

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2022, Vol. 3, No. 6, 1109 – 1127

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.06.15>

Research Article

Level of Implementation of Safekeeping Practices in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology

Elrhine D. Nicholas, Rowell B. Pallega*, Meynard O. Comecilla

College of Criminal Justice Education Jose Rizal Memorial State University Philippines

Article history:

Submission June 2022

Revised June 2022

Accepted June 2022

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

rowellpallega@jrmsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the level of implementation of safekeeping practices in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology in Ipil District Jail and Ipil Women's Dormitory Jail of Zamboanga Sibugay during calendar year 2018-2019. This study made use of non-experimental quantitative research design utilizing descriptive, frequency count, percentage and mean. It also utilized modified questionnaire in gathering the result. There were 127 inmates and 50 Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel utilized as respondents of the study. The main statistical tools used were frequency count, percentage, mean computation, t-test, analysis of variance and Pearson r Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation. The study revealed that there were more male inmates as compared to the females. Majority of the index crimes committed by the inmates were murder while on the non-index crimes, majority were charged against possession of illegal drugs. The security practices were always implemented by the two Jail under study which included the following: Commitment Order and Segregation of Prisoners or Detainees, Reception Procedures, and Disciplinary Boards and Punishable Acts of Inmates, Treatment of Inmates with Special Needs, Custody, Security and Control Emergency Plans, Movement and Transfer of Prisoners and Detainees, Rights, Privileges and Miscellaneous Provisions, and Inmates Welfare and Development Functions. There was no significant difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and inmate's ratings on the implementation of commitment order and segregation of inmates or detainees. However, there was a significant difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and inmates' rating on the rest of the safekeeping practices. Indeed, there was a significant relationship between the safekeeping practices and the level of Implementation of these practices. The researcher recommends that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology implementation of safekeeping practices be continued and sustained.

How to cite:

Nicholas, E. D., Pallega, R. B., & Comecilla, M. O. (2022). Level of Implementation of Safekeeping Practices in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 3(6), 1109 – 1127. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.03.06.15

Keywords: BJMP, level of implementation, safekeeping of inmates, safekeeping practices

Background

Section 5 Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015 said that one of the functions of the BJMP is to implement strong security measures for the supervision, control and rehabilitation of inmates. However, Cruzat et. Al (2015) said that according to the report, prisons and jails in the Philippines have been under increased pressure over the last decade to improve their security systems in terms of inmate custody. This is due to overcrowding, a lack of budget and resources, which results in potential violence, inmate escape, and other crises.

The Bureau of Jail Management and Penology was established as one of the five pillars of the Criminal Justice System to address the growing concern about jail administration and penology issues. Detainees accused before a court who are temporarily held in such jails while undergoing investigation, await final judgment, or serving a sentence imposed by the court for three (3) years or less are the majority of its clients. The Jail Bureau is mandated by Republic Act No. 6975 to take operational and administrative supervision of all city, district, and municipal jails.

The Bureau has four major areas of rehabilitation program, namely: Livelihood Projects, Educational and Vocational Training, Recreation and Sport, and Religious/ Spiritual Activities. These were continuously implemented to eliminate the problem on the safekeeping of inmates, the offenders' pattern of criminal behavior and to reform them to become law-abiding and productive citizens (BJMP Comprehensive Operations Manual Revised on 2015).

The custody, supervision, and rehabilitation of criminal offenders is the primary responsibility of BJMP, which is the line bureau of the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) and one of the main agencies of the five pillars of criminal justice. According to the BJMP manual, all Philippine jails are tasked with receiving the following prisoners: those who have been sentenced for one day to three

years; those who are awaiting the final disposition of their case; and those who are in jail for their own safety because their lives are in danger if they are out in the community.

The BJMP Manual also directs its personnel to keep safe the prisoner under their custody as much as they could. Accordingly, the livelihood of BJMP personnel depends on the inmate he/she is keeping or guarding. Because, if a prisoner escapes from the institution the personnel on duty and the warden of the reformatory and rehabilitation center are automatically relieved from post and are deprived of their salaries and benefits unless the prisoner is brought back to the cell. Moreover, the BJMP personnel are also tasked of ensuring that the prisoners under their custody are fully rehabilitated prior to their reintegration to the community (BJMP Comprehensive Operations Manual Revised on 2015).

Despite all of the innovations, trainings on proper convict management, proper implementation of rehabilitation programs, and the hiring of additional people, concerns with inmate safety persist. Inmates incarcerated in various correctional institutions across the country continue to flee their custody facilities. Overcrowding in jails is one of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology's rising issues. A problem that BJMP must solve (Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners).

The problems particularly on overcrowding also exist in other countries. According to Fox (2010), the optimal safeguarding ratio in the United States of America is one jail officer to six detainees, however due to rising inmate populations, one jail officer may be guarding twenty or more inmates. As a result, many jails run with the help of convicts and with a low level of custodial supervision, making the task of the custodial officer more difficult. There are jails in the United States where convicts participate in custodial control by carrying firearms and shotguns to protect fellow inmates. Escapes and riots are more likely as a result of this scenario.

Methods

This study made use of non-experimental quantitative research design utilizing descriptive, frequency count, percentage and mean. It also utilized modified questionnaire in gathering the result. Unstructured interviews were also conducted. The data gathered were tabulated; analyzed and interpreted in order to answer the questions on the safekeeping practices and its implementation in Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. The respondents of the study were 50 BJMP personnel particularly those assigned in the custodial force of

the two District Jails, namely: Ipil District Jail and Ipil Women's Dormitory Jail. They were chosen as the respondents because of their experience in the safekeeping of inmates. There was also a total of 127 inmates' respondents from these jails. As a matter security and safety of the researcher, the questionnaires were given to the jail personnel on the advice of the jail warden and then it was the jail personnel who distributed the questionnaire to the inmates. In totality there were 177 respondents of the study.

