JHER Vol. 32 (2) December 2025, pp. 197 – 208

Perceived Impact of Insecurity on Hospitality and Tourism Patronage: A Case Study of Jos Metropolis

[1]Adebayo Ibidapo N., [2] Adedipe Abioye & [3]Orimaye Olakunle, M.
[1]Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Federal University Oye Ekiti, Ekiti State; [2]Department of Hospitality and Tourism, Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Abeokuta Ogun State
[3]Department of Wildlife and Ecotourism Management, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State
Corresponding Author: Ibidapo.adebayo@fuoye.edu.ng

Abstract

This study focused on perceived impact of insecurity on hospitality and tourism patronage in Jos Metropolis. Specifically, the study determined perceived way insecurity affects key patronage indicators; operation of major service domains; and stakeholders' strategies for mitigating insecurity-related challenges. Population was made up of employers in the hotel industry and community members. Data were collected with questionnaire and analysed using means, and independent-samples t-tests. Results show a moderate-to-strong perceived impact of insecurity ($\overline{X}_g$= 3.80). Patronage was most affected for booking cancellations ($\overline{X}_g$= 4.20among others. Operational disruptions were most pronounced in reception, e.g., increased wait times, ($\overline{X}_g$ = 4.07), dining (limited menu options) ($\overline{X}_g$ = 4.05) and accommodation (room access controls) ($\overline{X}_g$ = 4.22). Twenty strategies for mitigating insecurity related challenges were identified, including: training and communication measures (safety-awareness training and guest briefings $\overline{X}_g$=4.56; incident reporting ($\overline{X}_g$=4.42); security alerts ($\overline{X}_g$=4.50). four recommendations were made based on the findings.

Keywords: Insecurity, Hospitality, Tourism, Patronage, Operational challenges, Security Measures, Safety Perceptions, Jos Metropolis.

Introduction

The hospitality and tourism industry is an important economic sector in Jos Metropolis, providing accommodation, food and beverage, conference and recreation services that support business travel, domestic tourism, and local social events. Jos's accommodation stock is heterogeneous: it ranges from international-standard hotels and upper mid-scale properties (commonly characterized as 4–5 star establishments) through mid-tier and economy hotels (3-star and 2-star categories) to small guesthouses, motels and budget lodgings that serve transient and price-sensitive markets. Hotels in the metropolis routinely host government delegations, corporate visitors, conference and event attendees, and leisure travellers who visit for the Plateau's cultural attractions and seasonal festivals. Beyond lodging, hotels

perform wider socio-economic functions, hosting meetings and weddings, employing local labour, sourcing food and services, and serving as informal community hubs, so disturbances to hotel operations have multiplier effects on local livelihoods.

In recent years Jos Metropolis has experienced episodes of insecurity that affect public perception of safety and the practical operation of hospitality businesses. Such insecurity is expressed through criminal incidents, sporadic communal unrest and heightened threat perceptions among potential guests. Empirical work in Nigeria has shown that perceived insecurity reduces tourist intention to visit, lowers occupancy levels, and forces hotels to alter service provision (Ajayi et al., 2022; Oladehinde et al., 2024; Oladele et al., 2023). Studies elsewhere similarly document that insecurity compels hotels to adopt restrictive operational responses, curtailed opening hours, reduced leisure programming, intensified entrance checks, and simplified food service, which can diminish the attractiveness of establishments and depress revenue (Cruz-Milán, 2022; Agbebi, 2023). Research on perceived risk also indicates that consumers weigh safety heavily when making travel and accommodation decisions; higher perceived risk reduces bookings, referrals and spontaneous patronage (Chen, 2023; Pizam et al., 2024; Tan et al., 2021).

