



Akinbogun, S. P., Kayode, O. and Oyedokun, T. B. (2022) Security practices in retail properties in a developing economy: a logistic analysis of impacts on customers' satisfaction and patronage. *Journal of Facilities Management*, (doi: 10.1108/JFM-03-2022-0024).

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/275057/>

Deposited on: 15 July 2022

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk>



Security Practices in Retail Properties in a Developing Economy; A logistic analysis of its Impact on Customers' Satisfaction and Patronage

Journal:	<i>Journal of Facilities Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JFM-03-2022-0024.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Security, Facility, satisfaction, patronage, retail, property

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Security Practices in Retail Properties in a Developing Economy; A logistic analysis of its Impact on Customers' Satisfaction and Patronage

Aim: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of a soft facility practice in the organized retail sector. In specifics, it draws context from a security practice and assesses its effect on customers' satisfaction and patronage in retail properties.

Method and Data; The research method is quantitative. The study employed a survey research design with the use of a structured questionnaire for data collection. The data were collected from the head of households who purchase items in the retail shops. It applied a logistic regression model to estimate customers' satisfaction and the effect of the current security practice on patronage.

Findings: Contrary to expectation, descriptive analysis of data shows that respondents were satisfied with the security procedure with weighted means scores (3.62, 3.74, 3.78, and 3.66) above average for bag check at exits, reconciliation of receipts with purchase, the attitude of security personnel during exit checks and time taken during exit checks. With specific reference to bag checks at the exit, logit shows that 32% were neutral while 8% were dissatisfied with the security practice. Among the dissatisfied, logit shows an odds ratio of 0.059, which implies that they are likely to verbally express their dissatisfaction with the shop. On the other hand, the chances that they would not do this are more likely with an odds ratio of 162818201.343. Further, continuous patronage (Loyalty) is strongly less likely with an odds ratio of 1.250E-22. This was corroborated by a similar odd ratio of 4.068E-11 estimated for those that would take the exit option due to the bag's check.

Implication: The findings on satisfaction imply that the convenience and swiftness associated with shopping in a retail shop had been eroded by the current security facility practices which may lead to a reduction in the growth and retail sector turnover. While many dissatisfied customers would have exited if there are alternative shops with more customer-friendly security practices, the limited number of organized retail shops in the study area will prevent this from happening.

Originality: Literature on the management of facilities in real estate is quite vast, however, not much attention has been paid to the management of security in the retail sector particularly in Nigeria. This study is, therefore, novel as it provides seminal evidence on this important topic and will serve as a reference for further research in Nigeria.

1
2
3 **Limitations:** The limitation of this study is that samples were randomly drawn from an unknown population
4 of customers. However, the study was guided by Cochran (1963) to select a valid representative sample
5 and support the reliability of the research findings.
6
7

8 **Keywords:** security, facility, satisfaction, patronage, retail, property
9
10

11 **Introduction**

12
13 Apart from the space requirement, every organization requires some soft facilities to facilitate its
14 operation, value for money, patronage, customer satisfaction, and achievement of its core
15 objective. These facilities essentially include security which is generally meant to protect
16 organizations and their customers. According to Bamfield (2012), all crime is a police issue,
17 however, retailers provide their security because the police are not able to provide the constant
18 monitoring of stores that is necessary to prevent crime and apprehend offenders. Debatably, due
19 to frequent occasions of theft in retail shops, security is a major concern in retail shops. Many retail
20 shops have responded to this challenge by using human and close circuit television to reduce theft
21 without compromising customers' satisfaction and the convenience associated with shopping in
22 the organized retail sector. Despite the application of sophisticated soft facilities, studies show that
23 a huge amount of money is lost to theft in the United Kingdom and the United States annually.
24 While this issue remains a concern, the approach to prevent loss by shop owners is user-friendly
25 with an ambience that facilitates uninterrupted engagement by shoppers. In developing countries
26 such as Nigeria, organized retail shops in large shopping complexes are growing in many urban
27 centres. However, the security procedure in the shops has assumed an unfriendly dimension with
28 a possible tendency of reducing patronage and customers' satisfaction. The searchlight of retail
29 crime is now overly beamed on the shoppers. Previous studies show that employees of retail shops
30 are more likely to steal from the shops than customers. However, the implication of the present
31 security procedure in retail shops is that every customer is a suspect. Every customer is subjected
32 to a thorough check at the exit barrier. After payment, shoppers are manually screened at the exit
33 by verifying every item purchased with the proof of payment. It is usual to find a large crowd at
34 the exit barrier while the security procedure is on. Observations and anecdotal evidence show that
35 this procedure has reduced the convenience and time taken at the shop. Debatably, the current
36 management of the security in retail shops in most Nigerian cities is not customer-friendly. While
37 no single security facility management model fits all retail shops, its success is measured by
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 customer satisfaction. Arguably, the ease, convenience, luxury, and swiftness associated with the
4 customers noted by Ubeja and Bedia, (2012) as the benefits of organized retail stores have been
5 eroded. While benefits are vital metrics that determine customer satisfaction, this study answers
6 the question of the current security practices and their implications on customers' satisfaction and
7 patronage of the organized retail sector. The study addresses this concern using the Hirschman
8 (1970), theory of Exit voice and loyalty to assess customers' decisions that may affect the growth
9 of the organized retail sector in Nigeria. **According to the theory, customers have three options
10 in responding to dissatisfaction with the services of an organization. First, they may raise
11 their voice to influence a change in the organization. Second, they may leave the organization
12 to engage with other competing organizations that meet their need. Third, customers may
13 opt for a passive choice through goodwill and remain in the organization, hoping for a
14 possible positive change. The theory could be applied in all socio-economic situations
15 demanding reaction to certain dissatisfaction with the quality of an organization's service.
16 The works of Bengtsson and Bohman (2020), Chisholm, Howden-Chapman and Fougere
17 (2018), Chisholm, Howden-Chapman and Fougere (2016) provide recent applications of the
18 theories in the areas of facility management and property studies. In line with the previous
19 studies, this study examined the three possible alternative responses to perceived unfriendly
20 security practices that seemly hold every customer as a suspect in a growing retail property
21 sector in a Nigerian city.**

