INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH
2026, Vol. 7, No. 11, 5064 – 5080
http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.11.22

Research Article

Institutional Effectiveness in Contraband Management: A Study of BJMP Carigara District Jail

Jason O. Nedic*, Monica Dg. De Jesus-Tantong, Eugenio L. Riego II

De La Salle University Dasmarinas

Article history:
Submission 31 October 2026
Revised 15 November 2026
Accepted 23 November 2026

**Corresponding author:*
E-mail:
1026cjnedic@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Contraband management requires jail facilities to maintain security while implementing clear, consistent, and respectful inspection procedures. This study assessed the implementation and perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Carigara District Jail in Leyte. A quantitative descriptive-comparative design was employed using structured questionnaires administered to 60 respondents comprising 10 jail personnel, 35 persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and 15 visitors. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance. Respondents generally assessed existing control measures favorably, particularly routine inspections, orientation on prohibited items, and the implementation of contraband-related rules. However, detection technology received low ratings from jail personnel and PDL, with mean scores of 2.00 and 2.74, respectively. Assessments of non-disruptive inspection procedures also varied: personnel and visitors provided favorable ratings, whereas PDL expressed a less favorable assessment. The reported analysis indicated no statistically significant difference in overall effectiveness assessments among the three respondent groups, $F(2, 57) = 1.27$, $p > .05$. The findings suggest that favorable overall perceptions coexist with specific concerns regarding detection resources and the experience of inspections. The study recommends assessing equipment availability and functionality, identifying personnel training needs, reviewing inspection procedures, and strengthening policy communication and monitoring. These findings reflect respondents' perceptions and do not establish actual reductions in contraband incidents or causal effects of the measures examined.

Keywords*: BJMP, Contraband management, Jail security, Perceived effectiveness, Persons deprived of liberty*

How to cite:
Nedic, J. O., Jesus-Tantong, M. D. D., & Regio II, E. L. (2026). Institutional Effectiveness in Contraband Management: A Study of Bjmp Carigara District Jail. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. *7*(11), 5064 – 5080. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.11.22

Introduction

The Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) is a bureau under the Department of the Interior and Local Government responsible for the administration of district, city, and municipal jails. Its statutory foundation is Republic Act No. 6975, which created the Jail Bureau and provided for the custody and safekeeping of detained persons. The law also requires respect for their human rights and attention to their physical and spiritual well-being. Contraband management therefore forms part of a broader responsibility to maintain secure and humane detention facilities (Republic Act No. 6975, 1990, secs. 60–63).

At Carigara District Jail in Leyte, this responsibility provides the context for examining how contraband control measures are implemented and experienced. The present study focused on inspection procedures, detection equipment, personnel preparedness, policy communication, and the handling of prohibited items. These areas concern different groups within the jail environment. Personnel implement security procedures, persons deprived of liberty (PDL) experience their application within the facility, and visitors encounter screening requirements during visitation. Their assessments provide complementary perspectives on the operation of contraband control measures.

The central problem addressed by this study was the need for a facility-specific assessment of these measures. Written procedures establish what a jail is expected to implement, but respondent assessments can identify perceived strengths, inconsistencies, and operational concerns that warrant closer examination. In particular, favorable assessments of routine inspections may coexist with concerns about equipment, communication, or the disruption associated with searches. Examining these dimensions separately can provide a more useful basis for institutional improvement than treating contraband control as a single, uniformly effective practice.

Accordingly, this study assessed the implementation and perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures at BJMP Carigara District Jail. It used a quantitative descriptive-comparative design to examine the assessments of jail personnel, PDL, and visitors, identify reported challenges, and determine whether assessments differed across respondent groups.

The study was intended to inform practical improvements in contraband management. Its findings represent respondents' assessments and do not independently establish reductions in contraband incidents or demonstrate the causal effects of particular security measures.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

This study was guided by Deterrence Theory, which explains how the anticipated consequences of prohibited conduct may influence an individual's decision to engage in that conduct. Within this perspective, the perceived likelihood of detection is particularly relevant. The National Institute of Justice (2016) emphasizes that the certainty of being caught has a stronger deterrent influence than increases in punishment severity. This distinction directs attention toward credible detection and consistent enforcement when examining institutional security practices.

Applied to contraband management, deterrence provides a basis for interpreting the intended functions of searches, screening procedures, detection equipment, incident reporting, and enforcement protocols. Regular inspections and functional detection equipment may increase the perceived likelihood that prohibited items will be discovered. Clear rules and orientation may communicate which items and actions are prohibited, while documentation and consistent procedures may strengthen the credibility of institutional responses. These relationships constitute theoretical expectations rather than effects established by the present study.

The framework also helps explain why the presence of security procedures alone may not be sufficient. Their potential deterrent value depends on how consistently they are implemented and whether individuals perceive detection and enforcement as credible. In this study, assessments of equipment, personnel preparedness, policy clarity, and implementation challenges were therefore relevant to understanding the perceived operation of contraband control measures.

Deterrence Theory was used as an interpretive lens rather than as a theory directly tested by the research. The survey did not measure changes in offending following punishment, individual perceptions of apprehension risk, or contraband incidents over time. Consequently, the findings cannot establish specific deterrence or demonstrate that the measures prevented subsequent violations. Instead, the framework supported the interpretation of respondents' assessments and the identification of practices requiring further operational verification.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to assess the implementation and perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Carigara District Jail in Leyte, based on the assessments of jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty, and visitors.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do respondents assess the implementation of existing protocols and strategies for contraband detection and prevention at BJMP Carigara District Jail?
2. How do respondents assess the effectiveness of contraband control measures at BJMP Carigara District Jail?
3. What challenges do respondents report regarding the implementation of contraband control measures at BJMP Carigara District Jail?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference in the mean assessments of the perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures among jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty, and visitors?

