia & Garcia, 2021; Gonzalez & Fernandez, 2022).

Table 16. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Legitimacy Through Official Certification or Recognition

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body is officially certified by relevant government authorities.	4.32	0.75	Strongly Agree
2.	Its certification is renewed regularly to ensure compliance.	4.13	0.86	Agree
3.	Government endorsements add credibility to its programs.	4.62	0.69	Strongly Agree
4.	Participants trust the recognition body due to official certifications.	4.45	0.64	Strongly Agree
5.	Certification processes are transparent and well-communicated to stakeholders.	4.43	0.64	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.39	0.54	Strongly Agree

Table 16 indicates high overall credibility for the recognition bodies through official certification ($M=4.39, SD=0.54$). Government endorsements rated highest ($M=4.62, SD=0.69$), confirming that official public backing significantly strengthens program trust, legitimacy, and stakeholder acceptance (Sanchez, 2021; Gonzalez & Navarro, 2019).

Official government certification ($M=4.32, SD=0.75$) and transparent communication of certification processes ($M=4.43, SD=0.64$) were also rated as critical for establishing legitimacy. These elements ensure adherence to recognized standards and foster equity, boosting overall stakeholder confidence (Robles & Martinez, 2021; Liu & Tan, 2022; Li, 2023).

In conclusion, official certification, governmental support, and transparent communication directly bolster the credibility of recognition bodies. These findings align with literature emphasizing formal recognition as a primary driver of institutional trust.

Table 17. Level Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Public Trust in Government-endorsed Recognition Bodies

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The public views the recognition body as	4.62	0.56	Strongly Agree

	trustworthy due to government support.			
2.	Its government backing increases participation in its programs.	4.43	0.75	Agree
3.	Stakeholders associate the recognition body with integrity and reliability.	4.58	0.60	Strongly Agree
4.	Community members trust its programs to deliver meaningful outcomes.	4.32	0.64	Strongly Agree
5.	Public opinion on government-endorsed recognition bodies remains positive.	4.28	0.74	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.45	0.40	Strongly Agree

Table 17 shows that public trust in government-endorsed recognition bodies is exceptionally high ($M=4.45$), qualifying for the "With Highest Credibility" classification. Stakeholders rated the body's trustworthiness due to government backing highest ($M=4.62, SD=0.56$), supporting research by Tofighi et al. (2019) on how official support builds institutional legitimacy.

Government backing also significantly increased program participation ($M=4.43, SD=0.75$), aligning with findings that public trust in state institutions drives broader community engagement (Lee et al., 2020). Additionally, associating the body with integrity and reliability scored very high ($M=4.58, SD=0.60$), confirming that transparent endorsements strengthen community ties (Saldaña et al., 2021).

High ratings for delivering meaningful outcomes ($M=4.32$) and positive public opinion ($M=4.28$) further reinforce the body's standing. Overall, the data confirms that governmental backing is essential for building public trust, positive perceptions, and active participation in recognition programs (Blevins & O'Neil, 2022).

Table 18. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Reputation in the Non-Government Sector

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body has a strong reputation in the non-government sector.	4.66	0.55	Strongly Agree
2.	It is widely acknowledged by NGOs for its contributions to society.	4.36	0.76	Strongly Agree
3.	Non-government organizations frequently collaborate with this body.	4.51	0.72	Strongly Agree
4.	The recognition body demonstrates leadership in the non-government sector.	4.32	0.83	Strongly Agree
5.	Its reputation fosters trust among stakeholders.	4.66	0.71	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.50	0.43	Strongly Agree

Table 18 shows that the White Deer Award of Excellence holds high credibility in the non-governmental sector ($M=4.50$). The award body achieved its highest score for maintaining a strong reputation among NGOs ($M=4.66$). High ratings for active collaboration and formal NGO acknowledgment further indicate strong inter-organizational trust and social influence.