Jos Metropolis presents specific contextual factors that amplify the relevance of this inquiry. The city's mixed urban morphology, a combination of central business districts, government offices, and dispersed residential communities, means that perceived safety is influenced by both proximate incidents and wider transport and access vulnerabilities (Akinruwa, 2023; Usman & Ogbole, 2023). Hotel managers report operational strains from security checks, supply-chain interruptions and staffing challenges; community actors report limited mechanisms for information sharing and incident reporting. Recent local findings further highlight these problems: the present study's survey indicates that a majority of respondents perceive insecurity as negatively affecting hotel patronage, that service quality is often compromised under insecure conditions, and that provision of formal security training by proprietors is limited. These patterns mirror accounts from other Nigerian cities (Stella et al., 2022; Udodiugwu & Okafor, 2021) and underscore the need for context-sensitive, evidence-based responses.

Beyond describing the problem, the literature points to a suite of mitigation approaches. Integrated strategies that combine technology (non-intrusive surveillance, contactless processing), staff capacity building (safety-awareness and emergency drills), transparent communication (timely security alerts for guests), and community-level engagement (reporting channels, local watch collaborations) show promise in restoring consumer confidence while preserving service standards (Agbebi, 2023; Cruz-Milán, 2022; Oladele et al.,

2023). However, the effectiveness and acceptability of specific measures vary by locale and by stakeholder group; management decisions that work in one city or hotel class may be inappropriate or infeasible in another (Majebi et al., 2023; Oladehinde et al., 2024). Consequently, localized empirical evidence from Jos, which captures perspectives from both employers in the hotel industry and community members, is necessary to tailor interventions that are operationally viable and socially acceptable.

Objectives of the Study

This study focused on perceived impact of insecurity on hospitality and tourism industry in Jos Metropolis. Specifically, the study determined:

1. perceived way insecurity impacts key patronage indicators (booking cancellations, walk-in patronage, length of stay), in the hospitality and tourism industry.
2. perceived ways insecurity impacts major service domains of the hospitality and tourism industry (reception, dining/restaurant, bar, kitchen, accommodation and recreation).
3. strategies for mitigating insecurity-related challenges within the hospitality and tourism industry.

Hypotheses (HOs)

The following HOs were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

There are no significance differences in the mean rsponses of the hotel employers and community members on:

HO_1: perceived way insecurity impacts key patronage indicators hospitality industry**.**

HO_2: perceived ways insecurity impacts major service domains of hospitality industry.

HO_3: strategies for mitigating insecurity-related challenges within the hospitality industry.

Methodology

***Design of the Study*:** Survey design was employed.

***Area of the Study*:** The study was conducted in Jos Metropolis, Plateau State, Nigeria. It is a state capital and regional urban centre with a heterogeneous accommodation stock that includes international-standard and upper mid-scale hotels (4–5 star), mid-scale hotels (3 star), lower-scale hotels (2 star) and numerous guesthouses and budget lodgings. According to the Plateau State Tourism Board (personal communication, July 2024), approximately 120 registered accommodation establishments operate in the metropolis, employing an estimated 2,000–2,500 staff. Recent episodes of local insecurity and the city's mixed urban morphology make Jos an appropriate context for this investigation.

***Population for the Study*:** Study population comprised two principal groups directly relevant to hotel operations and patronage in Jos Metropolis; namely employers in the hotel industry and community members. Employers industry included proprietors, hotel/general managers, departmental

heads (reception, food & beverage, security) and frontline staff (receptionists, servers, kitchen staff, security officers). According to Plateau State Tourism Board Registry (Researchers' Personal Communication, July 2024), there are approximately 120 registered accommodation establishments in the area. Each establishment was expected to one manager/proprietor; three departmental heads; 10 frontline staff. These gave an estimated population of 1680 employers.

Community members comprised three subgroups: adult residents, frequent hotel patrons and local leaders. Adult residents are adult (≥18 years) represent the demand-side community context; frequent hotel patrons were adults who had used hotel accommodation or hotel services in Jos at least three times during the previous 12 months; local leaders included elected ward representatives, leaders of neighbourhood associations and members of ward-level safety committees; with estimated population sizes of 54000, 27000 and 150 respectively, giving a total of estimated 567, 150 community members.

***Sample for the Study*:** A total of 30 hotels purposively selected out of 120 existing hotels in the area. These include: eight high-end (4–5 star), 12 mid-scale (3 star), and 10 budget/guesthouses (1–2 star) hotels. Employee selection was random and proportional to hotel size (1–2 employees from smaller properties; 2–3 from larger hotels). This produced A sample of 75 (30 managers/proprietors and 45 employees.