Hypotheses of the Study

The following null hypothesis was formulated for testing at the .05 level of significance:

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean assessments of the perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures among jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty, and visitors at BJMP Carigara District Jail.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study focused on contraband control measures at BJMP Carigara District Jail in Carigara, Leyte. It covered respondents' assessments of existing detection and prevention protocols, the perceived effectiveness of control measures, and challenges associated with their implementation. It also examined differences in assessments among jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty, and visitors.

Data were obtained through structured questionnaires. The findings were therefore limited to the respondents' knowledge, experiences, and perceptions of the practices assessed. Differences in institutional roles and access to information may have influenced their responses. Comparisons across groups also require equivalent indicators and consistent scoring, particularly where questionnaire versions differ.

The study did not independently measure contraband prevalence, changes in incident frequency, or the causal effects of individual security measures. Its findings were specific to the participating respondents and the facility examined and should be interpreted cautiously when considering their applicability to other BJMP-managed jails.

Methodology

This section describes the research design, locale, instrument, validation procedures, population and sampling, and data-gathering process used to examine stakeholder assessments of Community and Service-Oriented Policing (CSOP) in Sarangani Province.

Research Design

This chapter presented the research design, population and sampling, respondents of the study, research instrument, data gathering procedure, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive research approach to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of the existing contraband control measures at the BJMP Jail in Carigara, Leyte.

Quantitative methods were utilized to systematically and empirically examine the prevalence, patterns, and impacts of contraband within the correctional environment. As referenced in the research of Garcia (2019), a quan-

titative study using logistic regression identified several factors that significantly influenced the likelihood of successful contraband smuggling, including visits from family members, the absence of advanced detection technologies, and personneling limitations. These findings guided the formulation and focus of this study.

Prior to this research, the BJMP facility in Carigara, Leyte had not been the subject of detailed academic analysis, highlighting a critical gap in the literature regarding its specific contraband control mechanisms. This study aimed to address that gap by generating baseline data and stakeholder feedback to inform future improvements in jail security and policy implementation.

Population and Sampling

The population for this study consisted of Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL), visitors, and personnel at the BJMP Jail in Carigara, Leyte. Each group is defined as follows:

Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL):

This group included all individuals currently housed in the BJMP jail in Carigara, Leyte. PDL comprised persons detained for various offenses, ranging from minor infractions to serious crimes.

***Visitors*:**

This group consisted of individuals entering the jail facility. Visitors included immediate family members of PDL as well as service providers.

***Personnel*:**

This group encompassed all staff members working at the BJMP jail in Carigara, Leyte. Personnel included custodial officers, searchers, administrative staff, and other employees involved in the daily operations and management of the facility.

Sampling Technique

In this study, stratified random sampling was utilized to ensure that each subgroup within the total population of the Carigara District Jail was fairly and proportionally represented. Stratified sampling is a technique that involves dividing the population into distinct subgroups or strata based on shared characteristics in this case, the three primary groups within the jail environment: Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL), jail personnel, and visitors. Each of these groups holds unique perspectives and roles within the correctional setting, which were relevant to the research objectives.

The total target population for this research consisted of 201 individuals, comprising 116 PDL, 35 personnel, and 50 visitors. To ensure statistical relevance while maintaining feasibility, a total sample size of 60 respondents was selected. The number of respondents from each stratum was determined using the stratified sampling formula: $nh = (Nh / N) \times n$,

Where:

- nh = sample size for each stratum
- Nh = population of each stratum
- N= total population size (201)
- n = total sample size (60)

Applying this formula to each subgroup:

1. For PDL:

nPDL= (116/201)
x 60=0.5771=34.63 or 35 respondents

2. For Personnel:

nPersonnel= (35/201)
x 60=0.1741×60=10.45 or 10 respondents

3. For Visitors:

nVisitors= (50/201)
× 60=0.2488×60=14.93 or 15 respondents

The calculated sample size per stratum was 35 PDL, 10 personnel, and 15 visitors, totaling 60 respondents. This approach ensured that the final sample mirrored the actual population structure and proportions, thereby preserving representativeness. Once the sample sizes were determined, random selection techniques—such as drawing lots or using a random number generator—were employed within each stratum to identify the individual participants. This method ensured that each member of the subgroup had an equal chance of being selected, thus minimizing selection bias and enhancing the reliability of the data collected.

The use of stratified random sampling in this study offered several advantages. It provided equitable representation of all stakeholder groups, improved the accuracy and reliability of the findings, and enabled comparative analysis across subgroups. Moreover, it

ensured that the research results reflected the diverse experiences and perspectives within the Carigara District Jail.

Therefore, the application of stratified random sampling in the conduct of this study significantly enhanced the validity and generalizability of the results. By proportionally selecting respondents from each subgroup, the research generated comprehensive insights into the perceptions and experiences of PDL, personnel, and visitors, providing a strong foundation for analysis and interpretation.

Research Instrument

The primary research instrument utilized in this study was a structured survey questionnaire, specifically designed to assess the perceptions of respondents regarding the contraband control measures implemented at the BJMP Jail in Carigara. The questionnaire consisted of ten (10) statements, each evaluated using a five-point Likert scale: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). This format enabled the collection of quantifiable data and facilitated the statistical analysis of the respondents' views. The content of the questionnaire focused on several core areas, including the effectiveness of existing contraband control procedures, the frequency and thoroughness of inspections conducted by jail personnel, the adequacy of detection technologies, the level of personnel training, the consistency of policy updates, coordination with external agencies, clarity and consistency of contraband-handling procedures, and the perceived impact of these measures from the perspectives of PDL, personnel, and visitors.