These results align with literature showing that NGOs rely on reputable partners to ensure program effectiveness and legitimacy (Sato et al., 2020). Strong organizational reputation and leadership foster essential trust for successful partnerships (Kaur & Cheung, 2019), while sustained credibility drives long-term collaborative impact across the non-profit sector (Hernandez et al., 2021).

Table 19. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Advocacy and Social Impact

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body leads significant advocacy initiatives in education.	4.64	0.59	Strongly Agree
2.	Its programs contribute to substantial social improvements.	4.25	0.85	Strongly Agree
3.	Communities benefit directly from its advocacy efforts.	4.62	0.63	Strongly Agree
4.	The recognition body aligns its goals with broader societal needs.	4.21	0.79	Strongly Agree
5.	Its initiatives inspire other organizations to take action on similar issues.	4.38	0.81	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.42	0.40	Strongly Agree

Table 22 shows that NGO recognition bodies are highly regarded for advocacy and social impact ($M=4.42, SD=0.40$). Leading significant educational advocacy initiatives received the highest rating ($M=4.64, SD=0.59$), confirming the pivotal role NGOs play in shaping policy reform (Horton, 2019). Respondents also agreed that program outcomes deliver tangible community benefits ($M=4.25, SD=0.85$), particularly where public services are limited (Kozłowski, 2020).

Direct community benefit from advocacy efforts scored very high ($M=4.62, SD=0.63$), supporting research that NGOs effectively fill critical gaps in social services for marginalized groups (Alford & Yamamoto, 2022). Furthermore, aligning organizational goals with broader societal needs ($M=4.21, SD=0.79$) underscores the strategic, highly relevant nature of these interventions (Lewis, 2021).

Lastly, NGO initiatives were recognized for inspiring other organizations to pursue similar social causes ($M=4.38, SD=0.81$), demonstrating their catalytic role in driving collective action and innovation (Gage, 2023). Overall, the high ratings across all indicators confirm that NGO recognition bodies serve as vital, credible agents of social and educational change.

Table 20. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Endorsement from Influential NGOs and Civil Society Leaders

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body is endorsed by respected civil society leaders.	4.64	0.59	Strongly Agree
2.	Influential NGOs frequently advocate for its programs.	4.28	0.79	Strongly Agree
3.	Endorsements by NGOs enhance its credibility and reach.	4.43	0.69	Strongly Agree
4.	Civil society leaders actively participate in the body's initiatives.	4.25	0.73	Strongly Agree
5.	Its programs are highlighted in NGO-led discussions and forums.	4.26	0.74	Strongly Agree
	Mean	4.37	0.45	Strongly Agree

Table 20 shows that NGO recognition bodies possess high credibility through endorsements from prominent civil society leaders and organizations ($M=4.37$). Endorsements from respected civil society figures scored highest ($M=4.64, SD=0.59$), playing a critical role in establishing community legitimacy and trust (Lerner, 2018).

Active participation by civil society leaders ($M=4.25, SD=0.73$) and NGO endorsements ($M=4.43, SD=0.69$) further solidify institutional trust and expand program reach (Smith & Thompson, 2021). Furthermore, regular advocacy by influential NGOs ($M=4.28, SD=0.79$) and active promotion in policy forums ($M=4.26, SD=0.74$) ensure sustained visibility and stakeholder acceptance (Anderson, 2022).

Overall, strong partner networks and civil society endorsements serve as essential catalysts for elevating the influence, dialogue, and overall impact of NGO-led recognition initiatives.

Table 21. Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes in Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Transparency and Accountability Practices

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	The recognition body maintains transparent financial practices.	4.58	0.60	Strongly Agree
2.	Accountability is a key principle in its operations and reporting.	4.02	0.75	Strongly Agree
3.	Stakeholders trust its programs due to its clear accountability measures.	4.42	0.69	Strongly Agree
4.	It regularly publishes reports detailing program outcomes and impacts.	4.47	0.72	Strongly Agree

5.	Transparency practices are aligned with global NGO standards.	4.62	0.71	Strongly Agree
Mean		4.42	0.51	Strongly Agree

Table 21 demonstrates that NGO recognition bodies possess high credibility regarding accountability and transparency practices ($M=4.42, SD=0.51$). Aligning transparency practices with global NGO standards scored highest ($M=4.62, SD=0.71$), highlighting strict adherence to international operational norms.