2.0 The Security Component of Facility Management

22 Security is an important component of soft facilities in a building, it involves the protection, and
23 the measures taken toward the protection of a building or other physical location (Kozlow, 2000).
24 It is a necessary soft facility that helps to reduce theft and to ensure the safety of customers.
25 Normally a combination of close circuit television (CCTV) and security guards are employed to
26 achieve the purpose. Though the importance of personnel to facility security can hardly be
27 overstated, people are not the only dimension. There are also procedures and equipment whose
28 degree of effectiveness is commensurate with the capabilities of the security staff (Gips, 2002). As
29 the world today is characterized by excessive competition, a major factor that gives businesses a
30 competitive edge over others is exceptional services that exceed users' expectations and
31 satisfaction (Shemwell *et al.*, 1998). In the realm of procedure, there are necessary steps to be
32 taken when securing areas containing valuables. Installation of equipment may be necessary for
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 access control, surveillance, detection, communication, and incident response (Wolkowitz, 2002).
4
5 The economic satisfaction of getting value for money spent in an organized retail store may
6 become unrealizable if the satisfaction of customers is inadequate or absent. One of the major
7 factors that influence the satisfaction among customers is the effective and efficient management
8 of facilities which includes infrastructures, customer services, and security procedures. Also, it is
9 expected that each customer is unique, and their expectations will differ from another; hence,
10 purpose-oriented infrastructure, customer services, and security procedures are required to keep
11 the users satisfied (Sujatha and Priya, 2015). The most important element to be considered when
12 measuring the success of a facility management approach is the level of users' satisfaction
13 (Zagreus *et al.*, 2004). Consequently, the need to measure the current effect of security practice on
14 satisfaction and patronage. Spot-checks are common security measures to prevent shoplifting,
15 especially in many developing countries where security is mostly handled manually. In the absence
16 of magnetic sensors and surveillance cameras, physical checking of shoppers and their belongings
17 can be a way to detect theft or other criminal acts. However, there are instances where spot-checks
18 can become irritating and dehumanising; and in some extreme cases, they can cause horrible
19 shopping experiences that deter shoppers from continuous patronage. While retailers are entitled
20 to search customers, this should be performed discreetly and in a respectful manner (Tims, 2017).
21 The study by Aylott and Mitchell (1998) explored factors that cause stress concerning grocery
22 shopping and found that the fear of being confronted by shop attendants or security guards; and
23 the fear of being wrongfully charged or arrested, are potential stressors among shoppers. To
24 mitigate the impact of these stressors, savvy retailers are adopting self-service technologies to
25 potentially reduce cost, increase value and improve customer satisfaction. The results of the study
26 by Orel and Kara (2014) show that quality self-service technologies positively influence customer
27 shopping experience, satisfaction, and consequently, loyalty. Essentially, any security measures
28 that minimise awkward moments, stress, or the time shoppers spend in stores, are likely to yield a
29 positive shopping experience. Going shopping should be a relaxing recreational activity but can
30 become depressing if fraught with a negative experience due to inefficient and outdated security
31 measures (Geuens, Brengman, and S'Jegers, 2001).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **2.2 Satisfaction and Customers' Patronage** 53

54 Customer satisfaction has long been recognised in marketing thought and practice as a central
55 concept as well as an important goal of all business activities (Anderson, Fornell, and Lehmann
56
57

1994). There are two different concepts of customer satisfaction, namely, transaction-specific and cumulative satisfaction. Transaction-specific satisfaction provides specific diagnostic information about a particular product or service (Lam et al 2004). In contrast, cumulative customer satisfaction is an overall evaluation based on the total purchase and consumption experiences with a product or service over time (Anderson, et al. 1994). This concept is more fundamental to this study and useful than transaction-specific consumer satisfaction in predicting a consumer's subsequent behaviour and a firm's past, present, and future performance. It is cumulative customer satisfaction that motivates a firm's investment in customer satisfaction (Wang and Lo 2002). Satisfaction is a feeling or judgement by customers towards products or services after they have used them (Jamal and Naser, 2002). Though customer satisfaction is essential for survival (Rampersad, 2001), customers who are retained may not always be satisfied and satisfied customers may not always be retained (Dick and Basu, 1994). Customer satisfaction is contentment and a measure of pleasure derived from a product or service during consumption. It grades the level of fulfilment derived by consuming a particular product or service, including levels of over-or under-fulfillment (Oliver, 1997). The success or failure of a retail shop depends on many factors, but customer satisfaction and patronage constitute the most important factors that are vital to its success. According to Oladapo and Adebayo (2014), if customers cannot derive satisfaction from the shopping centres, it may become economically unfeasible for them to keep patronizing such premises. Therefore, it is important to understand the level of customer satisfaction towards the shopping centres and how facility management can add value to the management of retail shops (Musa and Pitt, 2009). So, this creates a challenge for maintaining high levels of service, which are consistent with customers' expectations (Pizam and Ellis, 1991). Satisfied customers are the assets of an organisation that ensure a regular cash flow for the business in the future (Rahman, 2004). Users' satisfaction surveys are important vehicles for businesses to determine customer loyalty and assess the degree of improvement that may be required for the facilities to satisfy users' needs and wants. Many studies have made attempts to affirm a positive link between service convenience and customer satisfaction (Heinonen, 2006; Wong *et al.*, 2012). These include studies by Ubeja and Bedia (2012), which focused on customer satisfaction in shopping malls; Anselmsson (2006), which focused on the sources of customer satisfaction within shops. Dubihlela and Dubihlela (2014), accessed the attributes of shopping mall image, customer satisfaction, and patronage. Whilst many of these studies have examined the effect of facilities on customers' satisfaction, no attempt was