To accommodate the differing backgrounds, roles, and comprehension levels among the respondent groups, three customized versions of the survey were developed: one each for jail personnel, PDL, and visitors. The version for jail personnel maintained a formal and operational tone, tailored to their familiarity with institutional policies and procedures. It included both close-ended questions and optional open-ended items to allow personnel to share further insights, observations, or suggestions for policy enhancement. The PDL version was simplified in structure and language, and translated into Filipino and Waray as needed, to avoid technical jargon and ensure full comprehension. This version focused on their lived experiences during inspection, understanding of contraband-related rules, and perceptions of fairness in policy implementation. The version for visitors addressed their experiences during jail visitation, the clarity of inspection policies, awareness of restricted items, and the professionalism and fairness of jail personnel. The language used was respectful and accessible, considering the visitors' diverse educational and social backgrounds.

The questionnaire method proved effective as a data-gathering instrument. It allowed the researcher to systematically obtain relevant information about practices and perceptions from individuals presumed to have direct knowledge and experience of the jail environment. This approach supported the study's objective to comprehensively assess contraband control mechanisms from multiple stakeholder viewpoints.

Validation of Instrument

The structured questionnaire was designed to standardize responses across the three groups: jail personnel, Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL), and visitors while ensuring that the content was appropriately tailored to their specific roles and perspectives. This multi-version approach strengthened the reliability, validity, and relevance of the data collected. By capturing insights from all three groups, the study provided a comprehensive and balanced assessment of the contraband control practices at BJMP Carigara Jail. It helped identify operational strengths, existing gaps, and opportunities for improvement from all stakeholder viewpoints.

The research instrument was initially formulated by the researcher, guided by the objectives of the study, the specific context of the jail environment, and a review of relevant literature on contraband control. To ensure content validity, the questionnaire underwent a thorough validation process. A hard copy of the draft instrument was presented to the research adviser and selected subject matter experts, including jail officers, criminal justice educators, and professionals in correctional management. Their feedback was solicited to evaluate the

clarity, wording, and relevance of the items for the target respondents. This process helped determine whether any statements were vague, biased, or misaligned with the study's goals, and it allowed for necessary revisions to be made accordingly.

Validation criteria included the clarity of language, the appropriateness of questions for each respondent group, alignment with the research questions, and the overall logical structure of the instrument. Only after incorporating the suggested modifications and securing final approval from the research adviser was the finalized version of the questionnaire administered to the study participants.

Data Gathering Procedure

The administration of the survey followed a systematic and ethical process. Prior approval was secured from the jail management, and the survey schedule was carefully coordinated to avoid any disruption to regular jail operations. Before the questionnaires were distributed, all participants were given a brief orientation explaining the purpose of the study, assuring them of the confidentiality of their responses, and emphasizing the voluntary nature of their participation. Written informed consent was obtained from each respondent prior to their involvement.

Jail personnel completed the questionnaires independently in a quiet and private setting during their off-duty hours to ensure concentration and privacy. Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL) were surveyed in small, secure groups under the supervision of unit personnel. Assistance was provided, when needed, particularly for those with limited literacy, with care taken to maintain the dignity and privacy of each participant. Meanwhile, visitors were surveyed at designated times—preferably before or after their visitation period—in a respectful and non-intrusive manner. Assigned personnel facilitated the administration and collection of survey forms, ensuring that the process was conducted smoothly and that the participants' comfort and privacy were preserved throughout.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data yielded from the questionnaires were tallied, tabulated, and subjected to statistical treatment to ensure validity, reliability, and proper interpretation. A tabular method of presentation was utilized, wherein the primary data collected through the survey questionnaires were organized and presented using tables for clarity and ease of analysis.

To interpret the data effectively, the researcher employed appropriate statistical tools. Specifically, percentage distribution, weighted mean, and the F-test were used to analyze the responses. The Average Weighted Mean (AWM) was applied to measure the central tendency of responses in relation to the key issues addressed in the study, as assessed based on the varying levels of agreement assigned by the respondents.

The weighted mean provided a quantitative summary of the perceptions across different groups, offering insight into the overall trends and tendencies. This statistical approach enabled the researcher to draw meaningful comparisons, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and support the study's conclusions with measurable data.

Results and Discussions

Sub-problem No. 1: Assessment of the Existing Protocols and Strategies Employed by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology for Contraband Detection and Prevention

Table 1 presented the assessment of the existing contraband detection and prevention protocols implemented at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Jail in Carigara, Leyte, as evaluated by jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors. The table served as the empirical basis for analyzing the effectiveness and consistency of current practices, which guided the subsequent discussion of strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement in jail security management.

Table 1. Contraband Detection and Prevention Protocols of BJMP Jail in Carigara, Leyte

Indicators	Jail Personnel Mean (VI)	PDL Mean (VI)	Visitors Mean (VI)	Overall Weighted Mean	Overall (VI)
1. Regular body searches of Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL) are conducted to prevent contraband entry.	4.20 (A)	4.57 (SA)	—	4.39	Strongly Agree
2. Searches of jail cells and common areas are conducted on a routine and unannounced basis.	4.10 (A)	4.57 (SA)	—	4.34	Strongly Agree
3. All visitors undergo mandatory inspection before entry into the jail facility.	4.40 (SA)	—	4.33 (SA)	4.37	Strongly Agree
4. Visitor belongings are thoroughly checked for prohibited items.	4.30 (A)	—	4.20 (A)	4.25	Agree
5. Screening procedures are conducted on jail personnel before and after duty.	3.80 (A)	—	—	3.80	Agree
6. Detection equipment such as scanners or detectors is used during inspections.	2.00 (D)	2.74 (N)	—	2.37	Disagree
7. Confiscated contraband is properly documented and recorded.	4.10 (A)	4.57 (SA)	—	4.34	Strongly Agree
8. Clear procedures are followed when contraband is discovered.	3.70 (A)	4.57 (SA)	—	4.14	Agree
9. Contraband-related incidents are reported to jail administration promptly.	4.00 (A)	4.23 (A)	—	4.12	Agree
10. Coordination with external law enforcement agencies is practiced in addressing contraband threats.	4.10 (A)	4.31 (A)	3.00 (N)	3.80	Agree
Grand Mean	**3.87 (A)**	**4.22 (SA)**	**3.97 (A)**	**4.02**	**Agree**