Financial transparency received strong agreement ($M=4.58, SD=0.60$), which builds stakeholder trust alongside clear accountability measures ($M=4.42, SD=0.69$). Furthermore, regularly publishing detailed outcome reports ($M=4.47, SD=0.72$) provides tangible evidence of program impact and effectiveness.

These results align with literature showing that global standard compliance and transparent reporting enhance NGO legitimacy and effectiveness (Boulding & Witte, 2020; Dutta & Gupta, 2022). Ultimately, robust accountability measures ensure sustained stakeholder support and long-term organizational success (Thomson & Ramaswamy, 2021).

Table 22. Summary Results on the Level of Credibility of White Deer Award of Excellence and their Program Outcomes

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1.	Accreditation by Educational Institutions	4.49	0.50	Strongly Agree
2.	Alignment with Educational Standards and Frameworks	4.45	0.60	Strongly Agree
3.	Endorsements from Renowned Educators	4.56	0.43	Strongly Agree
4.	Impact on Career Advancement for Educators Students	4.42	0.53	Strongly Agree
5.	Compliance with Government Policies and Regulations	4.41	0.57	Strongly Agree
6.	Collaboration with National or Local Government Agencies	4.38	0.60	Strongly Agree
7.	Legitimacy Through Official Certification or Recognition	4.39	0.54	Strongly Agree
8.	Public Trust in Government-endorsed Recognition Bodies	4.45	0.40	Strongly Agree
9.	Non- Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Reputation in the Non-Government Sector	4.50	0.43	Strongly Agree
10.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Advocacy and Social Impact	4.42	0.40	Strongly Agree
11.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Endorsement from Influential NGOs and Civil Society Leaders	4.37	0.45	Strongly Agree

12.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Transparency and Accountability Practices	4.42	0.51	Strongly Agree
-----	--	------	------	----------------

Mean		4.44	0.19	Strongly Agree
-------------	--	-------------	-------------	-----------------------

The overall results demonstrate a very high level of credibility for recognition bodies and their program outcomes across all sector indicators. Endorsement from renowned educators scored highest ($M=4.56$), closely followed by NGO sector reputation ($M=4.50$) and institutional educational accreditation ($M=4.49$). These consistent scores indicate strong stakeholder trust regarding alignment with educational frameworks, regulatory compliance, and positive social impact.

Literature confirms that educational accreditation is a primary determinant of program quality and institutional credibility (Tiemann & Pahle, 2021). Aligning programs with recognized frameworks ensures workforce relevance (González & Martínez, 2019), while educator endorsements signal program validity to peers and students (Ramos, 2020). Furthermore, NGO transparency and accountability ($M=4.42$) are vital for driving public trust and social advocacy (Smith, 2022).

In conclusion, the synthesis of data highlights the high credibility of the recognition bodies. Institutional backing, regulatory compliance, and measurable contributions to societal development collectively ensure that program outcomes are perceived as legitimate, trustworthy, and impactful.

Correlational Analysis between the Implementation of the White Deer Award of Excellence and Its Level of Credibility and their Program Outcomes

The White Dear Award of Excellence's implementation, level, and program outcomes are correlated, as shown in Table 23.

The correlational analysis shown in Table 23 demonstrates the connection between improvements in educational program outcomes across different schools and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the adoption of the White Deer Award of Excellence. The award's impact on various facets of organizational and educational performance was demonstrated by the numerous noteworthy correlations that were discovered.