1
2
3 made to separate specific components of the soft facilities to examine the effect of security
4 practices on customers' satisfaction and patronage. This is a significant missing link in the quest
5 for improving the quality of service delivery in the organized retail sector. Therefore, this research
6 attempt to narrow the existing research gaps by examining the effect of the security component of
7 facility management in a shopping mall on customers' satisfaction and patronage. As noted by
8 Singh (2006) and Oluwunmi, (2014), customers need to be highly, (not merely) satisfied, to
9 provide a competitive advantage to the retail investors. Therefore, to establish an efficient and
10 consistent standard in retail facilities, there is a need to conduct studies on customers' satisfaction
11 with the security procedures. This study was inspired by the need to realize the goal of the retail
12 shop, which according to Hammer (1998), involves understanding customers' perceptions;
13 replacing reactions with actions; planning for the future; promoting user involvement, and
14 prioritizing customers' convenience, satisfaction and patronage. Patronage is the degree to which
15 a customer concentrates purchases over time to a particular business entity within a service
16 category. It develops through positive reinforcement and repetition of buying behaviour, Oliver
17 (1997). Customers' patronage provides the basis for a stable and growing market share. As noted
18 by the Business Week magazine (April 2001), consumers can avoid risks by being patriotic to a
19 service provider with which they are satisfied, instead of purchasing from new and untried service
20 providers. For obvious reasons, the patriotic customer is the key to a business, especially those
21 customers who provide long patronage (Barker, 1989). Oliver (1997) observed that improving
22 customer satisfaction is a key to gaining customer patronage. Being a patriotic customer indicates
23 that a customer will continue to patronize, talk favourably about the service provider, pay less
24 attention to competing bars and be less sensitive to price and buy more. While this may be true in
25 the developed economy, the situation may be different in a developing economy with limited retail
26 shops which operate security procedure that is far below best practice. Findings from empirical
27 studies show that customer satisfaction and patronage constitute a measure of the quality of the
28 service provided. **Bengtsson and Bohman (2020) recognize the suitability of the Hirschman
29 theory of Exit Voice and Loyalty and applied it to dissect tenants' responses to house
30 renovation processes in Sweden. Findings show that renovation is a critical juncture in
31 existing tenant-landlord relations and exposes the power relation in the housing market.
32 While tenants were unable to directly affect the scope of the renovation, their voices affect**
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the process and quality of the renovation. The findings show the limit of the influence of
4 tenant voice in the renovation process. According to the studies of Bachelder et al. (2016).

5
6
7 Cook et al. 2002; Fozdar and Hartley 2014; Grineski 2008; Lister 2004, many cases of
8 housing quality conflict are not voiced, and hidden over housing quality remains hidden
9 because tenants prefer to move home (exit) rather than discuss with the landlord. While these
10 previous studies provide a good background to apply the EVL theory to dissect the response
11 of end-users to issues of dissatisfaction in property studies, the applications were limited to
12 housing studies with a qualitative approach. The need for this study is justified, to cover end-
13 users responses to poor service quality in the retail property sector using a quantitative
14 approach, particularly in the context of a developing country.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 3.0 Research Method

23 3.1 Study Area and Data

24
25 The study was conducted in Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. Akure is a city in southwestern Nigeria
26 and is the largest city and capital of Ondo State. According to the world population review 2022,
27 the city had a population of 716,815. It lies about 7°25' north of the equator and 5°19' east of the
28 Meridian and covers an area of 383m². The major retail stores are NAO supermarket, CECI
29 supermarket, PEP stores, Omega supermarket, DE CHRIS supermarket, and Shoprite. All except
30 Shoprite are on two floors with an average area of 625m². They enjoy a high level of patronage.
31 The target population is the customers that patronize the shops. The sample was drawn from the
32 customers that were present at the shops when the survey was conducted. The sample frame is
33 unknown and perhaps infinite. Since the population of the study is large, the appropriate sample
34 size used for this study was determined using four criteria, which are: assumed population size
35 (10,000) specified precision level ($\pm 10\%$), the confidence level of (95%), and the degree of
36 variability (0.5) in the attributes being measured. Based on these specified criteria, the study
37 adopted Cochram (1963) (See Table .1) for sample size determination from an unknown
38 population. Based on the formula, Table .1 was developed. Using the above-specified criteria, a
39 sample size of 99 respondents was obtained. Satisfaction with the exit security procedure was
40 assessed by classifying their experience using five points Likert scale namely, "Very satisfied",
41 "Satisfied", "Neutral", "Dissatisfied", and "Very dissatisfied".
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Sample size for $\pm 3\%$, $\pm 5\%$, $\pm 7\%$ and $\pm 10\%$ Precision Levels Where Confidence Level is 95% and $P=0.5$

Size of Population	Sample size (n) for precision (e) of			
	3%	5%	7%	10%
1000	A	286	169	91
2000	714	333	185	95
3000	811	353	191	97
4000	98	364	194	98
5000	909	370	196	98
6000	938	375	197	98
7000	959	378	198	99
8000	976	381	199	99
9000	989	383	200	99
10000	1,000	385	200	99*

a = Assumption of the normal population is poor (Yamane, 1967). The entire population should be sampled.