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Profile of Index Crimes Committed by the Inmates

Crimes	Male		Female		Total	
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Crime Against Person						
Murder	14	25.45	2	40.00	16	26.67
Attempted Murder	5	9.09	-	-	5	8.33
Frustrated Murder	11	20.00	-	-	11	18.33
Rape	9	16.36	-	-	9	15.00
Attempted Rape	3	5.45	-	-	3	5.00
Illegal Position of Firearms	5	9.09	1	20.00	6	10.00
Crime Against Property						
Robbery	1	1.82	2	40.00	3	5.00
Fence	2	3.64	-	-	2	3.33
Car napping	5	9.09	-	-	5	8.33
Total	55	100.00	5	100.00	60	100.00

Table 1 presents the index crimes committed by the inmates. As shown in the table, there were a total of 55 index crimes committed by male inmates and 5 crimes were committed by female inmates. As to the index crimes committed by male inmates, murder and frustrated murder were the most common and they constituted 25.45 percent and 20.00 percent respectively. Rape ranked next with 9 cases or 16.36 percent followed by attempted murder, car napping and illegal possession of firearms with 5 cases each constituting 9.09 percent of the crimes. There were also 3 cases of attempted rape, 2 cases of fence and only one case of robbery.

On the other hand, the female inmates have committed murder and robbery with 2 cases each while there was only one case of illegal

possession of firearms. On the whole, there were 16 cases of murder which constitute 26.67 percent; 5 cases of attempted murder, 8.33 percent; 11 cases of frustrated murder, 18.33 percent; 9 cases of rape, 15.00 percent; 3 cases of attempted rape, 5.00 percent and 6 cases of illegal possession of firearms, which constitute 10 percent. Going further, as to the crimes against property, there were 3 cases of robbery, 2 cases of fence and 5 cases of car napping.

In totality, the most common crime committed is murder which is a crime against person and the least crime committed by the inmates is anti-fencing which is a crime against property. The result was supported by Shacfer (2015) according to his research, murder is the most common type of inmate crime in the

United States. Murder accounts for 66% of all reported crimes, with drug usage appearing to be the most common factor. He went on to say

that such crimes are performed to get out of poverty.

Table 2 Profile of Non-Index Crimes Committed by the Inmates

Non-Index Crimes	Male		Female		Total	
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Crimes Against Civil Status						
Bigamy	1	2.50	-	-	1	1.49
Other related violations of Philippine Law						
Illegal Possession of Deadly Weapon	2	5.00	-	-	2	2.98
Illegal Possession of Illegal Drugs	33	82.50	27	100.00	60	89.55
Child Abuse	1	2.50			1	1.49
Violation Against Women and Children	3	3.75	-	-	3	4.48
Total	40	100.00	27	100.00	67	100.00

Table 2 presents the profile of the non-index crimes committed by the inmates. As seen in the table, there was only one case of bigamy committed by an inmate; Two or five percent of the total number of non-index crimes were on illegal possession of deadly weapon. Another 1 or 2.50 percent was on child abuse and the remaining 3 or 3.75 percent were on violation against women and children.

As to the female inmates, there were twenty-seven cases of illegal possession of drugs. In totality, there were 67 non-index crimes committed and one (1) or 1.49 percent was bigamy; two or 2.98 percent were on illegal possession of deadly weapon; another 1 or 1.49 percent is on child abuse. It shows that bigamy and child abuse are less number of non-index crimes committed; 3 or 3.75 percent is on violation against women and children and the most number of cases were on illegal possession of illegal drugs. They constituted 60 or 89.55 percent of the total number of non-index crimes committed by the inmates. It could be seen in the table that among the non-index crimes, illegal possession of drugs is the most common crimes committed other than being the most frequently committed crime by inmates.

The finding was supported by Dionisio (2009) who claimed that because to the increased availability of chips drugs in every barangay, more people are prone to selling drugs

in the community. Due to people's dread of being involved in the litigation and trial, getting witnesses in this case is extremely difficult. It is regrettable that some people rely solely on crime for a living. Careful planning and dependence on technical skills and methodologies are essential for success in this line of work.

Likewise, the result was also corroborated by Sacfer (2015) according to his research, murder is the most common type of inmate crime in the United States. Murder accounts for 66% of all reported crimes, with drug usage appearing to be the most common factor. He went on to say that such crimes are performed to get out of poverty.

Table 3 presents the safekeeping practices of the BJMP in terms of their commitment order and segregation of prisoners. The data in the table show that these practices were very much practiced and always visible in the BJMP. The personnel always follow the order by the courts and other entities authorized to commit a person to jail such as: Supreme Court, Court of Appeal (CA), Sandiganbayan, Regional Trial Court (RTC), Metropolitan/Municipal Trial Court (MTC), Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC). They classify the prisoners or the detainees into undergoing investigation, awaiting trial and awaiting final judgment. Further, they also classify inmate security as to high-risk,

high-profile inmate and ordinary inmate and finally they strictly follow requirements for commitment as to communication order, medical certificate, complaint information and police booking sheet. Generally, the commitment order and segregation of prisoners in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology were strictly obeyed (Torralba, 2014).

This finding means that such practices are always done and implemented by the BJMP personnel. This implies that the BJMP personnel are doing their job and that they adhere to rules and regulations in terms of commitment order and segregation of the prisoners or detainees as a first safekeeping operation or practices implemented to the inmates in the BJMP.

Table 3. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Commitment Order and Segregation of Prisoners or Detainees

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. The BJMP officers follows strictly the courts and other entities authorized to commit a person to jail such as: supreme court, court of appeal, sandiganbayan, regional trial court, metropolitan/municipal trial court, municipal circuit court.	4.70	VMP
2. The inmates are classified to prisoner and detainee.	4.39	VMP
3. The detainees are classified into undergoing investigation, awaiting or undergoing trial and awaiting final judgment.	4.62	VMP
4. The inmate security is classified into high risk inmates, high profile inmates and ordinary inmates.	4.38	VMP
5. Requirements for commitment are strictly followed such as communication order, medical certificate, complaint information and police booking sheet	4.69	VMP
Mean	4.56	VMP

Table 4. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Reception Procedures and Disciplinary Boards and Punishable Acts of Inmates