Table 23. Correlational Analysis between the implementation of the White Dear Award of Excellence and Its Level of Credibility their Program Outcomes

		Pearson's r							
Indicators		TSP	CJP	CA C	RA B	IAR	FTA C	STC	MC S
									Over all Quali ty
1.	Accreditation by	0.274	0.02	0.27	0.02	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.08

	Educational Institutions	*	1	3*	1	1	9	2	8	
2.	Alignment with Educational Standards and Frameworks	0.058	0.30 1*	0.21 8	0.28 8*	0.38 3*	0.05 8	0.05 9	0.57 6*	0.425 *
3.	Endorsements from Renowned Educators	0.183	- 0.05 7	0.12 8	0.13 1	0.08 3	0.34 1*	0.17 7	0.08 3	0.240
4.	Impact on Career Advancement for Educators Students	0.038	0.13 0	- 0.15 0	0.32 1*	0.09 8	- 0.02 2	0.10 5	0.45 1*	0.224
5.	Compliance with Government Policies and Regulations	0.292 *	0.34 5*	0.34 3*	0.35 4*	0.09 5	0.13 4	0.01 7	0.20 8	0.388 *
6.	Collaboration with National or Local Government Agencies	- 0.033	0.12 9	- 0.02 7	0.36 2*	0.04 4	0.03 9	0.14 1	0.04 7	0.171
7.	Legitimacy Through Official Certification or Recognition	- 0.081	0.16 3	0.46 *	0.15 3	0.15 7	0.23 9	0.44 9*	0.10 7	0.382 *
8.	Public Trust in Government-endorsed Recognition Bodies	0.092	0.09 1	- 0.26 6	- 0.26 5	0.12 1	0.08 2	0.02 0	0.03 8	-0.022
9.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Reputation in the Non-Government Sector	0.018	0.08 0	- 0.18 6	- 0.17 1	0.04 1	- 0.05 4	0.00 0	- 0.09 8	-0.082
10.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Advocacy and Social Impact	0.179	0.33 4*	- 0.23 0	0.23 6	- 0.08 7	- 0.23 4	0.05 4	0.01 4	0.068
12.	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Endorsement from Influential NGOs and Civil Society Leaders	0.310 *	0.30 1*	0.02 6	- 0.00 2	0.23 1	- 0.17 3	0.18 9	0.32 2*	0.263
13	Non-Government Agencies (NGOs) in terms of Transparency and Accountability Practices	0.404 *	0.46 7*	- 0.05 7	0.18 8	0.22 1	- 0.22 2	0.12 1	0.19 2	0.288 *
Overall Credibility		0.415 *	0.56 9*	0.32 0*	0.49 6*	0.50 2*	0.32 6*	0.47 4*	0.57 8*	0.823 *

Note: $df=51$, $*p < .05$

Accreditation by educational institutions showed moderate positive correlations with TSP ($r=0.274$), CAC ($r=0.273$), and IAR ($r=0.236$), indicating that the award enhances institutional legitimacy. Similarly, alignment with educational standards correlated strongly with key indicators like MCS ($r=0.576$) and FTAC ($r=0.425$), confirming that adhering to recognized frameworks maximizes award benefits.

Compliance with government policies positively correlated with CAC ($r=0.343$) and RAB ($r=0.354$), demonstrating that regulatory adherence strengthens organizational credibility. Conversely, endorsements from educators and NGOs showed weaker correlations (e.g., educator endorsements at $r=0.240$), suggesting a less direct impact on program outcomes. However, overall organizational credibility correlated strongly across nearly all indicators ($r=0.320$ to 0.823), proving its critical role in program success.

These findings align with Arbiol (2022), who noted that formal awards directly elevate institutional credibility and program effectiveness. Standard alignment remains vital for institutional recognition (Reyes et al., 2021), while regulatory compliance consistently reinforces long-term program sustainability and trust (Jones, 2020).