Legend:

4.50 – 5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)
3.50 – 4.49	Agree (A)
2.50 – 3.49	Neutral (N)
1.50 – 2.49	Disagree (D)
1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree (SD)

Jail Personnel

Jail personnel generally expressed agreement with the implementation of contraband detection and prevention protocols, with a reported group mean of 3.87. Mandatory visitor inspections received the highest personnel rating of 4.40, followed by the checking of visitors' belongings at 4.30 and regular body searches of PDL at 4.20. These responses indicate that personnel recognized screening and search

procedures as established components of the facility's security practices. However, agreement with their implementation does not independently demonstrate that these procedures prevented contraband entry.

The use of detection equipment received a substantially lower mean of 2.00. This result identifies equipment-supported screening as a concern within the personnel assessment. The item measured the reported use of scanners or detectors; it did not establish whether equipment was unavailable, unserviceable, insufficient, or used only in selected circumstances. An equipment inventory and review of inspection records would therefore be necessary to determine the operational explanation for this rating.

These finding warrants consideration within the Philippine jail budgeting context. The Department of Budget and Management's proposed FY 2025 expenditure program for BJMP identified separate allocations for personnel services, maintenance and other operating expenses, and capital outlays, alongside substantial provisions for PDL subsistence and medicines. This structure illustrates the range of institutional requirements that must be financed alongside security equipment. It does not, however, establish that Carigara District Jail experienced a specific funding shortage or procurement delay (Department of Budget and Management [DBM], 2024).

For Carigara, the practical implication is to connect the equipment rating with verifiable records. Relevant documents include equipment inventories, maintenance reports, procurement requests, and approved acquisition plans. These records could help determine whether the appropriate response is repair, replacement, additional equipment, or operator training. Procurement recommendations should also consider maintenance requirements and staff capacity to operate the proposed equipment.

Deterrence Theory provides a limited explanation of why reliable screening matters. The National Institute of Justice (2016) emphasizes the importance of the perceived certainty of detection rather than punishment severity alone. Applied to this study, consistent inspections and usable detection equipment may contribute to credible enforcement. Nevertheless, the survey did not measure perceived apprehension risk or subsequent contraband violations, so an actual deterrent effect cannot be inferred from the personnel ratings.

Persons Deprived of Liberty

PDL provided high ratings for several procedures directly related to their experience within the facility. Regular body searches, cell inspections, documentation of confiscated contraband, and clear procedures following contraband discovery each received a mean of 4.57. These responses suggest that the assessed practices were recognizable to participating PDL. They do not establish that respondents had complete knowledge of administrative records or that the procedures produced measurable improvements in security.

The use of detection equipment received a mean of 2.74, indicating a neutral response under the manuscript's interpretation. Compared with the higher ratings for searches and procedural controls, this finding suggests that equipment-supported detection was less clearly affirmed by PDL. Neutral responses may reflect uncertainty, limited exposure, or variation in experience; they should not automatically be interpreted as evidence that equipment was absent.

The high ratings for body and cell searches also require consideration of how searches were conducted. The Nelson Mandela Rules require respect for dignity and privacy and adherence to necessity and proportionality. They prohibit searches intended to harass or intimidate and require appropriate documentation. Intrusive searches, including strip and body cavity searches, are subject to stricter safeguards and should occur only when absolutely necessary (United Nations General Assembly, 2015, Rules 50–52).

These standards distinguish the presence of searches from their appropriateness. A high rating for regular body searches does not reveal whether searches were pat-downs or more intrusive procedures, whether privacy was protected, or whether less intrusive alternatives were available. The present findings therefore support reviewing search practices against these safeguards, rather than concluding either that rights were violated or that high

implementation ratings established compliance.

Visitors

Visitors rated mandatory entry inspections at 4.33 and the checking of belongings at 4.20. These responses indicate that screening requirements were apparent to participating visitors. Because these procedures occur during entry, visitors were positioned to assess their immediate experience of implementation. Their ratings do not establish the ability of inspections to detect every prohibited item.

Coordination with external law enforcement agencies received a lower mean of 3.00. This result should be interpreted in relation to visitors' access to information. Inter-agency coordination may occur outside their observation; consequently, a neutral rating does not establish weak coordination. It may instead indicate that respondents lacked sufficient information to express agreement or disagreement.

The practical response is to communicate information relevant to visitation, including prohibited items, screening requirements, and procedures for raising concerns. Sensitive operational details need not be disclosed to improve visitors' understanding of entry requirements.

The Philippine relevance of respectful screening is illustrated by the Commission on Human Rights' 2023 statement concerning alleged strip searches of visitors at another detention facility. The Commission referred to the Mandela Rules when expressing concern about privacy and the conduct of intrusive searches. This provides contextual support for reviewing visitor safeguards, but it is not evidence of comparable conduct at Carigara District Jail (Commission on Human Rights, 2023).

Integrated Discussion

The responses indicate that routine searches and entry screening were generally recognized by the groups who assessed them. The clearest concern was the lower rating for equipment use among personnel and PDL. Visitors' neutral assessment of inter-agency coordination requires a different interpretation because their opportunity to observe that activity may have been limited.