**= selected appropriate sample size*

3.2 Data Collection Protocol and Analysis

To achieve the goals of this study, the data collected for this research is basically from primary sources. The data were randomly collected from shoppers who visited the retail outlets through a survey, using a structured questionnaire and personal walk-through observation. The main purpose of the walk-through-observation was to experience the real scenario and the facility management services at the shops that may impact the customer's satisfaction and patronage. The structured questionnaire contains questions that focused on the satisfaction of customers with security practices in the organized retail sector. Five variable categories were set for satisfaction in the responses. Multinomial logistic regression was applied to evaluate the effect of the security practice on the level of satisfaction and patronage of customers in the study area. During data analysis, "Very dissatisfied" was set as the reference category and omitted in the model. In specifics, the study examines the predictors of customers' decision to patronize the retail shops based on the theoretical construct of exit, loyalty, and voice consumers' response to issues with a service provider. Descriptive Statistics was used to analyse the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents which include gender, marital status, and educational level.

3.4 Model Specification and Validation

The study adopts a multinomial logistic model which is mathematically denoted by equation 1

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit}(P_j) &= \ln \left[\frac{p(y = j/x_i)}{p(y = 0/x_i)} \right] = \beta_{j0} + \beta_{j1}x_1 + \beta_{j2}x_2 + \dots + \beta_{jn}x_n \\ &= \beta_{j0} + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{ji}x_i \end{aligned} \quad \text{equation 1.}$$

Where $\text{logit}(P_j)$ is the logit function of the dependent variable y

J = variable category (Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neutral satisfied, very satisfied)

x_1 = observation

β_0 = intercept

$\beta_1 \dots \beta_n$ = (parameters of the multinomial logistic regression)

This analysis considers one dependent variable x (satisfaction with bag checks at exit) with three levels

x_1 = (continue to patronize (loyalty)

x_2 = (rather patronize another shop (exit)

x_3 = (cannot say (Voice)

The model was validated by the model fitting information provided in Table 2. The Chi-square was statistically significant at $p < 0.005$). This indicates that the Final model gives a significant improvement over the baseline intercept-only model. It implies that the model gives better predictions than we just guessed based on the marginal percentage for the outcome categories.

Table 2: Model Fitting Information

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log-Likelihood	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	134.265			
Final	54.584	79.681	32	.000

Further, the pseudo R^2 values (e.g. Nagelkerke = 59%) in Table 3 indicate that the level of satisfaction explains a substantial proportion of the variation between responses. The moderate R^2 indicates that a model containing the level of satisfaction of respondents is likely to be a good predictor of the behaviour (continued patronage, complaining to the shop, and rather patronising another) for any particular individual. The model fitting information and pseudo-R Square proved

the validity and reliability of the result beyond doubt. The likelihoods of occurrence of the estimated parameters are significant at a 0.05 p-value (See Table 8 in the appendix)

Table 3: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.549
Nagelkerke	.593
McFadden	.306

4.0 Result and Discussion

4.1 Background Information of Respondents

The result of Table 4 above shows the respondents' (customers) gender, marital status, and educational level. As shown in the Table. 52% of the respondents are male while 48% are female. Results also show that 62% of the respondents are married, 30% are single, 4% are divorced, 2% are separated and 2% are widowed. The Table revealed that 2% of the respondents had only primary education, 14% had secondary education while 80% went to a tertiary institution. However, 4% of the respondents had other forms of education like vocational training, Arabic school, etc. A larger percentage (62%) of the respondents are married, educated, well exposed, and capable of answering the questions of this study, and as such their responses can be relied upon.

Table 4: Background Information of Respondents

Background Information	Frequency	Per cent
Gender		
Male	52	52
Female	48	48
<i>Total</i>		
Marital Status		
Single	62	62.0
Married	30	30.0
Divorced	2	2.0
Separated	4	4.0
Widowed	2	2.0
<i>Total</i>	100	100.0
Education Level		
Primary Education	2	2.0
Secondary Education	14	14.0
Tertiary Education	80	80.0
Others	4	4.0
<i>Total</i>	100	100.0

4.2 Respondents' satisfaction with the security practices in the retail properties

The respondents' satisfaction with exit security procedures adopted at the retail properties is presented in Table 3. The Weighted Mean Score (WMS) of the data collected from the occupants was estimated to represent their collective satisfaction with the security practice. The table shows that respondents seem to be satisfied with the exit security procedure, which includes checking bags at exits, reconciliation of receipts with purchases, the attitude of security personnel during exit checks, and time taken during exit checks with weighted means of 3.62, 3.74 3.78 and 3.66 respectively. From the table, it can be deduced that a majority of users are satisfied with the exit security procedure employed by the shops. This is buttressed by the lowest weighted mean score of 3.62 which is above the average on a 5-point satisfaction scale.

Table 5: Respondents' satisfaction with security procedures

Security Procedures During Exit	Very Satisfied (5)	Satisfied (4)	Neutral (3)	Dissatisfied (2)	Very Dissatisfied (1)	Mean Rank
Bags Check at Exit	16	42	32	8	2	3.62
Reconciliation of Purchases with Receipts	16	44	38	2	0	3.74
The attitude of Security Personnel	24	32	42	2	0	3.78
Time taken	12	44	42	2	0	3.66

4.2 Effect of Security Procedures on Customers' Patronage

The model derived from the logit model used to investigate the effect of exit check procedures on customers' satisfaction and patronage is shown in Table 4. Variables in the model are bags checked at exits.