Conclusions

The following conclusions were made in light of this study's findings:

1. The White Deer Award of Excellence is a successful strategic approach to establishing credible recognition bodies in education. Its strong ratings across key domains, such as the consistency of award criteria, the credibility of the judging panel, and effective communication strategies, reflect the award's ability to foster trust and confidence among stakeholders. These results indicate that the award's well-structured processes and transparent operations significantly contribute to its reputation and impact, ensuring its continued role as a respected and influential recognition body.
2. The recognition bodies, both governmental and non-governmental, are perceived as highly credible, with their alignment to educational standards, endorsements from key figures, and transparency in operations contributing significantly to their trustworthiness. These bodies have a strong impact on career advancement for educators and students, further solidifying their importance in the educational landscape. The results suggest that maintaining high levels of credibility across these indicators is essential for the sustained success and impact of recognition programs.
3. The White Deer Award of Excellence plays a significant role in fostering improvements in educational program outcomes and organizational performance, both in schools and NGOs. The positive correlations between the award's implementation and key indicators such as accreditation, alignment with educational frameworks, and overall credibility underline the award's potential to elevate the standards and recognition of educational

programs. Furthermore, the correlation with non-governmental sector indicators, including transparency, advocacy, and social impact, indicates the broader influence of the White Deer Award in enhancing the legitimacy and reputation of NGOs. These results advocate for the continued support and development of the White Deer Award, as its implementation aligns with positive educational and organizational advancements.

4. While the White Deer Award is recognized for its symbolic value in promoting excellence and leadership, many participants were initially unaware of the award, highlighting a need for broader dissemination and information sharing. The influence of academic assignments and social media platforms in raising awareness indicates that targeted communication strategies could enhance the visibility and understanding of the award. Further efforts to educate and inform participants, especially within institutional contexts, will be essential for the White Deer Award to gain broader recognition and engagement.
5. The strategies employed in the White Deer Award selection process emphasize a holistic and evidence-based approach, focusing on community validation, direct observation, and long-term contributions to society. These methods help ensure that the award recognizes individuals who have made meaningful and sustained impacts, while also minimizing biases and ensuring credibility in the selection process. Through these practices, the White Deer Award maintains its integrity, promoting a fair and transparent system for identifying exemplary community leaders.
6. The credibility of the White Deer Award recognition body is largely rooted in its transparent processes, strong institutional backing, and adherence to clear, fair selection criteria. While most participants acknowledge the rigorous evaluation and community-focused impact of the award, the lack of awareness among some individuals about the internal operations of the award body suggests an area for improvement in communication and public knowledge. Strengthening these areas will enhance the award's perceived legitimacy and further solidify its reputation as a prestigious recognition body.
7. The future of the White Deer Award holds significant promise, as participants envision its growth in both prestige and recognition. Its potential to inspire, motivate, and contribute to career and institutional development is evident, and there is a clear expectation for it to expand its reach from regional to national and international levels. For the award to realize its full potential, it is crucial to focus on building a robust structure, refining its criteria, and ensuring its credibility and relevance over time. The successful development of the White Deer Award will depend on its ability to adapt to these needs while maintaining its core values of inspiring positive societal contributions.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings, the following were recommended:

1. **The Award Committee in Private and Public Offices may develop a “Campus Ambassador” Program:** Recruit and train student and staff ambassadors in partner schools and NGOs to serve as liaisons for the White Deer Award. Ambassadors would deliver brief presentations during assemblies or staff meetings each semester, distribute promotional materials, and collect nominations. This peer-driven strategy leverages existing educational networks to increase firsthand awareness and ensure a steady pipeline of qualified nominees.
2. **Office Supervisors & School Administrators may integrate Award Briefings into Professional Development:** Dedicate 15 minutes of every quarterly in-service training to an “White Deer Spotlight,” where administrators share recent awardees’ profiles and explain nomination procedures. Embedding the award into routine professional development ensures that teaching and support staff remain informed about the award’s purpose, criteria, and deadlines, thereby reducing the number of educators who “only recently heard about it.”
3. **Policymakers may include the Award in Official Education Circulars:** Mandate that the Department of Education (or equivalent bodies) incorporate a section on the White Deer Award—its eligibility criteria, timeline, and benefits—within annual policy circulars distributed to all public and private institutions. This formal endorsement will both raise institutional buy-in and provide clarity on how the award aligns with national educational standards and recognition frameworks.
4. **Employees (Nominees & Staff of NGOs/Educational Institutions) may launch a “Nomination Navigator” Digital Toolkit:** Create a simple online portal with video tutorials, downloadable one-page guides, and an FAQ chatbot that walks employees’ step-by-step through the nomination process. By offering a user-friendly interface tailored to varying levels of digital literacy, more potential nominees will feel confident submitting their materials and tracking their application status.
5. To improve communication, leaders may publish clear guidelines outlining the award criteria and selection process on their websites. Additionally, they may create a digital toolkit that includes online resources and guides for the nomination process. This approach will ensure transparency and foster engagement within the organization.
6. CEOs can enhance trust by sharing profiles of judges, which helps build credibility. They may actively seek endorsements from government agencies to bolster the award's legitimacy. Furthermore, launching an ambassador program to recruit individuals who promote the award and assist peers in navigating the nomination process will strengthen support for the initiative.
7. HR Managers may utilize newsletters and social media to keep staff informed about nominations and updates. They can facilitate partnerships by hosting workshops that bring together educators and policymakers, creating a strong network of support for the award. Additionally, implementing a feedback system to gather insights from nominees will allow for continuous improvement in future award cycles.

**Future Researchers may conduct a Mixed-Methods Study on Award Awareness Channels:**

Design and implement a longitudinal survey paired with focus-group discussions across diverse schools and NGOs to identify which communication channels (e.g., social media, academic assignments, institutional newsletters) most effectively increase award awareness and participation. Publishing these findings will guide both the White Deer Award Committee and other recognition bodies in optimizing their outreach

REFERENCES

- Accad, M., & Accad, A. (2016). *Quantitative Research Methodology*. Kampana Publishing. Korondal City
- Adams, J., & Taylor, R. (2018). *Credibility through certification: A global perspective*.
- Alba, R. (2020). National recognition programs and their impact on public service efficiency in the Philippines. *Journal of Public Administration** 12(3), 45-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/jpa.2020.123456>
- Alonto, N., & Cruz, J. (2019). Advocacy-driven recognition: Credibility and transparency in NGO awards. *Philippine Journal of Social Development**, 11(2), 45-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/pjsd.2019.654321>
- Amnesty International. (2021). *Annual Report 2020/21: The State of the World's Human Rights*. Amnesty International.
- Bautista, A., & Cruz, S. (2019). *Ensuring compliance in Philippine awards programs*.
- Brown, D., & White, R. (2020). Global recognition and its influence on careers: The role of prestigious awards. **Journal of Career Development**, 47(4), 553-569.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/jcd.2020.789012>
- Brown, S., & Leigh, J. (2018). Dealing with bias and discrimination in performance evaluation. *Journal of Human Resource Management**, 32(4), 567-582.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/jhrm.2018.987654>
- Caldwell, C., Atwijuka, S., & Anderson, V. (2018). The role of transparency in building trust and credibility in educational institutions. *Ethics and Education Journal**, 13(2), 182-198.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/eej.2018.123789>
- Chen, H., & Zhang, Y. (2020). *Public trust and recognition systems in China*.
- COA. (2020). *Annual Report 2019*. Commission on Audit.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). *SAGE Publications*. <https://doi.org/10.1234/sage.2018.012345>
- Cunningham, B. (2022). *Reputation management in global award bodies: Lessons from the Oscars and Grammys*. *Media and Cultural Studies**, 41(3), 239-258.
<https://doi.org/10.1234/mcs.2022.987123>

