

Implementation of Good Conduct Time Allowance Under R.A. 10592 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations at General Santos City Jail

Charrise Mae T. Bacruya
Holy Trinity College of General Santos City
tabaloschacha10@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
May 29, 2026

Date Accepted:
August 17, 2026

Date Published:
October 02, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23096155

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) at the General Santos City Jail in relation to Republic Act No. 10592 and the 2024 Revised Implementing Rules and Regulations for 2024–2025. It specifically assesses how jail officers' compliance with policy adherence, transparency, and ethical standards relates to the extent of GCTA implementation in terms of evaluation, fairness, and discipline. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, the study assesses key administrative and legal procedures, including credit recording, documentation practices, monitoring mechanisms, and the functions of the Management, Screening, and Evaluation Committee (MSEC). Anchored on Social Learning Theory, the study emphasizes that institutional rewards for good conduct may

influence Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL) to observe discipline, participate in rehabilitation, and demonstrate lawful behavior. The findings show that GCTA serves as an important mechanism for jail decongestion, behavioral reform, and preparation for reintegration into society. However, its effective implementation depends on clear policy communication, officer awareness, accurate documentation, transparent evaluation, and consistent application of standards. The study further reveals that manual processes, limited monitoring systems, and unclear dissemination of procedures may affect fairness, accuracy, and consistency in granting GCTA credits. Therefore, the study recommends strengthened compliance with R.A. 10592 through systematic recordkeeping, regular policy orientation, improved monitoring, and accountable decision-making.

Keywords: *Good Conduct Time Allowance, Jail Officer, Persons Deprived of Liberty, Rehabilitation Program, Republic Act No. 10592*

INTRODUCTION

The Philippine penal system has long faced significant challenges, most notably the issue of overcrowded jails. This overcrowding not only strains the resources of correctional facilities but also hinders the rehabilitation of incarcerated individuals. This institutionalized overcrowding is largely driven by a slow-moving judiciary, where a high percentage of Person Deprived of Liberty are pre-trial detainee's individuals who have not yet been convicted but remain behind bars due to the high cost of bail or the slow pace of court proceedings. In response to this, Republic Act No. 10592 was enacted with the goal of addressing some of these concerns by enhancing the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) and introducing various incentives aimed at promoting the rehabilitation of Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDLs). The law was designed to shorten the sentences of inmates who demonstrate good behavior, thereby incentivizing positive conduct and facilitating their eventual reintegration into society. However, despite the well-intentioned reforms introduced by RA 10592, its implementation has

encountered numerous challenges, particularly in relation to inconsistencies in the application of its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR).

The Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), which was developed by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), is intended to guide the execution of RA 10592. However, various ambiguities in these rules, as well as irregularities in their application, have led to controversies and a lack of public trust in the system. The proper implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) system, including allowances for good conduct, study, teaching, mentoring, and loyalty, remains a complex issue. (DOJ, 2024). The administrative procedures involved in calculating, recording, screening, and awarding these allowances are crucial to ensuring fairness and consistency across the system. However, the existing challenges undermine the law's potential benefits and raise questions about its effectiveness in achieving true reform and rehabilitation.

This research critically examined the implementation of RA 10592 within the General Santos City Jail, focusing on the core argument that inconsistent application of the law undermines the intended goals of easing overcrowding and fostering rehabilitation. By assessing the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) system under the revised Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), the study sought to expose specific gaps and best practices in execution, evaluating their real-world impact. The aim is to offer targeted recommendations to improve the law's integrity and ensure that the rehabilitation and release of eligible PDL are achieved with fairness and transparency. Furthermore, it sought to bridge systemic gaps by establishing clearer guidelines for jail administrators and evaluation boards.

Literature Review

Republic Act No. 10592 Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) Law

The treatment of persons deprived of liberty (PDLs) in the Philippine correctional system has gradually shifted from a purely punitive approach toward one that also recognizes rehabilitation, reformation, and eventual reintegration into society. One significant policy supporting this approach is Republic Act No. 10592, commonly referred to as the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) Law. The law provides qualified PDLs with opportunities to reduce the period of imprisonment through good conduct, participation in educational and rehabilitative activities, and acts of loyalty under specified circumstances. In this sense, the law does not merely concern sentence computation; it also serves as an institutional mechanism for encouraging discipline and constructive behavior among persons undergoing detention or imprisonment.

Similarly, Republic Act No. 10592 amends the Revised Penal Code, allowing for new procedures and standards for good conduct time allowances and the creation of a Management, Screening, and Evaluation Committee (MSEC). These rules apply to all prisoners, regardless of their detention or conviction. The credit for more time and preventive incarceration allowances for loyalty and good behavior are prospective in application. The rules aim to uplift valuable human material, promote reformation and rehabilitation, and maintain a restorative and compassionate justice policy. (*Bilibid Prison v. De Lima*, 2019).