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. In reception procedure, the jail desk officer carefully checks and examine the credential of the personal bringing the inmate to determine his/her identity and authority such as: warrant of arrest issued by the court, commitment order from the court/mittimus, cash and other personal property of inmates where keep by officers issued by the corresponding receipt duly signed by him/her countersigned by the inmate.	4.44	VMP
2. The inmate is then fingerprinted and photographed and accomplishes a jail booking report, attaching there the inmate's photograph for reference.	4.47	VMP
3. Conduct of medical examination (pregnancy test if female) and preparation of inmate's medical record.	4.12	MP
4. Upon commitments the inmates are briefly oriented, provided with jail clothing properly received, cleaned and stored safely until his/her release.	4.15	MP
5. The warden establishes and maintains a record of all inmates.	4.45	VMP
6. Upon completion of the reception procedures, the detainee is assigned to his/her confinement, if such materials are available.	4.17	MP
7. The detainee was issued all the materials that he/she will be using during his/her confinement.	3.42	MP

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
8. Upon receipt of a detainee, he/she was appraised, preferably in the dialect which he/she understands in consonance with the RA 6125.	3.94	MP
9. The procedures in the hearing of disciplinary cases are strictly implemented.	4.41	VMP
10. Inmates are strictly prohibited from committing any minor offenses, less grave offenses and grave offenses.	4.44	VMP
Mean	4.25	VMP

Shown in Table 4 are the data on the safe-keeping practices in terms of reception procedures, disciplinary boards and punishable acts of inmates. Along this line, the overall impression of the inmates was these practices were very much practiced and obvious. The reception procedure was very well facilitated. In reception procedure, the jail desk officer carefully checks and examines the credential of the personal bringing the inmate to determine his/her identity and authority such as: warrant of arrest issued by the court, commitment order from the court/mittimus, cash and other personal property of inmates were kept by officers issued by the corresponding receipt duly signed by him/her countersigned by the inmate and the process of finger print, photography, accomplishment of jail booking report, conduct of medical examination, briefing and orientation, assignment of confinement cell, issuance of materials like mat, blanket to be used during the confinement period, disciplinary measures. Upon receipt of a detainee, he/she shall be appraised, preferably in the dialect which he/she understands in consonance with the RA 6125 and prohibition of the inmates from committing any minor offense while on

confinement and the inmates are briefly oriented, provided with jail clothing properly received, cleaned and stored safely until his/her release.

In this particular aspect the mean was 4.25 which is described as very much practiced. This means that reception procedures and disciplines and punishable acts of inmates are properly dealt with in accordance with rules and regulations set. Since this is the first time the prisoner is at a face to face with the BJMP personnel, the personnel may just observe caution when dealing with them.

The result was supported by Weels (2014) who said that reception is the first point of contact between a prisoner and prison officer. For many prisoners this is a time of apprehension, misgivings and low self-esteem.

Moreover, Banay (2015) corroborated the result. He stated that officers must be mindful of the prisoner's mental and emotional condition while processing, verifying, and seeking information because it is critical, and as one of the main purposes of the BJMP, putting someone in prison is not for punishment but for reformation prior to reintegration into society.

Table 5. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Treatment of Inmates with Special Needs

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. Inmates with special needs was separated from other regular inmates.	3.82	MP
2. Observation of guidelines in the handling inmates with special needs such as female inmates, drug users, alcoholics, mentally-ill, sex deviates, suicidal inmates, handicapped, aged, infirmed and non-Philippine citizen inmates are observed.	3.99	MP
Mean	3.90	MP

Table 5 presents the safekeeping practices of inmates in terms of treatment of inmates with special needs. The data in the table show that treatment of inmates with special needs like inmates not held in jails with other regular inmates and observation of guidelines in handling inmates with special needs. This was proven by the average weighted values of 3.82 and 3.99 and the mean of 3.90. This means that treatments of inmates are much practiced in jail. The people assigned to facilitate the inmates and who correspondingly deal with

them are doing their task most of the times and they give due consideration to the inmates even if they are incarcerated. They treat the inmates properly as human beings despite the fact that they are law breakers. Even in their aberrant state, the BJMP personnel regard them as normal human beings with the right to live humanely. Furthermore, the jail wardens treat them with humanity and care. (Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015).

Table 6. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Custody, Security and Control Emergency Plans, Movement and Transfer of Prisoners and Detainees

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. Conducts regular briefing for every shift, especially before any member of the custodial force assumes his/her duty and before the escort personnel leave with inmates for court hearing and other authorized/lawful destination is observed.	4.18	MP
2. Maintains strict control of firearms, bladed weapons, and other potentially dangerous weapons.	4.52	VMP
3. Censorship of incoming and outgoing mails for inmates.	3.93	MP
4. Conduct regular inmates count, at least four (4) times within 24 hours period, frequent surprise searches of inmates and their quarters to detect contraband, frequent inspection of security facilities to detect tampering or defects.	4.59	VMP
5. Secure firearms and anti-riot equipment in the armory and supervises the proper use of tools and other potentially dangerous articles such as bottles and other kitchen utensils and keep them out of any inmates reach when not in use.	4.46	VMP
6. Develop plans dealing with emergencies like escapes, fires, assaults and riots and make these plans known and understood by jail personnel.	4.23	VMP
7. Never allow a jail officer to render successive shifts of duty except in cases of emergencies, open the inmate's quarters alone.	4.18	MP
8. Designate a gate supervisor for every shift who will be made administratively responsible and accountable for the daily activities at the entrance gate of jail.	4.42	VMP
9. Security in serving the food inside the cells/quarters is strictly observed.	4.17	MP
10. Observance of separate dining or mess halls.	4.00	MP
Mean	4.27	VMP

Table 6 presents the data on the safekeeping practices in terms of custody, security and control, emergency plans, movement and transfer of prisoners and detainees. The data in the table show that on this particular aspect of responsibility of the BJMP personnel is always visible. This means that these practices are

very much practiced to the inmates. The inmates have observed that there is a regular briefing for every shifts especially when there are shifting of duties for BJMP personnel. The BJMP personnel also maintain strict control of firearms, bladed weapons and other potentially dangerous weapons that may be brought

inside the jail. Firearms and other riot equipment are being secured and there is always an emergency plan just in case there are escapes and assaults as well as riots. The gate supervisors are designated in every shift. Security and safety is even visible in the serving of food. The dining area is secured. The mean of 4.27 proved this claim.

