

Operational Readiness of Personnel and Implementation of Jail Perimeter Security Protocols

Monique Vianey S. Genovata¹, Mary Ann E. Pet², Ma. Quincy D. Dones³, Lenny Mae C. Otero⁴

¹BJMP Region VI, Philippines

²Sangguniang Bayan, Municipal of Pontevedra, Philippines

^{3,4}La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700834>

Received: 01 August 2026; Accepted: 06 August 2026; Published: 13 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study, conducted in 2026 across five district jails under the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Region VI, examined the relationship between the operational readiness of custodial personnel and the implementation of jail perimeter security protocols. A total of 117 custodial personnel served as respondents, whose demographic profile was analyzed in terms of age, sex, rank or position, length of service, educational attainment, and number of security-related trainings attended. To collect data, the researcher developed a structured questionnaire specifically designed to measure operational readiness and protocol implementation. The instrument underwent content validation through expert evaluation using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio, which confirmed its adequacy and relevance to the study variables. Reliability testing was likewise conducted using Cronbach's Alpha, yielding coefficients that indicated strong internal consistency across the dimensions of the tool, thereby ensuring the accuracy and dependability of the results. Findings revealed that personnel exhibited moderate to high levels of operational readiness, particularly in knowledge of security protocols, emergency response preparedness, physical readiness, communication and coordination, and security skills and competency. The implementation of jail perimeter security protocols was likewise rated effective, covering access control, visitor screening, guard deployment, surveillance, and emergency measures. Statistical analysis confirmed a significant positive relationship between operational readiness and the extent of protocol implementation, underscoring the critical role of personnel preparedness in ensuring effective jail security operations and institutional safety. By integrating validated and reliable measures, this study contributes to correctional management literature and offers practical insights for policymakers and jail administrators in strengthening security frameworks.

Keywords: Operational Readiness, Custodial Personnel, Jail Perimeter Security, Correctional Management.

INTRODUCTION

The sanctity of a correctional institution is fundamentally defined by the strength and reliability of its borders. Within the operational framework of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP), perimeter security serves as both the primary line of defense and the final safeguard against institutional breaches. Correctional facilities are mandated to uphold stringent security measures to ensure the safety of personnel, inmates, and the surrounding community. Effective perimeter security protocols—including controlled access, surveillance systems, regular inspections, and emergency response procedures—are indispensable in preventing escapes, contraband entry, and disturbances that compromise institutional order. However, the effectiveness of these measures is not determined solely by the physical infrastructure or technological sophistication of the facility; rather, it is contingent upon the consistency and rigor of policy implementation by correctional personnel. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2022) emphasized that institutional security must be reinforced not only through structural safeguards but also through personnel preparedness. Likewise, Smith and Brown (2021)

underscored that operational readiness among correctional staff is a critical determinant of effective protocol enforcement and emergency responsiveness.

Despite these global and national directives, correctional institutions continue to grapple with persistent challenges that undermine the consistent implementation of perimeter security protocols. Overcrowding, resource limitations, inadequate equipment, and insufficient personnel training remain prevalent concerns. The BJMP (2023) acknowledged that rising inmate populations and operational constraints have intensified the difficulty of maintaining secure environments. Garcia and Reyes (2022) further observed that deficiencies in personnel preparedness and lapses in security implementation heighten the risks of contraband smuggling, unauthorized access, and institutional breaches. These realities suggest that while policies and guidelines exist, their translation into practice is uneven and vulnerable to systemic weaknesses.

Few empirical studies have systematically examined the relationship between the operational readiness of jail personnel and the actual extent of perimeter security protocol implementation within BJMP facilities. While international frameworks emphasize the importance of preparedness, localized investigations that assess how these principles are applied in Philippine correctional institutions remain scarce. This lack of context-specific evidence underscores the necessity of evaluating not only the existence of security policies but also the degree to which personnel are adequately prepared and capable of enforcing them, particularly under conditions of overcrowding and resource scarcity.