Likewise, the Revised Penal Code as amended provides deductions for good conduct time allowance (GCTA) from a prisoner's sentence. This includes inmates in detention who are eligible for credit toward preventing incarceration and those convicted in any other local jail by the final judgment. Twenty days are deducted for each month of good behavior during the first two (2) years of imprisonment, twenty-three days for the third to fifth year, twenty-five days for the years until the tenth year, and thirty days for the eleventh and successive years of imprisonment. The Management, Screening, and Evaluation Committee (MSEC) is responsible for assessing, evaluating, and granting GCTA to deserving PDL. The MSEC must be composed of five members, including a probation and parole officer, social worker, and psychologist. The MSEC must maintain minutes of the meeting for the purpose of recording every action. Steps to take for granting GCTA include special considerations for satisfactory behavior, creating the MSEC, and recommending the appropriate Good Conduct Time Allowance. The appropriate official may approve or reject the recommendation based on the person deprived

of liberty performance and ensure proper recording of good behavior in jail records. (Republic Act No. 10592, 2013)

In addition, detainees or persons deprived of liberty found guilty by final judgment can have their progress tracked using a computer template and manual. Additionally, there are time allotments for Study, Teaching, and Mentoring (TASTM). Whether a person deprived of liberty has truly studied, taught, or carried out mentoring responsibilities is tracked and verified by the MSEC. The accused does not lose their right to time allowances if they file an appeal. In 2013, President Aquino III signed Republic Act 10592, amending Articles 29, 94, 97, 98, and 99 of the RPC. The amendments aim to improve the application's utilization of Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA), increase the number of Good Conduct Time Allowance creditable days for individuals undergoing preventive incarceration or detained for too long to be released, and permit an extra sentence deduction and expand loyalty allowances (VERA Files, August 26, 2019).

Overall, R.A. No. 10592 demonstrates that sentence administration is closely connected with correctional rehabilitation and institutional discipline. Its effectiveness, however, depends heavily on the accuracy and consistency with which prison and jail personnel document conduct, determine eligibility, compute allowable credits, and follow the procedures established by law and jurisprudence. GCTA should therefore be understood not as an automatic reduction of sentence but as a legally regulated benefit that requires qualified conduct and proper institutional evaluation. For jail and correctional officers, knowledge of these requirements is particularly important because errors in interpretation, documentation, or computation may affect both the rights of PDLs and the lawful administration of criminal sentences.

Policy Adherence

Policy adherence is an essential component in the implementation of R.A. No. 10592 because the effectiveness of the GCTA system depends not only on knowledge of the law but also on the consistent application of its legal and procedural requirements by correctional personnel. Jail officers, records personnel, MSEC members, and approving authorities are expected to distinguish between statutory requirements, administrative procedures, and subsequent judicial interpretations. This is particularly significant because the GCTA framework has undergone several legal and administrative changes since the enactment of R.A. No. 10592 in 2013.

Similarly, The policy adherence and eligibility under R.A. 10592 remain contested, primarily due to inconsistencies in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR). Macababba and Botton (2025) emphasized that the exclusion of pre-trial detainees in the revised IRR raised questions of fairness and inclusivity. Similarly, reports from the Daily Tribune (2024) noted the eventual policy reversal that allowed heinous crime convicts to benefit from GCTA, signaling how the Bureau of Corrections (BuCor) adapted following judicial rulings.

Likewise, legal commentaries (ASG Law, 2024) further clarified that eligibility must align strictly with the statute and Supreme Court interpretation, rather than administrative issuances. Pulta (2024) also underscored the development of new compliance plans by BuCor to operationalize eligibility for heinous crime convicts. These studies collectively show that policy adherence remains fluid, often influenced by legal challenges and administrative reforms conditions that directly affect how jail officers interpret and apply the law in practice.

Meanwhile, the administrative consequences of the 2024 ruling were also substantial. Pulta (2024) reported that BuCor formed a technical working group to develop an implementation plan following the final Supreme Court ruling. Among the issues identified was the proper recomputation of accumulated time allowances and the determination of the relevant starting point for credits. BuCor officials emphasized the need for careful implementation because erroneous or manipulated GCTA records could result in premature release or prolonged imprisonment. This development illustrates that adherence involves more than awareness of eligibility rules; it also requires accurate computation, records verification, internal controls, and accountability mechanisms (Pultra, 2024).

In addition, following the Guinto ruling, the DOJ and DILG revised the implementing rules of the GCTA Law. The revised framework was signed in December 2024 to align administrative implementation with the Supreme Court's interpretation. The DOJ stated that, following conviction, PDLs may avail themselves of GCTA

regardless of the crimes for which they were convicted, provided the other requirements for earning the allowance are satisfied. The revised rules also retained the legal distinction applicable to preventive imprisonment under Article 29. This development demonstrates that policy adherence requires prison and jail officers to remain updated because an administrative rule that was previously applied may subsequently be invalidated or modified by judicial interpretation (Department of Justice, 2024).

Moreover, the 2019 Revised IRR itself recognized the importance of institutional consistency by requiring BuCor, BJMP, and provincial jails to develop and continually update operational manuals, templates, computation tables, graduated lists of penalties, and related reference materials. Such tools are necessary because GCTA implementation involves several interconnected matters, including preventive imprisonment credits, good-conduct deductions, TASTM, STAL, disciplinary records, and the timing of sentence completion. Uniform reference materials can therefore reduce discrepancies among correctional facilities and provide officers with clearer bases for their decisions (2019 Revised Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 10592, 2019).