A sample of 60 community members were purposively selected from 10 wards in the area of the study. This was made up 40 adult residents, 15 frequent patrons, and five local leaders.

***Instrument for Data Collection*:** Data were collected using questionnaire that was developed based on the objectives of the study and extensive review of literature. It comprised sections on demographics; perceived insecurity; ten patronage indicators; operational impacts across five service domains (reception, dining/restaurant, bar, kitchen, accommodation and recreation); and stakeholder mitigation strategies. Items used a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The instrument was validated by three university expetts in Hospitality management. Twenty copies of the instrument was pilot-testedon 20 respondents outside the area of the study. Data obtained were used to establish reliability of the instrument using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded rehabilitee coefficients of 0.70.

***Data Collection Methods*:** A total of 135 of questionnaire (75 and 60 copies to employers and community members with respectively) were distributed by hand with the help of four trained research assistants. Only 130 copies (70 from employers and 60 from community members) were retrieved. This represents 96.30 percent return.

***Data Analysis Techniques*:** Data were analysed using mean ($\overline{X}$) and standard deviation (SD). Also t-test was used to test

hypotheses (HOs) at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Table 1: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impacts Key Patronage Indicators in Hospitality Industry in Jos Metropolis

S/N	Patronage indicators	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Decision
1	Booking cancellations	4.17	0.99	4.24	0.70	4.20	-0.48	NS
2	Advance booking of rooms	3.72	0.76	3.89	0.74	3.80	-1.30	NS
3	Walk-in patronage	4.10	0.82	3.90	0.75	4.00	1.29	NS
4	Length of stay	3.45	1.02	3.55	0.98	3.50	-0.61	NS
5	Repeat visits (return rate)	3.79	0.87	4.01	0.92	3.90	-1.55	NS
6	Average spend per guest	3.62	0.92	3.78	0.94	3.70	-1.30	NS
7	Room-upgrade requests	3.96	0.78	4.27	1.02	4.10	-1.93	NS
8	Referral of others	3.79	0.83	3.38	0.98	3.60	2.53	S
9	No-show rate	3.55	1.06	3.22	0.73	3.40	2.06	S
10	Group bookings	3.62	0.77	4.02	1.05	3.80	-2.44	S

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 1 shows a generally moderate–to–strong perceived effect of insecurity across ten patronage indicators ($\bar{X}_g$ = 3.4–4.2), with the largest impacts reported for booking cancellations ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.20), room-upgrade requests ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.10) and walk-in patronage ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.00). These high scores indicate that both planned and spontaneous revenue streams are vulnerable when security is questioned. While most indicators show no significant difference between employers and community respondents, three items do diverge: employers report greater perceived effects on referral behaviour and no-show rates, whereas community respondents perceive group bookings to be more affected.

Table 2: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impact Reception Operations

S/N	**Perceived Effects on Reception Operations.**	**$\bar{X}_1$**	**SD_1**	**$\bar{X}_2$**	**SD_2**	**$\bar{X}_g$**	**t-cal**	**Decision**
1	Delayed check-in due to security screening	3.87	0.76	3.62	0.89	3.75	1.85	NS
2	Increased guest wait time	3.97	0.82	4.10	0.75	4.03	-1.10	NS
3	Enhanced (Personal identification) ID verification	4.12	0.68	3.98	0.71	4.05	1.32	NS
4	Additional baggage screening	3.78	0.81	3.85	0.88	3.81	-0.58	NS
5	Restricted lobby access	4.05	0.74	4.00	0.79	4.03	0.44	NS
6	Security signage at entrance	3.92	0.69	3.88	0.72	3.90	0.36	NS