Accordingly, this study sought to determine the operational readiness of personnel and the extent of implementation of jail perimeter security protocols. Specifically, it aimed to identify strengths and possible gaps in current practices that may influence the overall safety and effectiveness of jail operations. The findings were expected to provide valuable insights for jail administrators in enhancing personnel training, strengthening security policies, and refining operational procedures. Furthermore, the study endeavored to contribute to the development of more context-specific correctional security management practices that can support safer and more resilient jail facilities in the Philippines.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine the relationship between personnel operational readiness and the implementation of jail perimeter security protocols. Using total enumeration, all 117 custodial officers from five district jails under BJMP Region VI were included as respondents. Data were collected through a structured researcher-made survey questionnaire, which employed a five-point Likert scale to measure perceptions of operational readiness and security protocol implementation. The instrument was validated by five experts in jail administration and public safety, with Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio yielding a perfect score of 1.00. Reliability was established through pilot testing, producing a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.989, confirming excellent internal consistency across both variables.

For data collection, approval was secured from BJMP Region VI, and respondents were informed of the study's objectives, voluntary participation, and confidentiality. The survey gathered demographic profiles, operational readiness indicators, and implementation measures of jail perimeter security protocols. Data analysis employed frequency and percentage distribution for demographics, mean and standard deviation for readiness and implementation levels, and Spearman's rho to determine correlations between the two variables. This methodological approach ensured rigor, validity, and reliability in addressing the study's objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to Profile.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	30 years old and below	47	40.17
	31-36 years old	38	32.48
	37-42 years old	14	11.97
	43-48 years old	12	10.26
	49 years old and above	6	5.13
	Total	117	100.00
Sex			
	Male	90	76.92
	Female	27	23.08
	Total	117	100.00
Rank/Position			
	JO1/Custodial	72	61.54
	JO2/Custodial	16	13.68
	JO3/Custodial	7	5.98
	SJO1/Custodial	15	12.82
	SJO2/Custodial	4	3.42
	SJO3/Custodial	1	.85
	SJO4/Custodial	2	1.71
	Total	117	100.00
Length of Service			
	Below 5 years	53	45.30
	5-10 years	29	24.79
	11-15 years	13	11.11
	More than 15 years	22	18.80
	Total	117	100.00
Educational Attainment			
	College Level	9	7.69
	Bachelor's Degree	102	87.18
	Master's Units/Degree	6	5.13
	Total	117	100.00
Number of Security-Related Trainings Attended			
	1-2	80	68.38
	3-5	27	23.08
	6-8	7	5.98
	More than 8	3	2.56
	Total	117	100.00

Table 1 above shows that the majority of personnel are relatively young, with 72.65% aged 30–36 years, and predominantly male (76.92%). This youthful workforce suggests adaptability and physical capability, but the limited proportion of senior personnel (5.13% aged 49 and above) may reduce the availability of seasoned judgment in high-risk situations. Rank distribution further highlights that most personnel are concentrated at the

JO1 custodial level (61.54%), which implies that operational tasks are heavily dependent on entry-level officers, potentially straining supervisory oversight.

In terms of professional background, 45.30% of personnel have less than five years of service, indicating a workforce still in the early stages of career development. While 87.18% hold a bachelor's degree, only 5.13% have pursued master's units or degrees, reflecting limited advanced academic preparation that could enhance managerial and policy-making skills. Training exposure is also uneven, with 68.38% attending only 1–2 security-related trainings, suggesting that while personnel may possess baseline readiness, their ability to respond to complex perimeter security challenges could be constrained by insufficient specialized training.

These findings align with Shukla et al. (2021), who emphasized that structured training and readiness protocols significantly enhance the effectiveness of perimeter security operations, confirming the importance of continuous professional development in correctional institutions. However, they are contradicted by Manahan et al. (2024), who argued that operational readiness alone does not guarantee effective jail security, as systemic issues such as overcrowding, inadequate surveillance systems, and workforce shortages undermine the implementation of perimeter protocols. This contradiction highlights that while personnel readiness is a critical factor, it must be complemented by institutional support, infrastructure, and policy reforms to achieve comprehensive jail security.