Table 6: Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
Bags_Checks_at_exit		2	2.0%
	Dissatisfied	8	8.0%
	Neutral	32	32.0%
	Satisfied	42	42.0%
	Very Satisfied	16	16.0%
VOICE (advice to shop owners)		4	4.0%
	Yes	74	74.0%
	No	18	18.0%
	Cannot say	4	4.0%
LOYALTY (Continuous Patronage)		4	4.0%
	Yes	68	68.0%
	No	20	20.0%
	Cannot say	8	8.0%
EXIT (Rather_patronize_another)		6	6.0%
	Yes	24	24.0%

	No	54	54.0%
	Cannot say	16	16.0%
Valid		100	100.0%
Missing		0	
Total		100	
Subpopulation		17 ^a	

a. The dependent variable has only one value observed in 13 (76.5%) subpopulations.

The case summary processing of the logistic model shows that the respondents were satisfied with bag checks at the exits. In specifics, 16% were very satisfied, 42% were satisfied, and 32% were neutral. While 8% were dissatisfied, 2% were very dissatisfied with the bag check at the exit. In addition, 74% of the respondents said they can voice their opinion on the security procedure to the shop owners. Conversely, 18% will not say anything to the shop owners while 4% are unsure of what they would do. Further, 54% of the respondents would be loyal by continuing to patronize the retail shop regardless of the security practice. While 24% would exit by patronizing, 16% are undecided about their possible response to the current security practice at the retail properties.

Category Very Dissatisfied

For those who were very dissatisfied, the tendency to express dissatisfaction by complaining to the shops is less likely with an odds ratio of 0.059. On the other hand, the chances of not complaining to be very dissatisfied is very strong, with an odds ratio of 162818201.343. Further, those who are very dissatisfied with the current security practice of checking bags at the exit, are strongly less likely to remain loyal by continuous patronage with an odds ratio of 1.250E-22. An odd ratio in a similar direction showing that they would not discontinue their patronage was estimated with a less likelihood of 4.068E-11. While this is unexpected, it is perhaps due to similar security check experience in the few organized retail shops in the city. A positive odd ratio may be estimated if a retail shop with a more customer-friendly security procedure emerges. Furthermore, those who are very dissatisfied are strongly less likely to remain loyal to continuous patronage. In specific, an odds ratio of 3.190E-11 which is in the same direction as the former was recorded. The satisfaction of customers with bag checking at exits does not have a significant influence on customers' loyalty as all categorical variables had a p-value > 0.05.

Category Dissatisfied

For those who were dissatisfied, the odd ratio of verbally expressing their dissatisfaction and complaining is strongly likely with a possibility of 7142609167462956.000. On the other hand, the chances that they would not do this are strongly likely with an odds ratio of

1
2
3 1180646985529698.000. Conversely, the odds ratio of those that would be loyal customers by
4 continuing to patronize the shop is strongly less likely with an odds ratio of 4.669E-16. An odd
5 ratio of 1.255E-15 in a similar negative direction was estimated for those who would not continue
6 patronage due to the current bag check at the exit. The high negative odd ratios recorded in both
7 instances imply that the respondents in these categories are most likely to stop patronizing the
8 retail stores if a competitive retail shop with a more customer-friendly security facility emerges.
9 The odds ratio of those who will express their dissatisfaction by exiting by patronizing another
10 shop is 311121036.178. It increased to 606851967.149 for those who prefer to be loyal customers.
11 These high odd ratios imply the same inference with the penultimate implication of the dissatisfied
12 group. The satisfaction of customers with bag checking at exits does not influence customers'
13 loyalty as all categorical variables had a p-value > 0.05. This finding is unexpected, however, it
14 could be attributed to the limited number of organized retail outlets with a wide range of
15 commodities in the city. This limits their patronage to the available option though without a
16 customer-friendly security management procedure. **This finding is consistent with the exception
17 noted by Hirschman (1970) in the EVL theory and corroborated by Oliver and Peter (2021)
18 who noted that pure exit does not always exist because of the lack of competition and the
19 availability of alternatives**

32 33 *Category Neutral*

34 This category of respondents is undecided about their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The
35 odds ratio of those who would complain is 46064221.065. On the other hand, the chances of those
36 who would not do this are strongly likely with an odds ratio of 10042559.726 but lower than the
37 former. The odds ratio of those who would continue patronage being neutral is 8.518E-1 and
38 strongly less likely. A similar negative odd ratio (1.359E-14) was also estimated for those who
39 would not continue patronage through neutrality to the unfriendly security practice. The chances
40 of those who will rather patronize another competitive retail shop are likely with an odds ratio of
41 5.250. The odd ratio is 4.393 for loyal customers who prefer not to patronize similar organized
42 retail shops in the city. The satisfaction of customers with bag checking at exits does not influence
43 customers' loyalty as all categorical variables had a p-value > 0.05.