Table 2 Continued

7	Guest escort requirements	3.85	0.77	3.90	0.83	3.87	-0.46	NS
8	Frequent security announcements	3.70	0.85	3.75	0.90	3.72	-0.46	NS
9	Temporary reception closures	3.60	0.88	3.55	0.92	3.58	0.26	NS
10	Background checks for new staff	4.00	0.71	4.05	0.68	4.02	-0.55	NS
11	Visitor log maintenance	3.82	0.79	3.78	0.82	3.80	0.27	NS
12	Enhanced (Closed-circuit television (CCTV) presence	4.10	0.65	4.05	0.69	4.08	0.52	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 2 shown reception items register some of the highest grand means in the study (enhanced CCTV ($\bar{X}_g$= 4.08); increased guest wait time ($\bar{X}_g$= 4.03), signalling widespread recognition that front-desk security measures materially slow arrival procedures and alter the check-in experience. Background checks and visitor-log maintenance ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.02 and 3.80 respectively) further indicate that personnel vetting and record-keeping are seen as routine responses to insecurity. The lack of significant group differences reflects a broad consensus that reception is a primary locus of security-driven operational change.

Table 3: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impact Dining/Restaurant Operations

S/N	Perceived Impact on Dinning/Restsurant Operations.	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Decision
1	Limited buffet options	4.05	0.72	3.98	0.78	4.02	0.75	NS
2	Reserved seating for security checks	3.85	0.81	3.90	0.85	3.87	-0.46	NS
3	Increased food safety inspections	3.95	0.88	3.99	0.82	3.97	-0.48	NS
4	Staff security briefings before service	4.10	0.67	4.05	0.70	4.08	0.52	NS
5	Reduced operating hours	4.15	0.74	4.20	0.69	4.17	-0.59	NS
6	Menu simplification	4.00	0.79	3.95	0.83	3.98	0.55	NS
7	Temporary kitchen lockdown drills	3.75	0.85	3.70	0.89	3.73	0.40	NS
8	Guest screening before entry	3.90	0.77	3.85	0.81	3.88	0.49	NS
9	Restricted group dining	3.80	0.82	3.75	0.86	3.78	0.45	NS
10	Security personnel in dining area	4.02	0.70	4.00	0.73	4.01	0.28	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

As shown in Table 3, the dining-related items also show elevated grand means, with reduced operating hours ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.17), staff security briefings ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.08) and limited buffet options ($\bar{X}_g$ = 4.02) most prominent. There are no significant differences in the responses of the two groups. This suggests shared recognition of these adaptations and the potential trade-offs between safety and guest experience.

Table 4: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impact Bar Operations

S/N	Perceived Impact on Bar Operation	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Deci
1	Strict guest ID protocols	3.85	0.79	3.90	0.81	3.87	-0.49	NS
2	Limited operating hours	4.20	0.68	4.25	0.65	4.22	-0.59	NS
3	Visible security personnel	3.90	0.75	3.85	0.78	3.88	0.46	NS
4	Search on entry	3.95	0.82	3.90	0.84	3.93	0.47	NS
5	Suspension of live entertainment	4.00	0.73	4.05	0.70	4.02	-0.52	NS
6	Reduced drink menu	4.10	0.71	4.05	0.74	4.08	0.53	NS
7	Secure transaction methods	3.88	0.80	3.85	0.82	3.87	0.29	NS
8	Enhanced lighting for surveillance	4.05	0.69	4.00	0.72	4.03	0.53	NS
9	Restricted guest capacity	4.00	0.74	3.95	0.77	3.98	0.50	NS
10	Evacuation drills in bar area	3.80	0.83	3.75	0.86	3.78	0.45	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 4 shows that bar operations record some of the highest domain scores (limited operating hours ($\bar{X}_g$=4.22); reduced drink menu ($\bar{X}_g$=4.08); suspension of entertainment ($\bar{X}_g$=4.02), reflecting the acute vulnerability of social and nightlife offerings to insecurity. Such measures are likely to depress evening revenue and the social ambiance that drives repeat patronage.