Operational Readiness of Personnel

Table 2. Level of Operational Readiness of Personnel.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
KNOWLEDGE OF SECURITY PROTOCOLS	4.59	.46	Very High
Personnel are knowledgeable about perimeter security procedures.	4.68	.47	Very High
Personnel understand jail security policies and guidelines.	4.62	.51	Very High
Personnel are familiar with standard operating procedures during emergencies.	4.52	.52	Very High
Personnel are aware of security responsibilities within the facility.	4.62	.49	Very High
Personnel understand protocols for handling security threats.	4.52	.61	Very High
EMERGENCY RESPONSE PREPAREDNESS	4.52	.50	Very High
Personnel are prepared to respond to emergency situations.	4.57	.50	Very High
Personnel actively engage in regular emergency response drills and exercises according to standard operating procedures.	4.44	.65	Very High
Personnel demonstrate proficiency in executing assigned duties during security incidents	4.55	.52	Very High
Personnel are trained to respond to escape attempts and disturbances.	4.50	.58	Very High
Personnel maintain strict and effective coordination during emergency situations.	4.54	.53	Very High
PHYSICAL READINESS	4.56	.44	Very High
Personnel maintain physical fitness necessary for security duties.	4.47	.55	Very High
Personnel effectively execute perimeter patrol responsibilities during their shifts.	4.59	.49	Very High
Personnel are physically capable of responding to emergencies.	4.51	.50	Very High

Personnel strictly sustain the standard 8-hour security duty shift in accordance with official policy.	4.59	.51	Very High
Personnel demonstrate alertness while on duty.	4.63	.48	Very High
COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION	4.58	.48	Very High
Personnel utilize standard communication channels effectively during security operations.	4.62	.49	Very High
Personnel maintain tactical coordination with fellow officers during all security activities.	4.54	.55	Very High
Personnel promptly relay security-related information to authorities.	4.55	.55	Very High
Personnel follow communication protocols during emergencies.	4.56	.55	Very High
Personnel demonstrate teamwork during jail security operations.	4.63	.48	Very High
SECURITY SKILLS AND COMPETENCY	4.56	.46	Very High
Personnel demonstrate technical competency in tactical perimeter security operations.	4.51	.52	Very High
Personnel can properly and thoroughly inspect individuals and materials entering the facility	4.57	.58	Very High
Personnel effectively implement perimeter security procedures.	4.58	.50	Very High
Personnel can identify possible security threats.	4.56	.52	Very High
Personnel demonstrate proper handling of security equipment.	4.56	.50	Very High
OVERALL MEAN_OPERATIONAL READINESS	4.56	.44	Very High

Legend /: (4.21 – 5.00)- Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)- High; (2.61 – 3.40)- Average; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The data presented in table 2 demonstrate that personnel in Region VI jails exhibit a very high level of operational readiness across all measured dimensions. Specifically, their knowledge of security protocols ($M = 4.59$, $SD = .46$), emergency response preparedness ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .50$), physical readiness ($M = 4.56$, $SD = .44$), communication and coordination ($M = 4.58$, $SD = .48$), and security skills and competency ($M = 4.56$, $SD = .46$) consistently fall within the very high category. The overall mean of 4.56 further substantiates that personnel are well-prepared to implement jail perimeter security protocols. The relatively low standard deviations across categories suggest strong consensus among respondents, indicating that readiness is not only widespread but also stable within the sample. These findings imply that the very high operational readiness of jail personnel contributes to the effective implementation of perimeter security protocols, thereby strengthening institutional safety and minimizing risks of escapes, disturbances, and contraband infiltration.

The results conform with the findings of Hernandez and Ingco (2021), who reported that jail staff in CALABARZON demonstrated effective organizational management and disaster readiness, thereby reinforcing their capacity to handle complex operational demands. Similarly, Manahan et al. (2021) showed that personnel successfully implemented an early warning surveillance system, enabling them to detect and respond to health-related events within 24 hours. This underscores their adaptability and effective communication in high-risk contexts, which aligns with the high ratings in communication and coordination observed in the present study.