52 53 *Category Satisfied*

The chances that those who are satisfied with the security checks at the exit odds and express this by voice is highly likely with an odds ratio of 2657234808544728.000. On the other hand, the chances that they would not mention their satisfaction to the shop owners are very likely with an odds ratio of 26296949987461.277. However, the chances of their loyalty (through continuous patronage) are less likely with an odds ratio of 5.205E-15. Similarly, it is also strongly less likely for them not to continue patronage with an odds ratio of 3.406E-14. The odds ratio of those that agree that they will rather patronize another being satisfied is 31.841 and increases to 45.484 for those that said they will not patronize another. Only the decision of customers on preference to

Table 7: Parameter Estimates

	B	Std. Error	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bags Checks at exit^a								
Intercept	20.229	11218.313	.000	1	.999			
[Recommend=]	-53.270	.000	.	1	.	7.331E-24	7.331E-24	7.331E-24
[Recommend=1]	-2.836	11557.117	.000	1	1.000	.059	.000	. ^b
[Recommend=2]	18.908	11559.229	.000	1	.999	162818201.343	.000	. ^b
[Recommend=3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Continued_Patronage=]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Continued_Patronage=1]	-50.434	3732.858	.000	1	.989	1.250E-22	.000	. ^b
[Continued_Patronage=2]	-27.581	3721.231	.000	1	.994	1.051E-12	.000	. ^b
[Continued_Patronage=3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Rather_patronize_another =]	30.962	.000	.	1	.	27964599375621.130	2796459375621.130	27964599375621.130
[Rather_patronize_another =1]	-23.925	659.438	.001	1	.971	4.068E-11	.000	. ^b
[Rather_patronize_another =2]	-24.168	382.040	.004	1	.950	3.190E-11	.000	. ^b
[Rather_patronize_another =3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
Dissatisfied								
Intercept	-21.166	7040.874	.000	1	.998			
[Recommend=]	1.204	19134.969	.000	1	1.000	3.335	.000	. ^b
[Recommend=1]	36.505	6007.048	.000	1	.995	7142609167462956.000	.000	. ^b
[Recommend=2]	34.705	6007.048	.000	1	.995	1180646985529698.000	.000	. ^b
[Recommend=3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Continued_Patronage=]	0 ^c	.	.	0

patronize another or not is influenced by satisfaction with bag checking at the exits with a p-value < 0.05.

1									
2									
3	[Continued_Patronage=								
4	Yes1]	-35.300	3431.314	.000	1	.992	4.669E-16	.000	.b
5	[Continued_Patronage=No								
6	2]	-34.311	3431.314	.000	1	.992	1.255E-15	.000	.b
7	[Continued_Patronage=								
8	Cannot say 3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
9	[Rather_patronize_another								
10	=]	19.269	16158.566	.000	1	.999	233544688.294	.000	.b
11	[Rather_patronize_another								
12	=Yes	19.556	3648.120	.000	1	.996	311121036.178	.000	.b
13	[Rather_patronize_another								
14	=No2]	20.224	3648.120	.000	1	.996	606851967.149	.000	.b
15	[Rather_patronize_another								
15	=Cannot say]	0 ^c	.	.	0
16	Neutral Intercept	14.651	2444.834	.000	1	.995			
17	[Recommend=]	-33.018	11051.916	.000	1	.998	4.575E-15	.000	.b
18	[Recommend= Yes1]	17.646	2407.634	.000	1	.994	46064221.065	.000	.b
19	[Recommend= No 2]	16.122	2407.635	.000	1	.995	10042559.726	.000	.b
20	[Recommend= Cannot								
21	say3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
22	[Continued_Patronage=]								
22	[Continued_Patronage=]	0 ^c	.	.	0
23	[Continued_Patronage=								
24	Yes1]	-32.397	3431.313	.000	1	.992	8.518E-15	.000	.b
25	[Continued_Patronage=								
26	Noc2]	-31.930	3431.314	.000	1	.993	1.359E-14	.000	.b
27	[Continued_Patronage=								
28	Cannot say3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
29	[Rather_patronize_another								
30	=]	19.061	8731.803	.000	1	.998	189679431.224	.000	.b
31	[Rather_patronize_another								
32	=Yes1]	1.658	1.031	2.585	1	.108	5.250	.695	39.633
33	[Rather_patronize_another								
34	= No2]	1.480	.885	2.796	1	.095	4.393	.775	24.903
35	[Rather_patronize_another								
35	= cannot say3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
36	Satisfied Intercept	-4.232	4365.286	.000	1	.999			
37	[Recommend=]	20.200	12403.336	.000	1	.999	592429265.314	.000	.b
38	[Recommend=1]	35.516	4344.562	.000	1	.993	2657234808544728.000	.000	.b
39	[Recommend=2]	30.900	4344.562	.000	1	.994	26296949987461.277	.000	.b
40	[Recommend=3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
41	[Continued_Patronage=]								
42	[Continued_Patronage=								
43	yes1]	-32.889	3431.314	.000	1	.992	5.205E-15	.000	.b
44	[Continued_Patronage=								
45	No2]	-31.011	3431.314	.000	1	.993	3.406E-14	.000	.b
46	[Continued_Patronage=Ca								
47	nnot say3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
48	[Rather_patronize_another								
49	=]	2.570	10436.466	.000	1	1.000	13.065	.000	.b
50	[Rather_patronize_another								
51	= Yes1]	3.461	1.293	7.164	1	.007	31.841	2.526	401.359
52	[Rather_patronize_another								
53	=No2]	3.817	1.172	10.610	1	.001	45.484	4.574	452.261
54	[Rather_patronize_another								
55	=Cannot say3]	0 ^c	.	.	0
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- | |
|--|
| a. The reference category is very satisfied |
| b. Floating-point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing |
| c. The parameter is set to zero because its redundant |