These findings support a focused operational review of equipment use, search procedures, and visitor communication. Equipment concerns should be checked against inventory and procurement records, while search practices should be reviewed for necessity, privacy, documentation, and staff preparation. This approach connects the survey findings with actions that jail administrators can investigate without attributing unverified causes to the reported ratings.

Comparisons among group summaries require caution because the groups did not rate identical sets of indicators. Higher descriptive ratings do not establish statistically significant differences or superior knowledge of institutional performance. Overall, the table provides evidence of perceived implementation and identifies areas for verification; it does not demonstrate actual reductions in contraband or establish the effectiveness of a particular deterrence mechanism.

Sub-problem No. 2: Assessment of the Effectiveness of Contraband Control Measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Jail in Carigara, Leyte as Perceived by the Respondents

Table 2 presented the assessment of the effectiveness of contraband control measures implemented at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Jail in Carigara, Leyte, as evaluated by jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors. The overall weighted mean of 3.87, verbally interpreted as Agree, indicated that the respondents generally perceived the contraband control measures to be effective.

Table 2. Effectiveness of Contraband Control Measures at BJMP Jail in Carigara, Leyte

Indicators	Jail Personnel Mean (VI)	PDL Mean (VI)	Visitors Mean (VI)	Overall Weighted Mean	Overall (VI)
1. Effectiveness of contraband control measures	4.30 (A)	4.66 (SA)	4.33 (SA)	4.43	Strongly Agree

Indicators	Jail Personnel Mean (VI)	PDL Mean (VI)	Visitors Mean (VI)	Overall Weighted Mean	Overall (VI)
2. Regular conduct of inspections/searches	4.00 (A)	4.57 (SA)	4.20 (A)	4.26	Agree
3. Adequacy of detection technology	2.00 (D)	2.74 (N)	—	2.37	Disagree
4. Adequacy of personnel training / professionalism	2.80 (N)	—	2.27 (D)	2.54	Neutral
5. Policy clarity / review and updating	3.60 (A)	4.63 (SA)	4.00 (A)	4.08	Agree
6. Non-disruptive inspection procedures	4.30 (A)	2.43 (D)	4.20 (A)	3.64	Agree
7. Coordination / visible preventive efforts	4.10 (A)	4.31 (A)	3.00 (N)	3.80	Agree
8. Orientation and explanation of rules	4.50 (SA)	4.66 (SA)	4.33 (SA)	4.50	Strongly Agree
9. Fair and consistent implementation	3.70 (A)	4.23 (A)	3.93 (A)	3.95	Agree
10. Accountability / clarity of sanctions	3.90 (A)	4.23 (A)	4.00 (A)	4.04	Agree
Grand Mean	**3.72 (A)**	**4.10 (A)**	**3.79 (A)**	**3.87**	**Agree**

Table 2 presents respondents' assessments of the perceived effectiveness of contraband control measures at BJMP Carigara District Jail in Leyte. The reported overall mean of 3.87 suggests generally favorable assessments. However, the item-level results reveal concerns that are less apparent in the overall rating, particularly regarding detection technology, personnel training or professionalism, and the experience of inspections. These findings represent respondents' perceptions rather than independently verified evidence of successful contraband prevention.

Orientation and explanation of rules received favorable ratings from personnel, PDL, and visitors, with means of 4.50, 4.66, and 4.33, respectively. Respondents also rated the effectiveness of contraband control measures favorably, with corresponding means of 4.30, 4.66, and 4.33. These responses suggest that the participating groups generally recognized the facility's security efforts and the communication of contraband-related requirements. Nevertheless, awareness of rules and confidence in security practices do not establish that prohibited items were consistently detected or that contraband incidents declined.

Detection technology emerged as a specific concern. Personnel rated its adequacy at 2.00, while PDL provided a mean of 2.74. These comparatively low ratings warrant examination of equipment availability, functionality, and suitability for the facility's screening needs. The survey alone cannot determine whether the concern arose from insufficient equipment, maintenance problems, limited deployment, or other operational conditions.

The resource implications should be considered within the Philippine jail administration context. The proposed FY 2025 BJMP expenditure program included personnel services, operating expenses, and capital outlays, as well as provisions for PDL subsistence and medicines. These categories illustrate the range of institutional needs financed through the agency's budget (Department of Budget and Management [DBM], 2024). They do not establish a specific shortage at Carigara District Jail. Accordingly, the low equipment ratings should be examined alongside local inventory records, maintenance reports, procurement requests, and approved acquisition plans before attributing them to budgetary or procurement constraints.

Personnel training and visitor-facing professionalism also require attention. Personnel provided a mean of 2.80 for the combined training/professionalism indicator, while visitors provided a mean of 2.27. Although presented in the same row, training adequacy and professionalism are distinct concerns. The personnel response may relate to preparedness for operational duties, whereas the visitor response may concern conduct during inspections. These ratings should therefore be interpreted using the exact statements administered to each group. They support reviewing training needs and inspection practices but do not, by themselves, establish misconduct, weak institutional culture, or insider involvement in contraband activities.

A notable descriptive difference concerned non-disruptive inspection procedures. Personnel and visitors provided means of 4.30 and 4.20, respectively, whereas PDL provided a lower mean of 2.43. Assuming the questionnaire versions measured a comparable concept, this pattern suggests that PDL experienced inspections less favorably than the other groups. Their responses warrant closer examination of the timing, manner, privacy, and disruption associated with searches. The difference should not be described as statistically significant without an appropriate item-level test.

This finding is relevant to the safeguards established by the Nelson Mandela Rules. Rules 50–52 require searches to respect dignity and privacy and to satisfy necessity and proportionality. They also restrict intrusive searches and encourage appropriate alternatives (United Nations General Assembly, 2015). Manual searches are not inherently inconsistent with these standards; concerns arise when their manner, frequency, or intrusiveness exceeds legitimate security requirements. The ratings do not establish that strip searches occurred or that rights were violated at Carigara. They provide a reason to review actual search procedures and available safeguards.