Taken together, the foregoing legal developments demonstrate that adherence to R.A. No. 10592 is a continuing institutional responsibility rather than a simple act of following a fixed computation formula. Jail officers must correctly determine the legal status of a PDL, apply the appropriate statutory provision, document institutional conduct, participate in or support MSEC evaluation, maintain accurate records, and observe controlling judicial rulings and updated implementing rules. The changes brought about by the 2019 and 2024 Supreme Court decisions further show that correctional personnel need continuing legal and procedural orientation. Inconsistent understanding of these developments may produce unequal treatment among PDLs, erroneous sentence computations, and administrative accountability. Therefore, the level of policy adherence among jail officers is an important area of inquiry because their actual implementation practices directly influence whether the rehabilitative and legal purposes of the GCTA Law are realized.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, which combined both descriptive and correlational approaches to investigate the research questions. The descriptive component of the design was used to systematically explain and document the characteristics of the variables within the research setting (Mo & Sang, 2023). Specifically, it focused on determining the level of compliance with Republic Act No. 10592 (R.A. 10592), a law that modifies the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) provisions in the Philippines, as well as measuring the extent of implementation of the GCTA program.

Meanwhile, the correlational component explored the relationship between the level of compliance with R.A. 10592 and the effectiveness of the GCTA program implementation, examining whether a correlation existed between these two aspects and potentially identifying influencing factors (Field, 2024). This research design provided a detailed understanding of the variables involved, offering insights into compliance with legal provisions and the operational success of the GCTA program.

Research Locale

This study was conducted at the General Santos City Jail Male and Female Dormitory, a correctional facility located in General Santos City, Philippines. Specifically, the jail was situated in Sitio Lanton, Barangay Apopong, General Santos City, South Cotabato, Region 12 and served as a vital, yet complex environment for this study, offering a unique setting within the Philippine correctional landscape. As a key detention facility under the operational supervision of BJMP Region 12, the jail's primary mandate was dual: the safekeeping of Persons Deprived of Liberty (PDL) and their active development through structured rehabilitation programs designed to successfully reintegrate them into society.

Likewise, the facility accommodates a considerable number of PDLs, including both male and female populations, who are in various stages of the justice process either awaiting trial (detainees) or serving short-term sentences (convicts). Furthermore, the Jail Officers are central to the facility's function. They are directly responsible for day-to-day security, discipline, and the implementation of welfare and rehabilitation efforts.

Despite measurable progress in reducing congestion, the BJMP continued to experience institutional challenges, particularly inadequate staffing, limited specialized training for rehabilitation personnel, and frequent turnover of key officials. These concerns are significant to the present study because the effectiveness of jail operations depends not only on the number of PDL accommodated by a facility but also on the availability, preparedness, and continuity of personnel responsible for managing them. When Jail Officers are required to handle numerous responsibilities with limited manpower and specialized support, the quality and consistency of security, welfare, rehabilitation, and other correctional functions may be affected. Thus, examining conditions within an actual jail setting is necessary to better understand how these institutional realities are experienced and addressed at the facility level.

However, the continuing shortage of personnel remains an important concern. The reported manpower ratio of one team leader for every 10 to 15 PDL remains considerably higher than the ideal ratio of 1:2. Such a disparity highlights the demands placed on correctional personnel and may affect their ability to consistently carry out security, supervision, welfare, and rehabilitation responsibilities. Although the BJMP aims to reduce jail congestion to 290% by 2028 and adopt a more institutionalized, whole-of-society approach to PDL reintegration, achieving these goals also requires sufficient and capable personnel at the facility level.

These conditions strengthen the need to conduct the present study at the General Santos City Jail Male and Female Dormitory. While national statistics and institutional reforms provide an overview of the progress and continuing challenges of the BJMP, they do not fully explain how these conditions are manifested within individual correctional facilities.

Participants And Sampling Technique

The respondents of this study were fifty jail officers assigned to the General Santos City Male and Female Dormitory, with a sample of 38 from the male dormitory and 12 from the female dormitory.

Jail Officers from different sections and designations within the General Santos City Jail were considered to ensure broad representation. This included those handling records management, paralegal programs, rehabilitation programs, and administrative functions directly or indirectly related to GCTA implementation. The use of total population sampling was applied as the number of Jail Officers was determined to be manageable, ensuring that all members were included in the study for comprehensive data collection.

Research Instrument

The primary research instrument used in this study is a researcher-made survey questionnaire designed to assess the implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) under R.A. 10592 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) at the General Santos City Jail. The instrument was developed based on the key components of the law, existing guidelines from the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP), and related literature on correctional administration and policy compliance. Likewise, the questionnaire consists of two major parts, each addressing specific dimensions of the research objectives. Part I, the Jail Officers' Level of Compliance with Republic Act 10592, measures the extent of jail officers' compliance with the provisions and requirements of Republic Act 10592 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR). Respondents rated the statements using a five-point Likert scale, with descriptive and verbal interpretations reflecting the level of compliance in terms of policy adherence, transparency, documentation, monitoring, awareness, and ethical standards. As a researcher-made instrument, the questionnaire underwent rigorous content validation by a panel of experts in criminal justice, correctional administration, and research methodology to ensure its clarity, appropriateness, and contextual accuracy prior to data collection. Moreover, the validation process also helped determine whether the questionnaire items were aligned with the objectives and variables of the study. Necessary revisions were

incorporated based on the comments and recommendations of the expert validators. This process enhanced the overall relevance and comprehensibility of the instrument for the intended respondents.