They conduct regular inmates count, at least four (4) times within 24 hours period, frequent surprise searches of inmates and their quarters to detect contraband, frequent inspection of security facilities to detect tampering or defects is always observable with the mean of 4. 59. This implies that security and

safety of the inmates is of prime concern to the BJMP personnel.

This is part of their duties and responsibilities in safekeeping and that this would also reflect the kind of performance that they have. Proper security and control of the inmates should be given a priority because it deals with criminals and other law offenders. To some point, one deals with deviant behavior. It is a behavior that violates a social norm (Shacfer 2005). Thus, they should be stringent about the safeguarding and security of these people, not just for the inmates, but also for the prison or jail officials, who are the frontline officers directly engaged in the service of security and preserving order in the jail.

Table 7. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Rights, Privileges and Miscellaneous Provisions

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. The right to be treated as a human being, and not to be subject to corporal punishment.	4.12	MP
2. The right to be informed of the regulations governing the detention center.	4.17	MP
3. The right to adequate food, space and ventilation, rest and recreation.	3.82	MP
4. The right to avail of medical, dental, religious belief and the right to vote unless disqualified by law.	4.10	MP
5. The inmates enjoy the privileges allowed by the jail officer like receive books, letters, magazines, newspaper and to receive fruits and prepared food, subject to inspection and approval by the officials and receive visitor during visiting hours.	4.04	MP
6. To be entitled to good conduct time allowance as provided by the law.	4.22	VMP
7. Mode and guidelines shall be observed when inmates are to be released from detention/jail.	4.46	VMP
Mean	4.13	MP

Table 7 presents the data on the safekeeping practices of inmates in terms of rights, privileges and miscellaneous provisions. The data in the table show that along this line, the practices were much often. This was proven by the mean of 4.13 and the average weighted values that are well within the range 3.41 – 5.00 which ranges from much practice to very much practice.

This shows that the rights, privileges and miscellaneous provisions of the law are visible

most of the times and the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel are adhering to such provisions. The inmates are given the right to be treated as human being. They are given the right to be informed of the regulations of the detention. They have the right to be given adequate food, space and ventilation, rest and relaxation as well as recreation. The prisons have also given the inmates medical and dental services as well as the right to practice their religious beliefs.

The above result demonstrates that life goes on as usual. BJMP employees strive to provide the best possible service to convicts, and they worked hard to create a system in which inmates may maintain a normal way of life even while incarcerated. They tried to create a comfortable environment for the inmates despite the fact that they were incarcerated, but they also had a responsibility to follow the rules and regulations.

The result was corroborated by Torralba (2014) who stated that the government has an

upgraded "e-dalaw" program that was issued in November 2011 by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. Their families use the so-called "e-dalaw" program to interact with them via technology. This is especially useful when family members are unable to see their relatives in prison owing to distance or financial constraints. So that convicts inside the facility can connect with their loved ones through computer technology.

Table 8. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Inmates Welfare and Development Functions

Items	Inmates' Rating	
	Mean	D
1. Health service activities.	4.10	MP
2. Livelihood service activities	4.06	MP
3. Educational service activities	4.19	MP
4. Sports and recreational services activities	4.01	MP
5. Visitation services activities	4.17	MP
6. Religious service activities	4.33	VMP
Mean	4.14	MP

Table 8 presents the practices of observed in the BJMP in terms of looking into inmates' welfare and development. The data in the table show that health services, livelihood services, educational services, sports and recreation service, and visitation services were much practiced while religious services are very much practice. The mean was 4.14, described as much practice.

This finding was corroborated by Palompon (2013) who pointed that the Filipino concept of faith in God as Supreme Being is still given the topmost priority in all aspects. This is evident as religious services is placed with utmost concern and is being done almost all of the times in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. This proves the fact that the belief in the Supreme Being professes the value of religion where one denies enlightenment despite the fact that people commit mistakes and commit sin. On the other hand, the other services

were also very much favorably observed in jail like education, livelihood, health, sports and recreation. Most of the time, these services were visible and available to inmates. The BJMP, according to community members, provides these services. What the BJMP officers want inmates to do is maintain their interest in the program and participate enthusiastically in it.

In this context, the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology is doing its best to provide a good living for detainees, despite the fact that some of them have been convicted of crimes and others are still facing legal proceedings. In jail, there is a distinct sense of human fellowship. As a result, even while in prison, offenders obtain the essential rehabilitation to improve their chances of leading a normal life. In this level, one can better understand that life is more meaningful and worthwhile when one is present and assisting others (Palompon, 2013).

Table 9. Implementation of Safekeeping Practices of Inmates by the BJMP in Terms of Commitment Order and Segregation of Prisoners or Detainees

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. The BJMP officers follows strictly the courts and other entities authorized to commit a person to jail such as: supreme court, court of appeal, sandiganbayan, regional trial court, metropolitan/municipal trial court, municipal circuit court.	4.60	VWI	5.00	VWI
2. The inmates are classified to prisoner and detainee.	4.40	VWI	5.00	VWI
3. The detainees are classified into undergoing investigation, awaiting or undergoing trial and awaiting final judgment.	4.56	VWI	5.00	VWI
4. The inmate security is classified into high-risk inmates, high profile inmates and ordinary inmates.	4.13	WI	5.00	VWI
5. Requirements for commitment are strictly followed such as communication order, medical certificate, complaint information and police booking sheet	4.62	VWI	5.00	VWI
Mean	4.46	VWI	5.00	VWI

Table 9 presents the ratings of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel and the inmates on the extent of implementation of the safekeeping practices along commitment order and segregation of inmates. The results in the table show that these particular practices are very well implemented in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology this was proven by the means of 4.46 and 5.00 for Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel and inmates respectively. Except for the fourth indicator where the inmate security is classified into high risk inmates, high profile inmates and ordinary inmates with average weighted values that fall within the range 3.41 – 4.20, described as well implemented. The Bureau of Jail Management and Penology officers follow strictly the courts and other entities authorized to commit a person to jail such as: supreme court, court of appeal, sandiganbayan, regional trial court, metropolitan/municipal trial court, municipal circuit court. This means that there is a strict adherence to the provisions of the law in terms of commitment order and segregation of prisoners that happen in the jails of today. Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel strictly follow and implement what is stipulated in the law.