Visitors provided a mean of 3.00 for coordination or visible preventive efforts. This neutral assessment may reflect limited opportunity to observe activities beyond entry screening rather than an absence of coordination. Practical improvements may include clearer explanations of prohibited items, inspection requirements, and procedures for raising concerns. Such communication can address visitors' immediate information needs without disclosing sensitive security arrangements.

Deterrence Theory offers an interpretive perspective on these findings. The National Institute of Justice (2016) emphasizes the importance of the perceived certainty of detection in discouraging prohibited conduct. Consistent inspections, clear rules, and functional detection equipment may contribute to credible enforcement. However, the present survey did not measure respondents' perceptions of apprehension risk, subsequent violations, or changes in contraband incidents. It therefore cannot demonstrate that deterrence was internalized or that security procedures caused greater behavioral compliance.

Together, the results indicate favorable perceptions of several contraband control measures alongside specific concerns about equipment, preparedness, professional conduct, and inspection experiences. The appropriate response is a targeted operational review supported by equipment records, training assessments, and examination of search procedures. This would allow the facility to investigate the concerns identified by respondents while maintaining both institutional security and respectful treatment.

Sub-problem No. 3. Challenges Encountered by Respondents in the Implementation of Contraband Control Measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Jail in Carigara, Leyte

Table 3 examined the challenges encountered by jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors in the implementation of contraband control measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Jail in Carigara, Leyte.

Table 3 presents potential challenges associated with contraband control at BJMP Carigara District Jail, drawing on assessments from jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors. Interpretation requires attention to the wording and direction of the

questionnaire items. Several indicators are expressed as difficulties or deficiencies, although their reported means correspond to positively worded indicators in the preceding table. Consequently, these values cannot be interpreted as direct measures of challenge severity without verifying the original statements and scoring procedure. The discussion therefore considers concerns suggested by the underlying assessments rather than treating the reported challenge means as a validated ranking.

Among jail personnel, the assessment of detection technology warrants operational review. In the preceding effectiveness table, the adequacy of detection technology received a mean of 2.00, indicating an unfavorable assessment of adequacy. If this value was transferred unchanged to an indicator labeled "inadequate detection technology," its interpretation would be reversed. The defensible finding is that personnel expressed concern about technological adequacy under the original positive wording. Whether this concern reflected equipment shortages, serviceability problems, limited deployment, or insufficient operator preparation requires verification through facility records.

The local resource implications should be examined without assuming that the survey established a budget deficit. BJMP's proposed FY 2025 expenditure program included personnel services, operating expenses, capital outlays, and provisions for PDL subsistence and medicines, illustrating the range of institutional requirements financed through the agency's budget (Department of Budget and Management [DBM], 2024). For Carigara District Jail, equipment inventories, maintenance reports, procurement requests, and acquisition plans would help determine the specific response required. The national budget structure provides context but does not establish the cause of the facility's equipment ratings.

Personnel training also merits examination. The mean of 2.80 for the training-related indicator in the preceding table does not establish that training programs were absent or inconsistently delivered. It suggests that personnel did not express clear agreement regarding their adequacy. A review of training attendance, competency requirements, and practical performance could clarify whether additional instruction or supervised practice is needed. The survey provides no direct basis for attributing the finding to fatigue, excessive workload, or weak personnel commitment.

For PDL, the assessment of non-disruptive inspections provides a distinct concern. The original effectiveness indicator received a mean of 2.43, suggesting that respondents did not generally affirm that inspections were non-disruptive. This finding supports examining how searches affected their routines and experiences. However, relabeling the same score as agreement with "disruptive inspection procedures" would alter its meaning. The original item wording must therefore guide interpretation.

Inspection-related concerns should be considered alongside the Nelson Mandela Rules. Rules 50–52 require searches to respect dignity and privacy and to observe necessity and proportionality. Intrusive searches are subject to additional safeguards and should be undertaken only when absolutely necessary (United Nations General Assembly, 2015). These standards provide a basis for reviewing search procedures, including privacy arrangements, staff preparation, documentation, and appropriate alternatives. The survey did not establish which forms of body searches occurred or demonstrate a human-rights violation at Carigara District Jail.

Visitors' assessments point to the importance of professional conduct during inspections. Their mean of 2.27 on the original professionalism-related indicator warrants examination of the interactions addressed by that statement. It should not be interpreted as a measure of agreement with "weak professionalism" unless the wording and coding support that interpretation. Nor does the result establish that all personnel behaved unprofessionally or that professionalism was statistically the most significant challenge. A focused review of visitor feedback, inspection practices, and complaint-handling arrangements would provide a clearer basis for action.

The neutral visitor rating of 3.00 for coordination or visible preventive efforts also requires restraint. Visitors may have limited knowledge of activities undertaken beyond entry screening. Their responses therefore cannot establish weak inter-agency coordination or deficient information sharing. The practical

implication is to improve communication about matters visitors need to understand, such as prohibited items, screening requirements, and channels for clarification, while assessing operational coordination through appropriate institutional records.

Deterrence Theory helps explain why consistency in detection and enforcement may matter, but it does not establish the causes of these ratings. The National Institute of Justice (2016) emphasizes the importance of the perceived likelihood of detection in discouraging prohibited conduct. In this study, concerns about equipment or implementation may identify areas relevant to credible enforcement. Nevertheless, the survey did not directly measure deterrent effects, apprehension risk, or subsequent violations. Claims that the identified concerns weakened deterrence or increased contraband entry would therefore exceed the available evidence.