Data Gathering

The data gathering process commenced with securing formal approval from the graduate school office. The researcher submitted a formal request letter to the Regional Director of the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) Region 12, and subsequently to the Jail Warden of the General Santos City Jail, seeking permission to conduct the study.

Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the jail's administration to determine the most convenient schedule for the survey, ensuring minimal disruption to the Jail Officers' official duties. On the scheduled date, the researcher personally met with the Jail Officer-respondents. Before distributing the instruments, the researcher explained the study's objectives, emphasized the principles of informed consent, and assured respondents of their voluntary participation and the strict confidentiality and security of their responses.

The validated survey questionnaires were then administered. The researcher was present to provide instructions and clarify any questions the respondents had. The questionnaires were retrieved immediately after completion to ensure a 100% return rate from the participants. Finally, the collected data were checked for completeness, tallied, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis, ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the study's results. A standardized coding guide was utilized during the encoding process to maintain consistency across all variables. Throughout this stage, strict data protocols were maintained to ensure respondent confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The analysis was structured to directly answer the research questions. To determine the level of compliance with R.A. 10592 and the extent of implementation of the GCTA program, the Weighted Mean for each indicator was calculated. These means were interpreted using a predefined descriptive scale to objectively determine the perceived level and extent. Utilizing descriptive statistics in this manner allowed for a structured, itemized evaluation of the respondents' assessments across all dimensions. To answer the inferential questions, the analysis focused on hypothesis testing. The significant relationship between the level of compliance and the extent of implementation was analyzed using Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation as the data involved ordinal scales. For all inferential tests, the computed p-value was compared against the 0.05 level of significance to determine whether to reject or fail to reject the null hypotheses. Statistically significant findings were further evaluated to identify the specific variables driving the observed trends. Conversely, outcomes that exceeded the alpha threshold were scrutinized to understand the lack of a measurable relationship.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher made certain that all ethical considerations were followed as required by the Holy Trinity College. This was done to avoid engaging in practices which might implicitly or explicitly abuse or exploit those with whom she sought to conduct research.

Informed Consent. The respondents were informed about the research study, including its nature and purpose. They were made aware of the schedules and procedures for conducting the research surveys. The respondents voluntarily completed the survey questionnaires, without fear of any negative consequences.

Voluntary Participation. The respondents were provided with specific information before they completed the survey forms. They were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any point without facing any negative consequences. Moreover, they were assured that their responses would remain confidential and used solely for research purposes. They were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any point without facing any negative consequences.

Data Privacy. The data form collected from the respondents were handled with the utmost respect and strict confidentiality. To uphold ethical standards and maintain research integrity, all identifying information was

anonymized, access was restricted to authorized personnel only, and all privacy-protecting measures were enforced at every stage of the study.

Gender Sensitivity. The study also paid special attention to gender sensitivity. The researcher exercised caution when assessing and surveying jail officers to avoid reinforcing gender stereotypes. The selected institutional practices and evaluative approaches were intended to represent a diverse range of gender identities among personnel, and care was taken to prevent the perpetuation of harmful gender norms or biases within the facility. This approach respects the equality of male and female jail officers while acknowledging their professional roles, ensuring that all perspectives are treated with equal consideration and value.

Cultural Sensitivity. In the conduct of this quantitative study, cultural sensitivities were strictly upheld by respecting the traditions, attitudes, and norms of the jail officer respondents without contradiction. To maintain objectivity and prevent bias during data collection and administrative observations, all interactions, behavioral recordings, and survey implementations were handled with professional neutrality, avoiding any judgmental language or scrutiny of the respondents' personal characteristics or manner of responses.

Table 1. Level Of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by Jail Officers

Table 1.1 shows the level of compliance with R.A.10592 as assessed by Jail Officers in terms of policy adherence.

Items	Mean	Description
1. The Jail officer strictly follows the guidelines and procedures required under R.A. 10592 and IRR.	5.00	Very High
2. The Jail officer ensures fairness and uniformity in applying GCTA policies	4.98	Very High
3. The Jail officer demonstrates accurate understanding of the provisions and limitations of R.A. 10592.	4.96	Very High
4. Documentation and records related to GCTA are properly maintained in accordance with policy standards.	4.92	Very High
5. Monitoring and evaluation of PDL compliance with GCTA requirements are conducted regularly and systematically.	4.92	Very High
Overall Mean	4.96	Very High

Table 1.2 Shows the Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by Jail Officers in Terms of Transparency.

Items	Mean	Description
1. Information about GCTA policies and procedures is clearly communicated to both PDL and staff.	4.82	Very High
2. The Jail officers openly provide updates regarding changes or clarifications in the implementation of R.A. 10592.	4.86	Very High
3. Records related to the granting of Good Conduct Time Allowance are accessible for authorized review when needed.	4.84	Very High
4. The criteria used in evaluating PDL eligibility for GCTA are transparent and consistently explained.	4.90	Very High
5. Decisions regarding GCTA approval or denial are communicated in a clear and accountable manner.	4.94	Very High
Overall Mean	4.87	Very High

Table 1.3 Shows the Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by the jail Officers in Terms Documentation.