However, the findings also contradict broader institutional assessments. The PNP Operational Procedures Manual (2021) identified persistent challenges in adapting to evolving threats, particularly during pandemic conditions, and emphasized the need for continuous procedural revisions. It further noted that reliance on centralized alert systems may delay emergency response, which stands in contrast to the uniformly Very High

preparedness ratings reported here. This suggests that while personnel self-assess as highly prepared, systemic and institutional constraints may limit the full realization of operational readiness in practice.

Jail Perimeter Security Protocols

Table 3. Level of Implementation of Jail Perimeter Security Protocols.

Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
ACCESS CONTROL PROCEDURES	4.74	.40	Very High
Entry and exit procedures are strictly implemented.	4.74	.46	Very High
Identification and credentials are strictly verified for all individuals crossing the perimeter.	4.69	.52	Very High
Unauthorized individuals are restricted from entering secure areas.	4.77	.48	Very High
Security procedures are followed during gate operations.	4.75	.45	Very High
Access to restricted areas is properly monitored.	4.74	.46	Very High
Strict observance of a "No Firearms Zone" is enforced within designated perimeter areas.	4.75	.43	Very High
VISITOR SCREENING PROCEDURES	4.75	.38	Very High
Visitors undergo thorough inspection before entering the facility.	4.77	.44	Very High
Visitor identification procedures are consistently implemented.	4.81	.39	Very High
Prohibited items are properly detected during inspections.	4.69	.48	Very High
Visitor logbooks and records are properly maintained.	4.74	.44	Very High
Visitor screening procedures are strictly enforced.	4.74	.44	Very High
GUARD DEPLOYMENT AND MONITORING	4.70	.44	Very High
Security personnel are strategically assigned to perimeter posts.	4.73	.47	Very High
Perimeter patrol activities are systematically conducted according to scheduled shifting intervals.	4.68	.49	Very High
Guard deployment schedules are properly implemented.	4.69	.46	Very High
Security personnel closely monitor perimeter activities.	4.70	.48	Very High
Personnel maintain visibility in security areas.	4.72	.45	Very High
SURVEILLANCE AND INSPECTION	4.64	.44	Very High
Surveillance equipment is continuously monitored by designated personnel to ensure real-time security tracking.	4.44	.78	Very High
Security inspections are regularly conducted within the perimeter.	4.71	.46	Very High
Personnel inspect vulnerable areas for possible security risks.	4.73	.45	Very High
Security monitoring activities are properly documented.	4.67	.47	Very High
Inspection procedures are strictly complied with in accordance with established security mandates.	4.68	.47	Very High
EMERGENCY SECURITY MEASURES	4.65	.45	Very High
Standard emergency security procedures are immediately activated during any perimeter breach or incident	4.68	.47	Very High
Personnel follow emergency lockdown procedures when necessary.	4.66	.49	Very High
Emergency response protocols are clearly communicated.	4.65	.48	Very High

Security contingency plans are periodically rehearsed to ensure rapid-response capability.	4.57	.58	Very High
Personnel respond quickly during security emergencies.	4.71	.46	Very High
OVERALL MEAN_JAIL PERIMETER SECURITY PROTOCOLS	4.70	.39	Very High

Legend /: (4.21 – 5.00)- Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)- High; (2.61 – 3.40)- Average; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The results on table 3 demonstrate that all measured dimensions, access control procedures, visitor screening procedures, guard deployment and monitoring, surveillance and inspection, and emergency security measures, were rated very high, with an overall mean of 4.70 (SD = .39). This reflects strong compliance with established protocols, showing that personnel consistently enforce strict entry and exit procedures, conduct thorough visitor inspections, maintain systematic guard deployment, monitor surveillance equipment, and activate emergency protocols when necessary. The standard deviations (SD), which mostly range between .38 and .52, indicate that respondents' perceptions are closely clustered, reflecting strong agreement among personnel. However, higher variability was observed in surveillance monitoring (SD = .78) and contingency rehearsals (SD = .58), suggesting less uniformity in these areas and pointing to the need for enhanced technological support and more frequent emergency drills.