According to the United Nations' general provisions on the treatment of offenders, which were released in 2011, inmates of various

categories must be housed in separate facilities or parts of institutions based on their sex, age, criminal record, legal justification for incarceration, and treatment needs. As a result, male and female inmates shall be detained in different institutions to the extent practicable in an institution that receives both male and female, the whole area designated for female inmates shall be wholly separate. While many jails allow female officers to monitor male convicts, only a small number allow male officers to supervise female inmates.

This finding was also confirmed by Johnson (2014), who stated that the issuance of orders for officer segregation is prioritized in order to ensure the protection of prisoners' lives.

Table 10 The implementation of the safekeeping practices of inmates in terms of reception procedures, disciplinary boards and punishable acts of inmates is presented in Table 10. The data in the table show the ratings of the inmates with average weighted values that fall within the range 4.21–5.00, described as very well implemented. On the other hand, the ratings of the BJMP personnel range from 3.41 – 4.20 described as well implemented. The means of 4.16 and 4.78 were described as well implemented and very well implemented respectively. It is also show in this table that the reception procedure, the jail desk officer carefully check and examine the credential of the

personal bringing the inmate to determine his/her identity and authority such as: warrant of arrest issued by the court, commitment order, cash and other personal property of inmates where keep by officers issued by the corresponding receipt duly signed by him/her countersigned by the inmate fall within the range 4.98 described as very well implemented.

This means that reception procedures were well on place from the jail desk officer's careful checking to the finger prints and photography, down to medical examinations. Upon completion of the reception procedures, further, there were orientations made by the jail officers be-

fore confinement and proper recording of assignments to cells with corresponding sleeping and living materials and the inmate's or detainees, he/she shall be appraised, preferably in the dialect which he/she understands in consonance with the R.A. 6125. The detainee was issued all the materials that he/she will be using during his/her confinement.

During hearings of disciplinary cases, the proper procedures were strictly followed by the jail officers and finally inmates are prohibited from committing minor offenses, less grave offenses and grave offenses (Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015).

Table 10. Implementation of Safekeeping Practices Terms of Reception Procedures, and Disciplinary Board and Punishable Acts of Inmates

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. In reception procedure, the jail desk officer carefully checks and examine the credential of the personal bringing the inmate to determine his/her identity and authority such as: warrant of arrest issued by the court, commitment order from the court/mitimus, cash and other personal property of inmates where keep by officers issued by the corresponding receipt duly signed by him/her countersigned by the inmate.	4.36	VWI	4.98	VWI
2. The inmate is then fingerprinted and photographed and accomplishes a jail booking report, attaching there the inmate's photograph for reference.	4.35	VWI	4.90	VWI
3. Conduct of medical examination (pregnancy test if female) and preparation of inmate's medical record.	4.70	VWI	4.74	VWI
4. Upon commitments the inmates are briefly oriented, provided with jail clothing properly received, cleaned and stored safely until his/her release.	4.02	WI	4.90	VWI
5. The warden establishes and maintains a record of all inmates.	4.32	VWI	4.90	VWI
6. Upon completion of the reception procedures, the detainee is assigned to his/her confinement, if such materials are available.	3.91	WI	4.84	VWI
7. The detainee was issued all the materials that he/she will be using during his/her confinement.	3.62	WI	3.94	WI
8. Upon receipt of a detainee, he/she was appraised, preferably in the dialect which he/she understands in consonance with the RA 6125.	3.59	WI	4.84	VWI
9. The procedures in the hearing of disciplinary cases are strictly implemented.	4.48	VWI	4.86	VWI
10. Inmates are strictly prohibited from committing any minor offenses, less grave offenses and grave offenses.	4.62	VWI	4.90	VWI
Mean	4.16	WI	4.78	VWI

Table 11. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Treatment of Inmates with Special Needs

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. Inmates with special needs was separated from other regular inmates.	3.74	WI	4.90	VWI
2. Observation of guidelines in the handling inmates with special needs such as female inmates, drug users, alcoholics, mentally-ill, sex deviates, suicidal inmates, handicapped, aged, infirmed and non-Philippine citizen inmates.	3.60	WI	4.90	VWI
Mean	3.67	WI	4.90	VWI

Shown in Table 11 are the data on the implementation of safekeeping practices in terms of treatment of inmates with special needs. The result on the table shows that according to the BJMP personnel, such were well implemented while the inmates said these were very well implemented. The result indicates that proper treatments of inmates were generally well implemented. Inmates with special needs like female inmates whose needs are more intense than males. Those with mental illness are also treated accordingly including those with high levels of suicidal tendencies. Further the BJMP

also considered age, handicaps and inmates who are sex deviates.

This result was corroborated by Aranjuez (2017)'s research. She claims that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology takes special care of detainees with unique requests or needs, and that they are not mixed in with regular or ordinary inmates. It's worth noting that there are specific considerations even in jails. In jails, unique needs, particularly those of women detainees, are prioritized and addressed.

Table 12. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Term of Custody, Security and Control Emergency Plans, Movement and Transfer of Prisoners and Detainees

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. Conducts regular briefing for every shift, especially before any member of the custodial force assumes his/her duty and before the escort personnel leave with inmates for court hearing and other authorized/lawful destination.	4.06	WI	4.98	VWI
2. Maintains strict control of firearms, bladed weapons, and other potentially dangerous weapons.	3.82	WI	5.00	VWI
3. Censorship of incoming and outgoing mails for inmates.	4.20	WI	4.96	VWI
4. Conduct regular inmates count, at least four (4) times within 24 hours period, frequent surprise searches of inmates and their quarters to detect contraband, frequent inspection of security facilities to detect tampering or defects.	4.56	VWI	4.98	VWI
5. Secure firearms and anti-riot equipment in the armory and supervise the proper use of tools and other potentially dangerous articles such as bottles and other kitchen utensils and keep them out of any inmates reach when not in use.	4.28	VWI	4.96	VWI
6. Develop plans dealing with emergencies like escapes, fires, assaults and riots and make these plans known and understood by jail personnel.	4.18	WI	4.88	VWI
7. Never allow a jail officer to render successive shifts of duty except in cases of emergencies, open the inmates' quarters alone.	3.97	WI	4.76	VWI