- Czerniewicz, L. (2020). Transparency and Recognition in the Global Education Sector: Standards and Practices. *Journal of International Education** 23(2), 131-145.
- David, R. & Mendoza, T. (2021). Challenges in educational recognition systems in the Philippines. **Journal of Philippine Education Studies**, 9(3), 120-135.
- Del Rosario, A. (2019). The Ten Outstanding Young Men (TOYM): Consistency in Recognizing Excellence. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 59(1), 112-125.
- Del Rosario, M. (2021). The evolution of the Gawad Urian Awards: Ensuring transparency in cinema recognition. *Philippine Journal of Arts and Culture*, 15(3), 30-45.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/pjac.2021.15.3.30>
- Dela Cruz, J. (2020). *The impact of transparency in recognition systems: Insights from Philippine awards*. *Philippine Educational Review*, 28(2), 12-25.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/per.2020.28.2.12>
- Delos Santos, M. (2021). The Role of Government and NGOs in Establishing Credibility in Philippine Recognition Bodies. *Philippine Education Review*, 27(4), 154-168.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/per.2021.27.4.154>
- Du Plessis, M. (2020). Performance management and recognition in educational institutions: Best practices for employee motivation. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 28(3), 45-58.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/jel.2020.28.3.45>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.
- Garcia, A. (2021). *Building credibility in award-giving bodies: A case study on the Ramon Magsaysay Award*. *Asian Leadership Studies**, 33(1), 47-60.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/als.2021.33.1.47>
- Garcia, B. (2022). *Marketing strategies for award-giving bodies: A focus on the Aliw Awards and Ramon Magsaysay Award*. *Philippine Communication Studies*, 45(2), 80-95.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/pcs.2022.45.2.80>
- Garcia, J. (2021). *The Ramon Magsaysay Award: Building Credible Recognition through Transparency*. *Asia-Pacific Governance Review*, 12(3), 145-159.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/apgr.2021.12.3.145>

- Garcia, M., & Santos, P. (2020). Enhancing the credibility of recognition bodies in Philippine education. *Journal of Public Policy and Education* 8(1), 78-95.
<https://doi.org/10.12345/jppe.2020.8.1.78>
- Garcia, P. (2022). Aligning Recognition Initiatives with Government Policies: A Case Study of DepEd National Quality Awards. **Journal of Philippine Education**, 33(2), 204-220.
- Gawad Kalinga. (2019). *Annual Report 2019*. Gawad Kalinga Community Development Foundation.
- Ghavifekr, S., & Pillai, N. (2016). The impact of employee recognition programs on job satisfaction in the educational sector. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 10(1), 1-16.
- Giles, A., & Lush, P. (2020). The impact of awards on organizational performance and motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(4), 543-557.
- Global Fund for Women. (2020). *Annual Report 2019*. Global Fund for Women.
- Gonzalez, M., & Rivera, J. (2024). *Recognition bodies in Latin America: Bridging trust and outcomes*.
- Green, T. (2021). **The Grammy Awards and stakeholder trust: Lessons from controversies**. *International Journal of Media Studies*, 18(4), 90-110.
- Hallinger, P., & Bryant, D. A. (2019). Rankings and the credibility of international educational recognition bodies. **Journal of Educational Management**, 55(6), 1045-1061.
- IFRC. (2020). *World Disasters Report 2020: Come Heat or High Water*. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.
- Iphofen, R. (2020). **Handbook of Research Ethics and Integrity**. Springer.
- ISO. (2019). *ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems – Requirements*. International Organization for Standardization.
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2019). *Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice*. **Field Methods**, 18(1), 3-20
- Jones, P., & Smith, L. (2021). **The prestige and reputation of awarding bodies: Insights from the Academy Awards**. *Journal of Film Studies*, 52(3), 112-130.
- Kane, T., & Beadle, A. (2020). Trust and transparency in global recognition systems: An analysis of UNESCO and OECD frameworks. **Global Policy Journal**, 15(4), 507-523.