Journal of Facilities Management

5.0 CONCLUSION

This study assessed the effect of the security practice in retail properties on customer satisfaction and patronage in retail properties in Akure, Nigeria. The model tested is aimed at predicting the perceived effect of perceived unfriendly security practices on customers' satisfaction and patronage. It identified the various security procedures provided in shops and applied multinomial logistic regression to evaluate customer satisfaction and its effect on patronage. The study found that the security practice (searching of customers' bags and reconciliation of receipts with items purchased at the exit) does not have a significant effect on satisfaction and patronage at a p-value of 0.05. Although customers are largely satisfied with this procedure, the results of logistic regression show that those who were very dissatisfied were very less likely to complain, loyal, and most likely to exit. Findings show that customers are least satisfied with the exit checks and reconciliation of receipts with items purchased at the exit. This might have a negative implication on patronage. This impact on patronage may be pronounced if a retail outlet with a more customer-friendly security practice emerges in the future. This finding is partly consistent with the established theory of customers' responses to dissatisfaction in an organization. This is perhaps due to the common security practice in the organized retail shops in the city. **The implication is that the organized retail sector in the city and Nigeria may not reach its full potential if a customer-friendly security practice is not applied. The study recommends the use of effective high-tech security gadgets that limit physical contact with customers but are capable of triggering an alarm on unchecked goods at the exit barrier. In the future, a study could be conducted to examine the security practice amidst all other factors affecting satisfaction, to assess its strength.**

References

- Anderson, E W., Claes Fornell, and Donald R. Lehmann (1994), "Customer Satisfaction Market Share, and Profitability: Findings from Sweden," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (3), 53-66.
- Anselmsson J. (2006). Sources of Customer Satisfaction with Shopping Malls: A Comparative Study of Different Customer Segments. *Int. Rev. of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*. 16(1): 115-138.
- Aylott, R., & Mitchell, V. W. (1998). An exploratory study of grocery shopping stressors. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*. Volume 26 · Number 9 · 1998 · pp. 362-373.

- 1
2
3 Bachelder, A. E., Stewart M.K, Felix H.C and Sealy, N, (2016) “Health Complaints Associated
4 with Poor Rental Housing Conditions in Arkansas: The Only State without a Landlord’s
5 Implied Warranty of Habitability.” *Frontiers in Public Health* Vol. 4: pp. 263.
6
7
8 Bamfield; J. A. (2012): Shopping and Crime, Centre for Retail Research, UK
9
10 Barker, M.J (1992). Marketing; An Introductory Text 2nd Ed, Mc Millan Business, London
11
12 Berry, L.L., Seiders, K. and Grewal, D. (2002), “Understanding service convenience”, *Journal of*
13 *Marketing*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 1-17.
14
15 Bengtsson B and Bohman H. (2020): Tenant Voice as Strong as It Gets. Exit, Voice and Loyalty
16 in Housing Renovation, *Housing, Theory and Society*. Vol.38 (3), pp.365-380.
17
18 Chisholm E, Howden-Chapman P, and Fougere G, (2020): Tenants’ Responses to Substandard
19 Housing: Hidden and Invisible Power and the Failure of Rental Housing Regulation,
20 *Housing, Theory and Society* Vol.37, (2), pp.139-161.
21
22 Chisholm E, Howden-Chapman P, and Fougere G, (2016): The Application of Hirschman’s
23 Exit-Voice Framework to Housing Studies: A Review and Some Ways Forward,
24 *Housing, Theory and Society*, Vol.33, (4). Pp.381-402.
25
26 Cochran, W. G. 1963. Sampling Techniques, 2nd Ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
27
28 Cook, C. C., S. R. Crull, C. N. Fletcher, T. Hinnant-Bernard, and J. Peterson. 2002. “Meeting
29 Family Housing Needs: Experiences of Rural Women in the Midst of Welfare
30 Reform.” *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* Vol. 23 (3): pp. 285–316.
31
32
33
34
35
36 Dick, A.S. and Basu K. (1994), “Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual
37 Framework,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (2), 99-113.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Dubihlela D. and Dubihlela J (2014). Attributes of shopping mall image, customer satisfaction, and mall patronage for selected shopping malls in southern Gauteng, South Africa. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*. 6(8): 682-689.
- Fozdar, F., and Hartley, L. (2014): “Housing and the Creation of Home for Refugees in Western Australia.” *Housing, Theory and Society* Vol. 31 (2), pp. 148–173.
- Geuens, M., Brengman, M. and S’Jegers, R. (2001). An Exploratory Study of Grocery Shopping Motivations, *European Advances in Consumer Research* Vol 5, pages 135-140.
- Gips, M. A. (2002) "Options Reviewed for Federal Building Security." *Security Management* 46, (7) 14.
- Grineski, S. (2008): Childhood Asthma, Public Housing, and Environmental Control: Differences