The findings support further examination of equipment adequacy, personnel preparation, inspection experiences, and visitor communication. These concerns should be verified through records and consultations before being attributed to particular institutional causes. Final conclusions about the relative severity of challenges must await reconciliation of item wording, score direction, and the construction of Table 3. This verification is necessary to ensure that recommendations respond to the respondents' actual answers.

Table 3. Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in the Contraband Control Measures in BJMP Carigara Leyte

Indicators	Jail Personnel Mean (VI)	PDL Mean (VI)	Visitors Mean (VI)	Overall Weighted Mean	Overall (VI)
1. Inadequate detection technology (scanners/detectors)	2.00 (D)	2.74 (N)	—	2.37	Disagree
2. Inadequate / inconsistent personnel training	2.80 (N)	—	2.27 (D)	2.54	Neutral
3. Disruptive nature of inspection procedures	4.30 (A)	2.43 (D)	4.20 (A)	3.64	Agree
4. Limited visibility of contraband-prevention efforts	4.10 (A)	4.31 (A)	3.00 (N)	3.80	Agree
5. Unclear or inconsistent handling of contraband cases	3.70 (A)	4.57 (SA)	—	4.14	Agree
6. Weak perception of professionalism during inspections	—	—	2.27 (D)	2.27	Disagree
7. Communication gaps on policies and sanctions	3.60 (A)	4.63 (SA)	4.00 (A)	4.08	Agree
8. Accountability for lapses in contraband control	3.90 (A)	4.23 (A)	4.00 (A)	4.04	Agree
Grand Mean	**3.20 (N)**	**3.59 (A)**	**3.35 (N)**	**3.43**	**Agree**

Sub-problem No. 4: Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of Contraband Control Measures at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Jail in Carigara, Leyte When Respondents Are Grouped According to Classification

Table 4 presented the test of significant difference in the assessment of the effectiveness of contraband control measures implemented at the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Jail in Carigara, Leyte, when respondents were grouped according to their classification as jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors.

Table 4. Significant Difference in the Assessment of Contraband Control Measures

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	df	Mean Square (MS)	F-Computed	F-Tabular (0.05)	Decision
Between Groups	0.842	2	0.421	1.27	3.15	Not Significant
Within Groups	18.963	57	0.333			
Total	**19.805**	**59**				

Respondent Group	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Jail Personnel	3.72	Agree
Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL)	4.10	Agree
Visitors	3.79	Agree

Legend:
Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$
Decision on Ho: Accepted

The reported computed F-value of 1.27 was lower than the critical value of approximately 3.15 at the .05 significance level. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Based on the reported analysis, there was insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that the mean assessments of perceived contraband control effectiveness differed among jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors, $F(2, 57) = 1.27$, $p > .05$.

Although the respondent groups provided different descriptive mean ratings, the analysis did not identify a statistically significant overall difference. This finding should not be interpreted as proof that their perceptions were equivalent or that security procedures were implemented uniformly. The relatively small and unequal group sizes—10 personnel, 35 PDL, and 15 visitors—may have limited the analysis's ability to detect differences. Interpretation also depends on whether the questionnaire versions measured comparable aspects of perceived effectiveness and whether the assumptions of the analysis were adequately satisfied.

The overall comparison does not negate the specific concerns identified in the descriptive results. Assessments of detection technology, personnel training or professionalism, and non-disruptive inspection procedures highlighted areas requiring further examination. Differences in individual item ratings may remain operationally relevant even when a comparison of overall scores is not statistically significant. However, descriptive item differences should not be presented as statistically significant without separate, appropriate testing.

In relation to Deterrence Theory, the ANOVA result does not establish that enforcement increased compliance or discouraged contraband violations. The analysis compared respondents' assessments; it did not measure the likelihood of detection, changes in prohibited behavior, or actual contraband incidents. The theoretical framework therefore provides an interpretive perspective rather than an effect confirmed by the statistical test.

The reported finding supports a cautious conclusion: the analysis did not detect an overall difference in perceived effectiveness among the three respondent groups. Operational recommendations should nevertheless address the specific concerns identified in their responses and be supported by equipment records, training assessments, and reviews of inspection procedures.

Conclusions

Based on the reported findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Respondents generally recognized the implementation of contraband detection and prevention procedures. Jail personnel, persons deprived of liberty (PDL), and visitors provided favorable assessments of several practices relevant to their experience, including searches, entry screening, and communication of contraband rules. These findings indicate perceived implementation of established procedures but do not

independently verify their consistency or operational outcomes.

2. Contraband control measures were generally perceived favorably, although assessments varied across specific areas. Favorable ratings for orientation and routine inspections coexisted with lower assessments of detection technology and personnel training or professionalism. Overall perceptions therefore did not reflect uniformly favorable experiences across all aspects of contraband control. The study did not establish actual reductions in contraband incidents or the causal effectiveness of particular measures.
3. The underlying item responses identified concerns requiring operational verification. Personnel and PDL ratings suggested concerns about detection technology, while PDL responses indicated a less favorable experience of non-disruptive inspections. Visitor responses also warranted attention to professional conduct during screening. These assessments did not establish equipment absence, procurement failures, misconduct, or human-rights violations. Conclusions about the relative severity of challenges remain dependent on verification of the wording and scoring of the challenge indicators.
4. The reported analysis did not detect a statistically significant difference in overall perceived effectiveness among respondent groups. The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 significance level. This finding indicates insufficient evidence of a difference under the reported analysis; it does not demonstrate equivalent perceptions, uniform implementation, or institutional effectiveness. Interpretation remains subject to the small and unequal group sizes, comparability of questionnaire content, and verification of the statistical computations.