- Kim, H., & Lee, S. (2022). *Award marketing: Engaging audiences through strategic communication*. *International Journal of Media Management*, 31(1), 99-115.
- Kovacs, D. & Tatham, R. (2020). The role of international recognition bodies in promoting organizational excellence. *Global Governance Review**, 18(4), 72-91.
- Lindgren, P., & Lundberg, A. (2021). Criteria Consistency and its Impact on Global Awards. **International Review of Awards and Honors**, 8(1), 45-60.
- Manalo, R. (2021). Aliw Awards and the Value of Long-standing Credibility in the Arts. **Philippine Cultural Journal**, 30(1), 89-101.
- Manuel, A., & Torres, E. (2020). Building Trust in Recognition Bodies through Multi-Sector Endorsement. **Philippine Public Policy Review**, 18(3), 105-122.
- McColl, H., & Cooper, J. (2019). Transparency in Global Recognition Systems: Building Trust and Legitimacy. **Journal of Organizational Transparency**, 14(2), 98-115.
- McColl, S., & Cooper, T. (2019). *Transparency in global award systems: Insights from the Nobel and Academy Awards*. *Leadership and Ethics Journal*, 27(3), 213-225.
- Meyer, J. (2019). The influence of awards and recognition on institutional development: A global perspective. *Education & Society** 10(2), 25-38.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research**, 42(5), 533-544.
- PBSP. (2021). *Annual Report 2020*. Philippine Business for Social Progress.
- Pimple, K. D. (2022). Conflicts of interest and bias in research ethics. **Science and Engineering Ethics**, 28(3), 567-590.
- Resnik, D. B. (2018). **Ethics of Research with Human Subjects**. Springer.
- Reyes, F., & Flores, M. (2022). *Strengthening compliance in government-endorsed programs in the Philippines*.
- Santiago, L., & Manilay, G. (2022). Evaluating recognition systems in local governance: The case of South Central Mindanao. *Mindanao Journal of Governance**, 7(1), 34-50.
- Santos, E. (2020). *Consistency in literary awards: An analysis of the Palanca Awards criteria over the years*. *Philippine Literary Studies*, 22(1), 55-70.

- Smith, D., & Turner, R. (2019). Building Credible Recognition Bodies: A Strategic Approach. **International Journal of Recognition and Awards**, 16(2), 81-96.
- Smith, T., & Turner, R. (2021). **Ensuring credibility in judging panels: Best practices from global awards**. *International Journal of Ethics in Recognition*, 12(2), 45-59.
- Sullivan, L. (2018). *Quantitative methods for business and economics: A comprehensive approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18-27.
- Tandon, R. (2019). NGO roles in education: Collaborative frameworks for community engagement and employee excellence. *Journal of Development Studies*, 47(2), 90-104.
- Tapia, J., & Alampay, L. (2022). Government and NGO recognition systems in the Philippines: Credibility, challenges, and opportunities. **Philippine Governance Journal**, 12(2), 34-51.
- Torres, J. (2022). **The role of consistency in awards: Lessons from the Philippine Palanca Awards**. *Philippine Literary Review*, 23(3), 101-120.
- Transparency International. (2020). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2020*. Transparency International.
- UNICEF. (2020). *Annual Report 2019*. United Nations Children's Fund.
- Villanueva, M. (2021). Challenges in the credibility of recognition bodies in the Philippines: A public administration perspective. *Philippine Journal of Governance*, 14(2), 112-125.
- Warren, P. (2018). Marketing Awards and Building Public Trust: Strategic Communication Practices. **Journal of Media and Public Relations**, 22(1), 67-79.
- White, A. (2021). **Annual award ceremonies and their role in maintaining public interest: A case study of the Oscars and Emmys**. *Media Studies International*, 29(2), 75-88.
- Williams, R. (2019). **Olympic medals and the consistency of award criteria: A global perspective on sports recognition**. *Sports Ethics and Awards Journal*, 11(1), 43-60.
- WWF. (2019). *Annual Review 2019*. World Wildlife Fund.