- 1
2
3 between Families Renting with Section 8 Vouchers and Those Living in the Projects.”
4 *Journal of Poverty* Vol.12, (4): pp. 432–455.
5
6
7 Heinonen, K. (2006), “Temporal and spatial e-service value”, *International Journal of Service*
8 *Industry Management*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 380-400.
9
10 Hirschman, A (1970). Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations,
11 and States. United States of America: Harvard University Press.
12
13 Jamal, A and Naser K. (2002), “Customer Satisfaction and Retail Banking: An Assessment of
14 Some of the Key Antecedents of Customer Satisfaction in Retail Banking,” *International*
15 *Journal of Bank Marketing*, 20 (4), 146-160.
16
17
18 Kozlow, C, and John P. S. (2000): *Jane's Facility Security Handbook*. Alexandria, VA: Jane's
19 Information Group,
20
21
22 Lam, S.Y, Venkatesh S, M. Krishna E, and Bvsan M. (2004), “Customer Value, Satisfaction,
23 Loyalty and Switching Costs: An Illustration from a Business-to-Business Service
24 Context,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (3), 293-311.
25
26
27 Lister, D. 2004. “Young People’s Strategies for Managing Tenancy Relationships in the Private
28 Rented Sector.” *Journal of Youth Studies* Vol. 7 (3), pp. 315–330.
29
30
31 Oladapo R. A. and Adebayo M. A. (2014). Effects of housing facilities on residential satisfaction
32 in Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria. *Covenant Journal of Research in the Building*
33 *Environment*. 2(2): 165-190.
34
35
36 Oliver J and Peter J (2021): Testing Hirschman’s exit, voice, and loyalty model: citizen and
37 provider responses to decline in public health services, *International Public Management*
38 *Journal*, Vol.24(3), pp.378-393
39
40
41 Oliver, R.L., (1997), —Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer, in McMullan,
42 Rosalind and Gilmore, Audrey., (2003), —The Conceptual Development of Customer
43 Loyalty Measurement: A Proposed Scale, *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and*
44 *Analysis for Marketing*, Vol.11, No.3, pp. 230-243.
45
46
47
48 Oluwunmi A. O. (2014). Students' satisfaction with academic facilities in private universities in
49 Ogun State, Nigeria. Being an unpublished PhD thesis, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun
50 state.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Orel, F. D., & Kara, A. (2014). Supermarket self-checkout service quality, customer satisfaction,
4 and loyalty: Empirical evidence from an emerging market. *Journal of Retailing and*
5 *Consumer Services*, 21(2), 118-129.
6
7
8 Philips Consulting (2014). Online shopping report; a study of current trends in online shopping in
9 Nigeria.
10
11 Pitt M. and Musa Z.N. (2009). Towards defining shopping centres and their management systems.
12 *Journal of Retail and Leisure Property*. 8: 39-55
13
14 Pizam, A and Taylor, E. (1999), "Customer Satisfaction and its Measurement in Hospitality
15 Enterprises," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11 (7),
16 326-339.
17
18
19 Rahman, Z. (2004), "Developing Customer Oriented Service: A Case Study," *Managing Service*
20 *Quality*, 14 (5), 426-435.
21
22
23 Rampersad, H (2001), "75 Painful Questions about your Customer Satisfaction," *The TQM*
24 *Magazine*, 13 (5), 341-347.
25
26
27 Sankar A. R. N. (2005). Shopping Malls: A New Shopping Experience. ICMR Case Collection,
28 ICFAI Centre for Management Research.
29
30
31 Seiders, K., Berry, L.L. and Gresham, L.G. (2000), "Attention, retailers! How convenient is your
32 convenience strategy?" *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 79-89.
33
34
35 Seiders, K., Voss, G.B., Godfrey, A.L. and Grewal, D. (2007), "SERVCON: development and
36 validation of a multidimensional service convenience scale", *Journal of the Academy of*
37 *Marketing Science*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 144-156
38
39
40 Shemwell D. J., Yavas U. and Bilgin Z. (1998). Customer-service provider relationships: an
41 empirical test of a model of service quality, satisfaction and relationship-oriented outcome.
42 *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9: 155-168.
43
44
45 Singh H. (2006). The Importance of Customer Satisfaction in Relation to Customer Loyalty and
46 Retention,
47 <https://www.vanhaaften.nl/images/documents/pdf/The%20Importance%20of%20Customer%20Satisfaction%20in%20Relation%20to%20Customer%20Loyalty%20and%20Retention.pdf> pp 1-7.
48
49
50
51
52
53 Sujatha V. and Priya B. M. (2015). Factors determining tenants' satisfaction in shopping malls at
54 Chennai City: *Indian Journal of Research*, 4(2): 4-6.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tims, A. (2017) Spot check in public by Aldi security guard was dehumanising. The Guardian.
4 Retrieved 15th January 2022 from [https://www.theguardian.com/money/2017/jun/07/aldi-](https://www.theguardian.com/money/2017/jun/07/aldi-security-guard-spot-check-shopping)
5 security-guard-spot-check-shopping
6
7
8 Ubeja S. K. and Bedia D.D (2012). A study of consumer satisfaction from organized retailing with
9 reference to Indore City. *Prestige International Journal of Management and Research*.
10 4(2): 10-18.
11
12 Wang, Y and Lo, P. (2002), "Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Behavior Intentions:
13 Evidence from China"s Telecommunication Industry," *info*, 4 (6), 50-60.
14
15 Wolkowitz, D. (2002): "Facility Security Playing It Safe." *Area Development Site and Facility*
16 *Planning* 37, no. 9: 72.
17
18 Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, An Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row
19
20 Zagreus L., Huizenga C., Arens E. and Lehrer, D (2004). Listening to the occupants: a web-based
21 indoor environmental quality survey. *Indoor Air*. 14(8): 65-74.
22
23
24
25
26

27 APPENDIX

28 **Table 8: Likelihood Ratio Tests**

Effect	Model Fitting	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	Criteria			
	-2 Log-Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept	54.584 ^a	.000	0	.
Recommend	86.567 ^b	31.982	8	.000
Continued_Patronage	74.325 ^b	19.740	8	.011
Rather_patronize_another	90.180	35.596	12	.000

37
38
39
40
41
42
43 The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a
44 reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null
45 hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.

46
47 a. This reduced model is equivalent to the final model because omitting the effect does not
48 increase the degrees of freedom.

49
50 b. Unexpected singularities in the Hessian matrix are encountered. This indicates that either
51 some predictor variables should be excluded or some categories should be merged.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60