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
8. Designate a gate supervisor for every shift who will be made administratively responsible and accountable for the daily activities at the entrance gate of jail.	4.42	VWI	4.58	VWI
9. Security in serving the food inside the cells/quarters is strictly observed.	4.13	WI	4.88	VWI
10. Observance of separate dining or mess halls.	3.68	WI	4.48	VWI
Mean	4.23	VWI	4.98	VWI

Table 12 shows the extent of implementation of custody, security and control, movement and transfer of prisoners. The result on the table shows the weighted means of 4.23 and 4.98 for Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel and inmates respectively. It is also show in the Table 13 that one of the indicators', maintains strict control of firearms, bladed weapons, and other potentially dangerous weapons with the perfect mean score of 5.00 were described as very well implemented. This goes to show that security inside the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology is being secured by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel, from briefing prior to assumption of duty to maintaining strict control of firearms, bladed weapons and other potentially deadly weapons to censorship of incoming and outgoing mails for inmates.

In addition, security procedures include conducting a headcount, securing firearms and other anti-riot equipment in the armory, and

establishing emergency plans in the event of convict escape. The entire jail complex was secured, and the jail guards were not allowed to work a continuous shift. The Bureau of Facility Management and Penology prioritized security, and it is hoped that everyone will be safe while inside the jail (Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015).

According to the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and the convicts, security and safety in jail were properly adopted and very well done. Because the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel and the inmates were formerly one in their ratings, their ratings were regarded concrete and factual. These respondents are in the best position to know how the claimed safeguarding methods are actually implemented (Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015).

Table 13. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the BJMP in Terms of Rights, Privileges and Miscellaneous Provision

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. The right to be treated as a human being, and not to be subject to corporal punishment.	3.95	WI	4.98	VWI
2. The right to be informed of the regulations governing the detention center.	4.11	WI	4.96	VWI
3. The right to adequate food, space and ventilation, rest and recreation.	3.90	WI	4.90	VWI
4. The right to avail of medical, dental, religious belief and the right to vote unless disqualified by law.	4.04	WI	4.94	VWI
5. The inmates may enjoy the privileges allowed by the jail officer like receive books, letters, magazines, newspaper and to receive fruits and prepared food, subject to inspection and approval by the officials and receive visitor during visiting hours.	4.58	WI	4.96	VWI

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
6. To be entitled to good conduct time allowance as provided by the law.	4.08	WI	4.96	VWI
7. Mode and guidelines shall be observed when inmates are to be released from detention/jail.	4.47	VWI	4.98	VWI
Mean	4.20	WI	4.95	VWI

Presented in Table 13 are the data on the implementation of safekeeping practices in terms of rights, privileges and miscellaneous provisions. As shown on the table, the mode and guidelines observed during release of inmates from detention was rated by both respondents as very well implemented with average weighted values of 4.47 and 4.98 by BJMP personnel and inmates respectively.

On the other hand, rights of inmates to be treated as human beings was rated by the BJMP personnel as well implemented while the inmates have higher ratings on the said items with the mean of 4.98 meaning this item was "very well implemented". The right to be informed of the regulations governing the detention center was rated "well implemented" by the BJMP personnel while the inmates said the item was "very well implemented". The right to adequate food, space and ventilation, right to avail of medical, dental, religious belief and right to vote unless disqualified by law were rated by the BJMP personnel as well

implemented while the inmates said in this item was "very well implemented". The inmates may enjoy the privileges allowed by the jail officer like receive books, letters, magazines, newspaper and to receive fruits and prepared food, subject to inspection and approval by the officials and receive visitor during visiting hours was rated also by the BJMP personnel as well implemented while the inmates said in this item was "very well implemented". The mean of 4.20 and 4.95 proved the contention.

The Bureau of Jail Management and Penology evaluated convicts' rights to proper care, privileges, and other miscellaneous provisions as effectively executed, while inmates claimed it was "very well implemented." This merits recognition, as the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology workers are performing admirably. They were able to maintain human rights and benefits in a normal manner despite unusual circumstances (Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners).

Table 14. Safekeeping Practices of Inmates Implemented by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology in Terms of Inmates Welfare and Development Functions

Items	BJMP		INMATES	
	Mean	D	Mean	D
1. Health service activities.	4.04	WI	4.92	VWI
2. Livelihood service activities	4.24	WI	4.88	VWI
3. Educational service activities	4.14	WI	4.86	VWI
4. Sports and recreational services activities	4.17	WI	4.80	VWI
5. Visitation services activities	4.18	WI	4.86	VWI
6. Religious service activities	4.25	VWI	4.74	VWI
Mean	4.17	WI	4.84	VWI

Table 14 presents the data on the implementation of inmates' welfare and development functions. This is a set of Health service activities, like Livelihood service activities, Educational service activities, Sports and

recreational services activities, Visitation services activities, and Religious service activities. The result on the table shows that health services, livelihood services, educational services, sports and recreational services and visitation

services were said to be well implemented according to the BJMP personnel while the inmates said that these services were very well implemented. The said appraisals were concretized by the average weighted values that fall within the range 3.41 – 4.20 by the BJMP personnel and 4.21 – 5.00 for the inmates. On the other hand, religious services were very well implemented according to the two groups of respondents. This was proven by the average weighted values of 4.25 by the BJMP personnel and 4.84 by the inmates.

The means of 4.17 and 4.84 were said to be well implemented and very well implemented according to the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and inmates respectively. This could mean that inmates welfare provisions are very well attended in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. This further implies that these provisions are given due attention by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel, giving the best services to the inmates despite the fact that they are criminals. Table 15 presents the level of implementation of the safekeeping practices in terms of inmate's welfare and development. The data

on the table show that inmates; welfare and development functions were well implemented according to the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel while the inmates said that these were very well implemented. The contentions were concretized by the average weighted values that range from 3.41 to 4.20 while the inmates' ratings fall within the range 4.21 – 5.00.