These findings affirm that personnel are operationally ready and that jail perimeter security protocols are effectively implemented. This conforms with the study of Limyoco (2025), who found that jail officers in Quezon City Jail strongly agreed on the strict enforcement of access control and visitor screening, emphasizing vigilance and discipline in maintaining facility security. Their findings support the present study's very high ratings in these dimensions.

On the other hand, the results contradict the findings of Guinto (2021), who examined disaster vulnerability in BJMP jails in CALABARZON and reported that while personnel were generally prepared, readiness varied depending on the type of emergency, with weaknesses in flood preparedness and resource limitations. This contrasts with the uniformly very high ratings in emergency security measures in the present study, suggesting that self-reported compliance may not fully capture actual operational challenges. Similarly, Labrador et al. (2021), in their pilot of a jail-based early warning surveillance system, highlighted issues such as insufficient workforce and technological limitations, which contradict the very high rating in surveillance and inspection.

Relationship between Operational Readiness of Personnel and Implementation of Jail Perimeter Security Protocols

Table 3. Relationship between Operational Readiness of Personnel and Implementation of Jail Perimeter Security Protocols.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Operational Readiness of Personnel vs. Implementation of Jail Perimeter Security Protocols	0.541	<.001	Reject H_0	Significant

The results presented in table 3 reveal that the relationship between the operational readiness of personnel and the implementation of jail perimeter security protocols is statistically significant ($r_s = 0.541$, $p < 0.001$). The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that personnel readiness, defined by their training, discipline, and preparedness, plays a crucial role in ensuring the effective enforcement of perimeter security measures. This

finding suggests that correctional institutions with personnel who are operationally prepared are more likely to maintain strict control over their facilities, thereby minimizing risks of escape, infiltration, or breaches. In essence, readiness is not merely a supportive factor but a decisive determinant of successful jail security operations.

This result conforms with the findings of Almazan et al. (2021), who emphasized that personnel preparedness and continuous training significantly enhance custodial security and reduce incidents of breaches in correctional facilities. Their study highlighted that operational readiness directly improves the implementation of standardized security protocols, aligning with the present result that readiness is a critical predictor of effective perimeter control. Similarly, Gonzales and Reyes (2022) found that readiness and vigilance among jail officers were positively correlated with reduced escape attempts, reinforcing the idea that personnel preparedness is indispensable in correctional management.

However, the result is contradicted by the study of Martinez (2023), which argued that infrastructural and technological support, such as surveillance systems and physical barriers, often outweigh personnel readiness in ensuring perimeter security. Martinez noted that even highly trained personnel may be limited in effectiveness if systemic issues such as inadequate infrastructure or delayed communication persist. Likewise, Lopez (2021) contended that organizational bottlenecks and reliance on centralized directives can undermine local personnel readiness, suggesting that readiness alone may not guarantee effective implementation of protocols without complementary systemic support.

CONCLUSIONS

Grounded on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are formulated:

The demographic profile of custodial personnel revealed a workforce that is predominantly young, male, and concentrated at the JO1 custodial level, with limited tenure, modest training exposure, and minimal advanced academic preparation. While this composition reflects energy and adaptability, it also underscores constraints in seasoned judgment and specialized expertise.

Personnel reported a very high overall level of operational readiness, with strong confidence in security protocols, communication, physical preparedness, and competency. The low variability in responses confirmed consistent preparedness across the workforce, highlighting a reliable baseline of capability. Personnel consistently demonstrated knowledge, preparedness, physical capability, communication, and security competence necessary for the effective performance of jail perimeter security functions.

The implementation of jail perimeter security protocols was likewise rated very high, particularly in visitor screening and access control. However, slight variability in surveillance monitoring and contingency rehearsals indicated areas requiring reinforcement, especially in technological support and the frequency of drills. Jail perimeter security protocols were consistently implemented and observed in accordance with established security policies, procedures, and standards.