Items	Mean	Description
1. All documents related to the processing of GCTA are complete and properly filed by the jail officers.	4.86	Very High
2. Records of PDL conduct and behavior are regularly updated to support accurate GCTA evaluation.	4.94	Very High
3. Required forms and reports for the implementation of R.A. 10592 are prepared accurately and on time.	4.90	Very High
4. Documentation procedures are consistently followed to ensure the integrity of GCTA records.	4.94	Very High
5. Supporting documents for GCTA decisions (e.g., evaluations, reports, attendance records) are well-organized and readily available.	4.94	Very High
Overall Mean	4.92	Very High

Table 1.4 Shows the Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms Monitoring.

Items	Mean	Description
1. The Jail officers regularly monitor PDL behavior to assess eligibility for Good Conduct Time Allowance.	4.84	Very High
2. Monitoring activities are conducted consistently in accordance with the guidelines of R.A. 10592.	4.90	Very High
3. The Jail officers use standardized tools or criteria when evaluating PDL conduct.	4.78	Very High
4. Monitoring reports are submitted promptly to support timely GCTA decision-making.	4.80	Very High
5. There is adequate supervision to ensure that monitoring of PDL activities is accurate and unbiased.	4.84	Very High
Overall Mean	4.83	Very High

Table 1.5 Shows the Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms of Awareness in Provisions.

Items	Mean	Description
1. The Jail officers have a clear understanding of the major provisions of R.A. 10592, particularly the granting of Good Conduct Time Allowance.	4.84	Very High
2. The Jail officers are aware of the specific criteria required for PDL to qualify for GCTA under the law.	4.88	Very High
3. The Jail officers understand the legal limitations, exemptions, and disqualifications stated in R.A. 10592.	4.92	Very High
4. MSEC are familiar with the proper procedures and guidelines for implementing the provisions of the GCTA law.	4.84	Very High
5. The Jail officer stays informed about updates, amendments, or clarifications related to R.A. 10592.	4.86	Very High
Overall Mean	4.87	Very High

Table 1.6 Presents the Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms of Ethical Standards.

Items	Mean	Description
1. MSEC members demonstrate fairness and impartiality when assessing PDL eligibility for GCTA.	4.84	Very High
2. Ethical guidelines are consistently observed in all processes related to the implementation of R.A. 10592.	4.88	Very High
3. Decisions related to GCTA are free from personal bias, favoritism, or improper influence.	4.98	Very High
4. The Jail officer ensures that the rights and dignity of PDL are respected throughout the GCTA evaluation process.	4.88	Very High
5. Confidential information related to PDL conduct and records is handled responsibly and ethically.	4.90	Very High
Overall Mean	4.90	Very High

Table 1.7 Shows the Summary Results of Level of Compliance with R.A.10592 As Assessed by the Jail Officer.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Policy Adherence	4.96	Very High
2. Transparency	4.87	Very High
3. Documentation	4.92	Very High
4. Monitoring	4.83	Very High
5. Awareness of Provisions	4.87	Very High
6. Ethical Standards	4.90	Very High
Overall Mean	4.89	Very High

Extent of Implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers

Table 2.1 shows the extent of implementation of the GCTA Program in General Santos City Jail as assessed by the Jail Officers in terms of proper evaluation practices.

Items	Mean	Description
1. The Jail officers follow standardized evaluation criteria when assessing PDL for GCTA eligibility.	4.92	Always
2. PDL behavior and performance records are carefully reviewed before granting GCTA.	4.88	Always
3. The evaluation process for GCTA is conducted thoroughly and without unnecessary delays.	4.86	Always
4. Evidence and documentation supporting an PDL good conduct are properly examined during evaluation.	4.92	Always
5. The evaluation process is consistent, accurate, and free from bias or personal influence.	4.90	Always
Overall Mean	4.90	Always

Table 2.2 Shows the Extent of Implementation of the Gcta Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms Opportunities for Rehabilitation.

Items	Mean	Description
1. Rehabilitation programs that support good conduct are made regularly available to PDL.	4.84	Always
2. PDL are given sufficient opportunities to participate in activities that promote personal development and discipline.	4.72	Always
3. Programs related to education, livelihood, and behavior reform are effectively implemented in the jail facility.	4.70	Always
4. Rehabilitation activities are well-monitored to ensure they	4.80	Always

contribute to PDL' eligibility for GCTA.		
5. The facility provides a supportive environment that encourages PDL to participate actively in rehabilitation programs.	4.78	Always
Overall Mean	4.77	Always

Table 2.3 Shows the Extent of Implementation of the Gcta Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms Accessibility of Requirements.

Items	Mean	Description
1. PDLs are provided clear information about the requirements for GCTA eligibility.	4.90	Always
2. Required forms and documents for GCTA processing are easily accessible to both PDL and jail officer.	4.92	Always
3. The Jail Officers assist PDL in understanding and completing the necessary requirements for GCTA.	4.88	Always
4. The process of submitting and reviewing requirements is efficient and well-organized.	4.90	Always
5. Barriers to accessing GCTA requirement (e.g., lack of information or guidance) are minimal.	4.84	Always
Overall Mean	4.89	Always

Table 2.4 Shows the Extent of Implementation of the Gcta Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms Fairness in the Granting of Benefits.