This means that the inmates' welfare which include providing health and medical services, educational services, recreational services, visitation and religious services were well implemented and very well implemented according to the two groups of respondents respectively.

The outcome was confirmed by Aranjuez (2017), who stated that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology workers look after the detainees' wellbeing regardless of whether they are convicted criminals or mere law-breakers. The workers of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology continue to regard the detainees' human rights and do not want these rights to be taken away just because of the horrible conditions in which they are held.

Table 15. Test of Relationship Between Safekeeping Practices and the extend of Implementation of safekeeping practices

	Mean	StDev	r	t	P
Practices	4.126	0.264	0.35	4.77	0.000
Implementation	4.883	0.117			

Table 15 presents the test of relationship between the safekeeping practices and their extent of implementation. The data in the table show a computed r-value of 0.35 which is interpreted as low correlation. When the r-result was subjected to t-test, the resulting value was 4.77 which exceeded the critical value of 2.01 at 0.05 level of significance. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

There is therefore a significant relationship between safekeeping practices and their level of implementation. This means that the more often a particular safekeeping practice is done the more it is believed to be strictly

implemented by the implementers. The extent of implementation is then understood to be dependent on how often a particular practice is being done. Thus, when the safekeeping practices are much practiced, the more it is believed to be implemented. On the other hand, when a particular practice is less practiced, the less it is believed to be implemented.

In his study "Comparative study on Crime and Society," Winslow (2007) backed up this result. The study discovered that behaviors that are clearly visible in the jail's facilities are signs of implementation.

Table 16. Test of Difference Between Safekeeping Practices along Commitment Order

Respondents	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	p
BJMP	4.462	0.205	0.092	-1.54	0.185
INMATE	4.800	0.447	0.20		

Table 16 shows the test of difference between the BJMP and inmates' ratings on the implementation of safekeeping practices along commitment order. Along this line, the computed t-value was 1.54 with a p-value of 0.185 which leads to the non-rejection of the null hypothesis. It is then safe to say that there is no significant difference between the ratings of the BJMP personnel and the inmates on the extent of implementation of safekeeping practices in terms of commitment order.

This further leads to the idea that the level of implementation as perceived by both respondents remains to be as it is and that their ratings prove the sincerity of their appraisal as to the implementation of commitment order.

The result on the t-test leads to an understanding that BJMP personnel and inmates had a similar rating because that is what is generally existing. The level of implementation of the safekeeping practice is the level in which they believe such implementation was done.

This result was consistent with Grieve's research et al (2010) noted that the inmates' subservience to the Police Warden and in-charge was required so that they would be treated nicely and that they would always follow the Police Warden's directives. The detainees took great care not to irritate their guards. The reason why the inmates within strictly adhere to the rules.

Table 17. Test of Difference Between the BJMP and Inmates Ratings on the Implementation of the Safekeeping Practices Along Reception procedures, and Disciplinary Boards and Punishable Acts of Inmates

	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	P
BJMP	4.197	0.393	0.12	3.72	0.000
INMATE	4.780	0.302	0.095		

Table 17 presents the test of difference on the ratings between the BJMP and the inmates in terms of the implementation of safekeeping practices along reception procedures, and disciplinary boards and punishable acts of inmates. Along this line, the computed value was 3.72 which is greater than the critical value of 2.01 at 0.05 level of significances. This calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is therefore a significant difference between the BJMP and inmates' ratings on the said indicator for implementation.

This indicates that the BJMP and the convicts' ratings were not on the same level. The convicts scored extremely well on the indicator, but the BJMP employees scored poorly.

This indicates that the convicts hold the implementation of the safekeeping practices in high regard. This suggests that when detainees do penal acts, BJMP employees have actually implemented processes and imposed discipline. They use disciplinary procedures to admonish or generally discipline inmates so that undesired behaviour is minimized. In order for the convicts in jail to rigorously obey it when they are grouped.

This finding was corroborated by Grieve et al (2005) who revealed that any time, the inmates wanted to please their police officers and they observed what they imposed in order that they will be treated properly.

Table 18. Test of Difference Between the BJMP and Inmates Ratings on the Implementation of the Safekeeping Practices Along Treatment of Inmates with Special Needs

	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	P
BJMP	3.6700	0.0700	0.040	22.84	0.000
INMATE	4.8667	0.0577	0.033		

Table 18 shows the test of difference on the BJMP and inmates' ratings on the implementation of the safekeeping practices along treatment of inmates with special needs. The data on the table showed that the computed t-value was 22.84 which is greater than the critical value of 2.01 at 0.05 level of significance. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. It is then safe to say that there is a significant difference between the BJMP and the inmates' ratings on the implementation of safekeeping practices along treatment of inmates with special needs.

This means that the inmates and BJMPs ratings do not meet at a common point. As one examines and takes a closer look at the table, the BJMPs ratings were less than the inmates' ratings. While the BJMP personnel believed that the practices were well implemented, the inmates said these were very well implemented. Along this line, one could see that both groups of respondents have very high regard on the implementation however, the difference on

their ratings warrant significant difference, thus, such difference calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant difference calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant difference.

The study of Aranjuez (2017) corroborated the result, she found out that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology takes special care of detainees with unique demands or who have special needs, and does not mix them with typical or normal inmates. It's worth noting that there are specific considerations even in jails. In jails, unique needs, particularly those of women detainees, are prioritized and addressed. She also stated that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology workers are responsible for the detainees' wellbeing, regardless of whether they are convicted criminals or ordinary lawbreakers. The BJMP personnel continue to regard the detainees' human rights and do not want these rights to be taken away just because of the horrible conditions in which they are held.

Table 19. Test of Difference between the BJMP and Inmates Ratings on the Implementation of the Safekeeping Practices Along Custody, Security and Control Emergency Plans, Movement and Transfer of Prisoners and Detainees

	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	P
BJMP	4.130	0.264	0.084	4.56	0.000
INMATE	4.846	0.183	0.058		

Shown in Table 19 is the test of difference on the ratings between the BJMP and the inmates on the implementation of safekeeping practices along custody, security and control, emergency plans, movement and transfer of prisoners and detainees. The practices, thus, they gave very high ratings compared to the ratings of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology personnel because of their very high level of satisfaction on its implementation.