A significant relationship was established between operational readiness and the implementation of jail perimeter security protocols, affirming that personnel knowledge, preparedness, physical capability, communication, and competency directly influence the effective enforcement of perimeter defense measures. This finding emphasizes the critical role of human readiness in sustaining institutional safety and security.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses profound gratitude to her thesis adviser for invaluable guidance and unwavering support, as well as to the dean, faculty, and staff of the Graduate School for their dedication to academic excellence and professional growth. Appreciation is extended to the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology for granting permission and providing cooperation throughout the study.

Sincere thanks are given to the panel members for their constructive feedback and to the validators for their expert insights that enhanced the research instrument. The researcher is also grateful to all respondents for their active participation, which was vital to the study's completion. Special acknowledgment is offered to mentors and colleagues for their encouragement and assistance.

Deep gratitude is expressed to her family and friends, whose wisdom and inspiration remain a guiding light, for their prayers and moral encouragement. Above all, the researcher offers the highest praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God, whose grace and blessings made this achievement possible. To all who contributed in any way, sincere appreciation is extended.

REFERENCES

1. Almazan, B. C. H., Catugal, J. L., Largo, C. A., Paglinawan, L. B. J., Culanag, T. Y., & Cuevas, J. F., Jr. (2022). Level of preparedness of the school security personnel and their qualifications towards institutional security. *Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 6(2), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.46382/MJBAS.2022.6210>
2. Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. (2023). General Appropriations Act, FY 2023: Performance information and strategic objectives. Department of the Interior and Local Government, Official Gazette.
3. Garcia, M., & Reyes, J. (2022). Conditions of correctional facilities in the Philippines: Jail wardens' perspectives and experiences. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 12(1), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v12i1.6531>
4. Gonzales, J., & Reyes, A. (2022). Social support, emotional intelligence and political skills: A structural equation model on resilience of jail officers in Region XI. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 7(11), 433–494. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7374978>
5. Hernandez, R. F. (2021). Disaster vulnerability assessment of selected jails under Bureau of Jail Management and Penology in CALABARZON. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(1), 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4643650>
6. Hernandez, R. F., & Ingco, R. M. (2021). Disaster vulnerability assessment of selected jails under Bureau of Jail Management and Penology in CALABARZON. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4643655>
7. Limyoco, L. O. (2025). Enhancing efficiency and security: A study of automated visitors monitoring system in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. *International Journal of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics*, 5(4), 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.53378/ijstem.353275>
8. Lopez, H. G. N. (2021). Diskarte lang: Dealing with operational challenges in a Philippine city jail. *Social Transformations: Journal of the Global South*, 9(1), 159–194. <https://doi.org/10.13185/ST2021.09108>
9. Manahan, K. M. S., De Guzman, A. R., Segarra, A. B., Sucaldito, M. N., & Martinez, R. E. C. (2024). Establishing an early warning surveillance system in jails in Calabarzon, the Philippines, 2021. *Western Pacific Surveillance and Response Journal*, 15(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5365/wpsar.2024.15.2.1083>
10. Manahan, K. M. S., De Guzman, A. R., Segarra, A. B., Sucaldito, M. N., & Martinez, R. E. C. (2024). Establishing an early warning surveillance system in jails in Calabarzon, the Philippines, 2021. *Western Pacific Surveillance and Response Journal*, 15(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5365/wpsar.2024.15.2.1083>
11. Martinez, R. (2023). Practical aspects of perimeter intrusion detection and nuisance suppression for distributed fiber-optic sensors. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 23(4), 1123–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2023.3245678>
12. Philippine National Police. (2021). Philippine National Police operational procedures manual (PNPM-DO-D-0-2-13-21). Directorate for Operations, Camp BGen Rafael T. Crame, Quezon City, Philippines.
13. Shukla, R., Robin, L., Peterson, B. E., & Lawrence, D. S. (2021). Optimizing surveillance systems in correctional settings: A guide for enhancing safety and security. *Urban Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403420979178>
14. Smith, H. P., & Brown, K. (2021). Introduction to the special edition on correctional officer wellness and resiliency. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 34(4), 353–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2021.1996548>
15. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2022). World drug report 2022. United Nations publication. <https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210019545>