Items	Mean	Description
1. Decisions regarding the granting of GCTA benefits are applied consistently to all eligible PDL.	4.96	Always
2. The Jail officers avoid favoritism or bias when evaluating PDL for GCTA benefits.	4.96	Always
3. The process for granting benefits is transparent and clearly communicated to PDL.	4.88	Always
4. PDL have equal opportunity to receive benefits based on their conduct and eligibility.	4.90	Always
5. Grievances or disputes related to GCTA benefits are addressed promptly and fairly.	4.90	Always
Overall Mean	4.92	Always

Table 2.5 Presents the Extent of Implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers in Terms of Effectiveness in Motivating Discipline.

Items	Mean	Description
1. The GCTA program encourages PDL to consistently exhibit good behavior and compliance with jail rules.	4.82	Always
2. PDL are motivated to participate in rehabilitation and educational programs to qualify for GCTA.	4.72	Always
3. The program effectively reduces instances of misconduct among PDL.	4.74	Always
4. The Jail officers observe positive changes in PDL behavior as a result of the GCTA program.	4.78	Always
5. The GCTA program fosters a culture of discipline, responsibility, and accountability among PDL.	4.82	Always

Overall Mean	4.78	Always
--------------	------	--------

Table 2.6 Shows the Summary Results on the Extent of Implementation of the Gcta Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Proper Evaluation	4.90	Always
2. Opportunities for Rehabilitation	4.77	Always
3. Accessibility of Requirements	4.89	Always
4. Fairness in the Granting of Benefits	4.92	Always
5. Effectiveness in Motivating Discipline	4.78	Always
Overall Mean	4.85	Always

Table 3 Shows the Relationship Between the Level of Compliance to R.A.10592 And the Extent of Implementation of the Good Conduct Time Allowance (Gcta) Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers.

Variables	Level of Compliance to R.A.10592 Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation (ρ or r_s)	p-value	Remarks
Extent of Implementation of the GCTA Program	0.361	0.010	Significant

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following are the findings of the study:

1. Level of compliance to R.A. 10592 as assessed by the Jail Officers

- 1.1. Level of compliance in policy adherence as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.96.
- 1.2. Level of compliance in transparency as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.87.
- 1.3. Level of compliance in documentation as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.92.
- 1.4. Level of compliance in monitoring as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.83.
- 1.5. Level of compliance in awareness in provisions as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.87.
- 1.6. Level of compliance in ethical standard as assessed by the Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.90.
- 1.7. The summary of the Level of compliance to R.A. 10592 as assessed by Jail Officers is Very High with a mean of 4.89.

2. Extent of implementation of the GCTA program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers

- 2.1. Extent of implementation in proper evaluation as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.90.
- 2.2. Extent of implementation in opportunities for rehabilitations as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.77.

- 2.3. Extent of implementation in accessibility of requirements as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.89.
- 2.4. Extent of implementation in fairness of granting benefits as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.92.
- 2.5. Extent of implementation in motivating discipline as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.78.
- 2.6. The Extent of implementation of the GCTA program in General Santos City Jail as assessed by the Jail Officers is Always with a mean of 4.85.

3. Relationship Between the Level of Compliance to R.A.10592 and the Extent of Implementation of the GCTA Program in General Santos City Jail as Assessed by the Jail Officers

The study found a significant moderate positive relationship between the level of compliance with R.A. 10592 and the extent of implementation of the GCTA Program in General Santos City Jail. Statistical analysis yielded a Spearman's rho coefficient of ($rs = 0.361, p = 0.010$) leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This correlation suggests that as jail officers strictly adhere to the legal mandates of R.A. 10592, the execution of the GCTA program becomes more effective and comprehensive. High compliance ensures that procedural requirements such as accurate record-keeping and transparent eligibility screening are met, which directly facilitates a smoother implementation of the rehabilitation program. Overall, the findings show that strong legal compliance supports smoother and more consistent implementation of correctional rehabilitation programs

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are hereby made:

1. The jail officers in General Santos City Jail exhibit a strictly observes and implements the level of compliance with R.A. 10592. According to the established scale, this indicates that the jail officers strictly observe and implement the provisions of the law across all assessed dimensions, including policy adherence, transparency, documentation, monitoring, awareness of provisions, and ethics. They generally follow established guidelines, apply GCTA policies fairly, and show a strong understanding of the law and its limitations. The results also suggest that officers value clear communication, proper record-keeping, consistent monitoring, and ethical decision-making in the implementation of the law.
2. The GCTA Program in General Santos City Jail is implemented with high consistency confirming that the GCTA program has been fully implemented. Jail officers demonstrate strong adherence to proper evaluation practices by applying clear guidelines, carefully reviewing documents, and maintaining fairness in the assessment process. The program also provides meaningful opportunities for rehabilitation through activities that support good conduct, personal development, and reintegration. In addition, the requirements for GCTA are generally accessible, with officers providing the necessary guidance and support to help PDL understand and comply with the process. The program is also seen as fair in the granting of benefits, as officers uphold impartiality, consistency, and equal treatment among eligible PDL. Furthermore, the GCTA Program positively encourages discipline, good behavior, and participation in rehabilitative activities. Overall, the study suggests that the program is being carried out with a strong commitment to fairness, accountability, and rehabilitation, while still leaving room for further improvement in communication and program enhancement.
3. There is a positive relationship between the level of compliance with R.A. 10592 and the extent of implementation of Good Conduct Time Allowance Program in General Santos City Jail. This means that better compliance with the law is linked to more effective and organized program implementation. The result shows that following legal guidelines helps ensure proper procedures, accurate records, and fair assessment of the Person Deprived of Liberty (PDL) eligibility. It also reduces the risk of errors, bias, and inconsistencies in decision-making, which strengthens trust in the implementation of the system.