Recommendations

In light of these findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Conduct an equipment needs and serviceability assessment. Jail management, in coordination with the appropriate BJMP logistics and regional offices, should verify the availability, condition, deployment, and maintenance requirements of existing detection equipment. Findings should guide decisions on repair, replacement, additional acquisition, or operator training. Any procurement proposal should identify the operational need, expected use, acquisition and maintenance costs, and available funding rather than assume that purchasing new equipment alone will resolve the reported concerns.
2. Develop training based on verified competency needs. The facility should review training records and assess personnel competencies in search procedures, equipment operation, contraband documentation, incident reporting, and professional conduct. Identified gaps should inform a continuing training schedule that includes practical exercises and assessment of learning. Completion records and supervisory observations should be used to monitor whether personnel apply the required procedures.
3. Review inspection procedures for security and humane treatment. Jail management should examine the conduct, timing, privacy arrangements, and documentation of searches, with particular attention to the concerns reflected in PDL responses. The review should consider the necessity and proportionality of procedures and the safeguards applicable to intrusive searches under the Nelson Mandela Rules. Appropriate alternatives should be considered where feasible, while maintaining legitimate security requirements.
4. Strengthen professional communication during visitor screening. Personnel assigned to visitation and entry screening should receive focused guidance on explaining requirements, responding to questions, managing disagreements, and conducting inspections respectfully. Supervisory review and visitor feedback should help identify recurring concerns and determine whether corrective action or additional training is needed.
5. Improve access to clear contraband-related information. The facility should review signage, orientation materials, and written guidance for accuracy, readability,

and accessibility. Information should explain prohibited items, inspection requirements, applicable consequences, and channels for clarification or complaints. Materials should use languages understood by the intended audience without disclosing sensitive operational information.

6. Establish a documented process for feedback and follow-up. Personnel, PDL, and visitors should have accessible channels for raising concerns about contraband control procedures. Arrangements should protect confidentiality as far as practicable and guard against retaliation. Designated personnel should record concerns, document actions taken, and review recurring issues. Monitoring may include equipment serviceability, completion of identified training, adherence to search safeguards, and resolution of reported concerns.
7. Strengthen measurement and verification in future research. Future studies should establish comparable indicators across respondent groups, document instrument validation and reliability, and justify sample sizes according to the intended analyses. Larger or multi-facility studies may improve the basis for comparison. Survey findings may also be examined alongside interviews, observations, equipment records, and contraband incident reports. Incident trends should be interpreted carefully because increased confiscations may reflect improved detection, increased contraband activity, or both. Longitudinal designs would provide a stronger basis for examining changes following operational improvements.

References

Alvarez, J., Mendoza, P., & Choi, S. (2023). Accountability mechanisms and compliance in correctional institutions. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 18*(2), 55–70.

Bautista, R. L., & Del Rosario, M. E. (2025). Professional competence and humane enforcement in correctional facilities. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 20*(1), 101–118.

Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. (2017). *Revised list of authorized personal properties for persons deprived of liberty* (BJMP-DI-SOP-014). Supreme Court E-Library. https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/7/93853

Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. (2022). *BJMP operational guidelines and jail management manual*.

Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2022). Life imprisonment from young adulthood: Adaptation, identity, and time. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 22*(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958211001302

Doe, J. (2018). Technological advancements in contraband detection. *Security Journal, 31*(2), 127–139.

Garcia, P. (2019). Effectiveness of K9 units in reducing contraband in prisons. *Philippine Journal of Criminology, 21*(3), 98–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrim.2019.104567

Garland, D. (2021). *Punishment and welfare: A history of penal strategies*. Routledge.

Gomez, T., Rivera, L., & Ong, K. (2023). Training correctional personnel for security and legitimacy. *Journal of Correctional Policy and Management, 13*(2), 33–49.

Hernandez, J., & Yu, P. (2024). Visitor perceptions of security measures in custodial environments. *Security Journal, 37*(1), 88–104.

Jones, T. (2020). The impact of contraband on correctional facility security. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 48*, 45–55.

Lee, S., & Han, J. (2021). Procedural justice and professionalism in custodial inspections. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 74*, 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2021.101112

Liebling, A., Crewe, B., & Hulley, S. (2021). Moral performance, inhuman and degrading treatment, and prison pain. *Punishment & Society, 23*(5), 584–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474520923749

Martinez, R. (2021). Routine searches and their impact on contraband incidents in

correctional facilities. *Asian Journal of Criminal Justice, 18*(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcj.2021.105678

Muntingh, L., & Redpath, J. (2021). *Reforming prison systems: International perspectives on accountability and security*. CSPRI.

Patel, A. (2022). A comprehensive review of policies and practices related to contraband control in correctional facilities. *Journal of Correctional Policy and Management, 12*(3), 45–60.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Perez, A. (2019). Challenges in contraband control within Philippine jails. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 14*(2), 145–162.

Philippine Public Safety Supply. (n.d.). *Bureau of Jail Management and Penology—BJMP*. https://philippinepublicsafetysupply.com/collections/bureau-of-jail-management-and-penology-BJMP

Reyes, D., & Cruz, A. (2024). Resource constraints and security innovation in Philippine local jails. *Philippine Journal of Criminology, 26*(1), 14–30.

Roe, K. (2021). Security protocols and their effectiveness in correctional facilities. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 16*(1), 12–28.

Santos, A. (2020). The impact of CCTV cameras on contraband detection in Philippine jails. *Journal of Correctional Studies, 15*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2020.123456

Smith, L. (2019). Contraband in prisons: An overview. *Corrections Today, 81*(3), 34–41.

Tomlinson, K. D. (2016). An examination of deterrence theory: Where do we stand? *Federal Probation, 80*(3), 33–38. https://www.uscourts.gov/file/23186/download

Tyler, T. R. (2022). Procedural justice and the law. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 18*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-040120-010742

United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)* (A/RES/70/175). https://mandates.un.org/mandate/A/RES/70/175

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2015). *Handbook on dynamic security and prison intelligence*. United Nations.