The findings were supported by the US Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections, which stated that emergency planning is critical for all correctional institutions. Inmate violence on a large scale or a natural calamity can endanger the lives of both personnel and inmates. A catastrophic disaster can cost tens of millions of dollars and result in years of litigation in a matter of hours. The negative press that surrounds a significant institutional disaster can be exhausting and seemingly endless.

Table 20. Test of Difference Between the BJMP and Inmates Ratings on the Implementation of the Safekeeping Practices Along Rights, Privileges and Miscellaneous Provisions

	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	P
BJMP	4.161	0.261	0.098	-8.00	0.000
INMATE	5.000	0.0276	0.010		

Shown in Table 20 are the results on the test of difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology or BJMP and the inmates' ratings on the level of implementation of the safekeeping practices along rights, privileges and other miscellaneous provisions. In this table, the computed t-value was -8.00 which exceeded the critical vale of 2.01 at 0.05 level of significance. This calls for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

It is then safe to say that there is a significant difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and the inmates' ratings on this particular safekeeping procedure. The source of the difference is the difference on the mean ratings of the satisfaction. Their experiences gave them the idea that this particular safekeeping practices were very evidently

implemented by the BJMP Penology personnel. It is noteworthy to mention that the inmate's ratings are all consistent to the view that their actions mere intended to please their police officers.

The result was parallel by study of Palompon (2013) who found that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology is trying its best to provide a decent life for convicts, despite the fact that some of them are convicted criminals and others are involved in ongoing litigation. In jail, there is a distinct sense of human fellowship. As a result, even while in prison, offenders obtain the essential rehabilitation to improve their chances of leading a normal life. In this level, one can better understand that life is more meaningful and worthwhile when one is present and assisting others.

Table 21. Test of Difference Between the BJMP and Inmates Ratings on the Implementation of the Safekeeping Practices Along Inmates Welfare and Development Functions

	Mean	StDev	SE Mean	t	P
BJMP	4.1700	0.0764	0.031	-16.57	0.000
INMATE	4.8433	0.0638	0.026		

Presented in Table 21 are the data on the test of difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and the inmates as to the extent of implementation of safekeeping practices along inmates' welfare and development functions. The result on the table showed a computed t-value of 16.57 which is greater than the critical value of 2.01 at 0.05 level of significance. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

This means that there is a significant difference between the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and the inmates' ratings on the said safekeeping practices. This means that the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and the inmates differ on their ratings because the inmates gave a very high rating while the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology's ratings was quite lower than that of the important aspect in the rehabilitation and reformation while inside the detention or jail because along with the program it can help the inmates develop the personality and well-being in preparation to return to the fold of the community.

This finding was confirmed by Amendola et. al (2012) in their study entitle "A Model Crime Assessment," who revealed that the rapid growth of inmate's population has reduced the jails capability to provide them with standard facilities. Therefore, making the inmates life inside the jail bearable.

The study of Breach's (2010) also corroborated the result. He said that many people believe that allowing inmates to be visited by their family, particularly their spouses and children, will help them maintain a positive attitude on life.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher hereby concludes that both male and female can commit index and non-index crimes. The Safekeeping is evident in jail among inmates as practiced by the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. The level of implementation of the safekeeping practices is very high and the level of implementation of

safekeeping is believed to be a product of the frequency of the practices of safekeeping.

Recommendation

Implementation of safekeeping practices be continued and sustained in the two jails of the Province of Zamboanga Sibugay

References

Amendola et al (2012). A Model Crime Assessment. A published Master Thesis Cebu Normal University.

Aranjuez N. (2017) Level of Implementation of Dapitan City Jail Pre-Release Programs. JRMSU Graduate Thesis

Banay, R.S., (2015). Immaturity and Crime, American Journal of Psychiatry.

Bestre, S. C. (2016). Handbook on institutional correction. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Baguio, Philippines

Breach J. M., (2010). Introduction Globalization and Traditional Criminology. New York.

Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Comprehensive Operations Manual revised on 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.bjmp.gov.ph/images/files/Downloads/BJMP OPERATIONAL MANUAL 2015.pdf>

Cruzat M. et al (2015) Classification of Inmates in Batangas Provincial Jail, Philippines. Journal of Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities

Fox, R.J., (2008). The Influence of Personality on Social Non-Conformity, Journal of Criminology and Political Science.

Grieve, et al., (2010) Critical Incident: Investigation Management and Training (A Handbook)

Johnson, L. (2014). Prison Ministry. Journal of Criminology and Justice. Vol. 8.

Kutash, S.B., (2009). Encyclopedia of Criminology, New York.

Lindner, R.M., (2007). Handbook of Correctional Psychology, New York.

Ludek, L. (2016). Theoretical Sources for a Theory of Safety and Security. *SECURWARE: The Tenth International Conference on Emerging Security Information, Systems and Technologies*. Retrieved on April 14, 2021 from https://www.think-mind.org/articles/secur-ware_2016_8_20_30071.pdf

Morales, D.T., (2009). Penal Institution of the Philippines in the 21st Century, Wiseman Book Trading, Copyright 2009

Palompon et.al (2013). Youth Risks and Crimes. Unpublished Master's Thesis Cebu normal University.

Republic Act no. 6975. Retrieved from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1990/12/13/republic-act-no-6975/>

Robert, M. L., (2007). Handbook of Correctional Psychology, New York.

Seliger, R. V., (2007). Encyclopedia of Correctional Psychology, New York.

Shacfer, R., (2015). Sociology MacGraw Hill Publishing Inc. New York

Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.pdf

Torralba, A. D., (2014). Penal Institution in the Philippines: A Comparative Study, Wiseman Book Trading, Copyright 2014.

Trillana et. al., (2007). BJMP Manual Revise of 2007 book II. chapter 1

US Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections (2009) Retrieved from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/correctional-populations-united-states-2009>

Weels, V. M., (2014). The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis in Corrections, The Quarter play Journal of the Florida Arcade of Sciences

Wislow B., (2007). Comparative Study of Crime and Society. Published Thesis of the University of the Baguio. Baguio City