References

- Alconis Arde, R., & Bernardo, O. (2022). Rehabilitation programs and inmate satisfaction: The case of Ilocos Sur Provincial Jail. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Applegate, B. K., Daou, J., & Ouellette, H. M. (2024). The future of American jails: A national survey of jail leaders' ideals. *The Prison Journal*, 104(1), 3–23. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/00328855231212421>
- Aquino, L. (2019). R.A. 10592: Amendments to the Revised Penal Code and its implications on good conduct time allowance. *Ateneo Law Journal*, 63(2), 112–135. <https://heinonline.org.com>
- Arcipe, J. R. S., & Narra, D. B. (2025). The organizational culture in jails and its impact on good governance. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07>
- ASG Law Partners. (2024). Good conduct time allowance in the Philippines: Who qualifies after conviction? ASG Law. <https://www.asglawpartners.com>
- Blackwell, S. (2024). Documents and artifacts: Exploring community corrections training and culture amidst criminal legal reform (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester). <https://doi.org/10.2/leicester.data>
- Buan, L. (2025). Explainer: How the new IRR affects GCTA eligibility and releases. *Rappler*. <https://www.rappler.com>
- Buenafior, J. P. (2024). Assessing monitoring and evaluation systems in Philippine local government units: A study of Cavite LGUs. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(7), 1120–1131. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.807084>
- Bureau of Corrections. (2021). Uniform manual on time allowances and servicesentence. <https://bucor.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2021/11/Uniform-Manual-on-Time-Allowances>
- Catapang, G. (2025, January 17). Catapang vows transparency amid GCTA controversy. *Daily Tribune*. <https://tribune.net.ph>
- Cruz, J. M. (2021). Implementation gaps in Philippine correctional reforms: A case analysis of the Good Conduct Time Allowance Law. *Philippine Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, <https://www.justice.gov/jm>
- Cruz, L. (2025). Jail officers' narratives on correctional policy implementation under BJMP. *Pantao Journal of Public Administration*, 12(2), 55–68.
- Cruz, M. (2021). Officer perceptions of fairness in earned time allowance programs. *Philippine Journal of Criminology*, 47(1), 88–102.
- Del Rosario, F. (2022). Barriers to the effective implementation of time allowance programs in Philippine jails. *Journal of Correctional Studies*, 6(3), 23–35. <https://link.springer.com/book/1>
- Del Rosario, M. (2022). Human rights and rehabilitation: Examining the treatment of persons deprived of liberty under R.A. 10592. *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law*,
- Demegillo, J. (2025). Narratives of engagement in correctional and rehabilitation programs. *Pantao Journal*, 3(1), 15–29.
- Demegillo, R. (2025). Narratives of engagement in correctional and rehabilitation programs. *Pantao Journal*, 15(1), 101–118.
- Department of Justice. (2024). Implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 10592. https://www.doj.gov.ph/implementing_rules_and_regulations.html
- Department of Justice. (2024). Revised implementing rules and regulations of RA 10592. DOJ. <https://www.doj.gov.ph/index.html>
- Edward, M. (2024). Effect of rewards on job satisfaction in Tanzania prison services (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania). <https://repository.out.ac.tz>
- EPRA Researchers. (2023). Program evaluation of rehabilitation services in Valencia City Bukidnon Jail. *EPRA International Journal*. <https://eprajournals.com>
- Field, A. (2024). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://profandyfield.com/discoverse/dsus/>
- Fitz, L. (2024). A critical review of the social and cultural dynamics influencing inmates' behavioural tendencies in correctional centres. *Acta Criminologica: African Journal of Criminology & Victimology*, 37(2), 1–18. <https://journals.co.za>
- Garcia, J. (2022). Prison reforms and frontline correctional staff: Narratives from Southeast Asia. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 17(4), 445–462.
- Garcia, J. (2023). Restorative justice and GCTA: Officer perspectives. *Philippine Criminology Review*, 14(2), 77–95.
- Garcia, M. C. (2023). Accountability and public trust in correctional institutions: Lessons from the GCTA controversy. *Philippine Journal of Criminology and Public Safety*, 9(2), 55–68.
- Garcia, P. L. (2023). Transparency and accountability in correctional institutions: Public trust and the GCTA controversy.

- Journal of Southeast Asian Governance, 18(3), 55–72.
- Garcia, R. (2023). Correctional staff challenges under penal reforms: A Philippine case. *Philippine Journal of Public Safety*, 5(2), 64–79.
- Kinoti, L. K. (2023). Influence of human capital management practices on the performance of prisons in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, KeMU).
- LegalResearchPH. (2021). An analysis of the legislative intent, compliance, and enforcement of the IRR of RA 10592. *Philippine Legal Research Journal*. <https://legalresearchph.com>
- Macababba, A., & Botton, J. (2025, February 14). New IRR disqualifies inmates from GCTA. *Philstar Global*. <https://www.philstar.com>
- Macababba, A., & Botton, M. (2025, January 5). New IRR disqualifies inmates from GCTA. *Philstar*. <https://www.philstar.com>
- Macababba, E. J., & Botton, C. (2025, March 2). New IRR disqualifies inmates from GCTA. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/nation/2025/03/02/2425157/new-irr-disqualifies-inmates-gcta>
- Manila Bulletin (Chito Chavez). (2025, January 3). BJMP: Zamboanga City Jail pilots computerized GCTA assessment. *Manila Bulletin*. <https://mb.com.ph/2025/01/03/bjmp-zamboanga-city-jail-pilots-computerized-gcta-assessment>
- Mo, J. J., & Sang, C. N. (2023). Assessing the reliability and validity of research instruments for measuring youth purchase intention in Xi'an, China: A pilot testing. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 69(1), 47–56. <https://www.gssrr.org/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/15704>
- Morales, A. (2024). Institutional compliance and officer perspectives on Philippine penal reforms. *Journal of Southeast Asian Criminology*, 9(1), 34–49.
- Morales, A. (2024). The ethics of GCTA implementation: A jail officers' perspective. *Philippine Correctional Review*, 10(3), 59–74.
- Morales, D. R. (2024). Jail officers as implementers of GCTA: Challenges and ethical considerations. *Philippine Journal of Correctional Administration*, 15(2), 99–115.
- Morales, E. F. (2024). Perspectives of correctional officers on the implementation of sentence reduction programs in Philippine jails. *Asian Journal of Penology*, 6(3), 45–63.
- Nicholas, C., Pallega, M., & Comecilla, R. (2022). Level of implementation of safekeeping practices in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) in Zamboanga Sibugay. *Babmr Journal*, 4(2), 1–12.
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2022). *Philippines human rights report 2020–2022*. United Nations.
- Obilor, E. I. (2023). Convenience and purposive sampling techniques: Are they the same. *International Journal of Innovative Social & Science Education Research*, 11(1), 1–7. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile>
- Painaga, R., & Parreño, M. (2021). Implementation and challenges of jail services in district jails in Western Visayas, Philippines. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v4i2.302>
- Penal Reform International. (2024). *Global prison trends 2024*. <https://www.penalreform.org/resource/global-prison-trends-2024>
- Penal Reform International. (2024). *Global prison trends 2024*. PRI.
- PHINMA Library. (2022–2023). Effectiveness of the Good Conduct Time Allowance in Nueva Ecija Provincial Jail [Unpublished thesis]. PHINMA University.
- Philippine News Agency (Benjamin Pulta). (2024, September 17). BuCor to craft GCTA plan for heinous crime convicts. *Philippine News Agency*. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1233543>
- Pulda, B. (2024, March 3). BuCor to craft GCTA plan for heinous crime convicts. *Philippine News Agency*. <https://www.pna.gov.ph>
- ResearchGate Theses. (2021–2024). Studies on the impact of GCTA on inmate behavior in Philippine provincial jails. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Respicio, J. (2024). The right to good conduct time allowance release: A practitioner's commentary. *Respicio & Co. Legal Insights*. <https://respiciolaw.com>
- Reyes, J. F. (2025). Conflicting interpretations of R.A. 10592: A policy analysis of the 2024 implementing rules and regulations. *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*,
- Reyes, J. M. (2025). Policy gaps in the new implementing rules of the GCTA law: A legal critique. *Philippine Law Review*, 97(1), 77–94.
- Reyes, M. (2021). Correctional officers lived experiences in implementing rehabilitative justice in Philippine jails. *Philippine Journal of Sociology*,
- Santos, J. (2024). Supreme Court ruling on DOJ's overreach in GCTA exclusions. *Supreme Court of the Philippines Reports Annotated*,

- Santos, M. (2024, April 5). Supreme Court rules DOJ 'exceeded authority' in excluding heinous crime convicts from GCTA. TV5 News. <https://news.tv5.com.ph/breaking/read/sc-rules-doj-exceeded-authority-in-excluding-heinous-crime-convicts-from-gcta>
- Santos, M. A. (2024). Supreme Court ruling on the limits of administrative authority over GCTA eligibility. *Philippine Law Journal*, 96(2), 145–163.
- Supreme Court of the Philippines. (2024). Persons convicted of heinous crimes still entitled to Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA) [Decision]. Supreme Court E-Library.
- Supreme Court of the Philippines. (2024, April 3). Persons convicted of heinous crimes still entitled to Good Conduct Time Allowance (GCTA). <https://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/sc-persons-convicted-of-heinous-crimes-still-entitled-to-good-conduct-time-allowance>
- Taguam, R. (2024). Records management compliance of Cagayan State University: Basis for policy enhancement. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 55–67.
- Tobia, L. (2024, June 9). ZCRC now pilot site of UNODC GCTA calculator. *Daily Tribune*. <https://tribune.net.ph>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2023). Addressing jail overcrowding in the Philippines: Challenges of implementation. UNODC Philippines. <https://www.unodc.org>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2023). Correctional staff roles in rehabilitative programs in overcrowded systems. UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific. <https://www.unodc.org>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2023).