Table 5: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impact Kitchen Operations

S/N	Perceived Impact on Kitchen Operation	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Decis
1	Supply delivery security checks	3.90	0.77	3.95	0.79	3.92	-0.51	NS
2	Staff screening before shifts	3.85	0.82	3.80	0.85	3.83	0.47	NS
3	Restricted kitchen access	4.00	0.74	3.95	0.76	3.98	0.53	NS
4	Emergency exit drills	3.78	0.80	3.75	0.83	3.77	0.28	NS
5	Inventory inspections for contraband	3.88	0.79	3.85	0.82	3.87	0.26	NS
6	Temporary suspension of open kitchens	4.05	0.71	4.00	0.73	4.03	0.53	NS
7	Increased storage security	3.92	0.75	3.88	0.78	3.90	0.29	NS
8	Security briefings before prep	3.85	0.80	3.80	0.83	3.83	0.48	NS
9	Controlled visitor access	3.82	0.82	3.78	0.85	3.80	0.33	NS
10	Secure waste disposal procedures	3.88	0.79	3.85	0.82	3.87	0.26	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 5 shows kitchen items indicate important logistical pressures: temporary suspension of open kitchens ($\overline{X}_g$=4.03) and supply-delivery security checks ($\overline{X}_g$=3.92) are prominent, pointing to disruptions in input flows and service formats. Mid-range scores on staff screening and storage security ($\overline{X}_g$=3.8–3.9) suggest routine intensification of internal controls that can raise operating complexity and labour demands. The absence of significant group differences implies shared awareness of these operational vulnerabilities.

Table 6: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Perceived Ways Insecurity Impact Accommodation and Recreation

S/N	Percevied Impact on Accomdation and Recreation	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Decision
1	Room access control measures	4.10	0.68	4.15	0.70	4.12	-0.43	NS
2	Elevator security procedures	3.75	0.92	3.80	0.95	3.78	-0.31	NS
3	In-room emergency communication	3.85	0.88	3.90	0.90	3.88	-0.32	NS
4	Closure of recreational facilities	4.05	0.85	4.10	0.88	4.08	-0.45	NS
5	Restricted pool access	4.00	0.72	4.05	0.75	4.02	-0.42	NS
6	Escort for late-night movement	3.90	0.80	3.85	0.82	3.88	0.36	NS
7	Secure parking protocols	4.00	0.74	4.05	0.76	4.02	-0.37	NS
8	Enhanced door lock systems	4.12	0.66	4.08	0.68	4.10	0.48	NS
9	Security patrols around property	4.05	0.70	4.00	0.72	4.03	0.53	NS
10	Timed access to gym facilities	3.85	0.82	3.80	0.85	3.83	0.36	NS
11	Digital key verification	4.00	0.69	4.05	0.71	4.02	-0.37	NS
12	Safety signage in corridors	3.95	0.75	3.90	0.78	3.93	0.32	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 6 shows that accommodation and recreation record the highest and most consistent grand means across domains (room access controls $\overline{X}_g$= 4.12); closure of recreational facilities ($\overline{X}_g$=4.08); enhanced door locks ($\overline{X}_g$=4.10), indicating that guest mobility, amenity availability and perceived in-room safety are heavily affected. These visible changes to guest movement and facility access are likely to shape overall satisfaction and perceived value, especially for leisure clientele.

Table 7: Mean Responses, Standard Deviation and t-test Results on Stakeholder Strategies for Mitigating Insecurity-Related Challenges

S/N	Responsibility item	$\bar{X}_1$	SD_1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD_2	$\bar{X}_g$	t-cal	Decision
1	Conduct routine security drills	3.01	0.99	2.99	0.68	3.00	0.14	NS
2	Install CCTV cameras	3.18	0.90	3.06	0.72	3.12	0.84	NS
3	Liaise with local police	3.15	0.73	3.09	0.85	3.12	0.43	NS
4	Offer safety-awareness training to staff	4.57	0.89	4.55	0.53	4.56	0.16	NS
5	Develop emergency evacuation plans	3.34	0.56	3.38	0.83	3.36	-0.32	NS
6	Provide first-aid training	3.76	0.67	3.72	0.59	3.74	0.32	NS
7	Implement guest verification protocols	3.82	0.75	3.78	0.70	3.80	0.28	NS
8	Maintain incident reporting logs	4.44	0.58	4.40	0.66	4.42	0.29	NS
9	Coordinate with community watch groups	3.87	0.82	3.83	0.71	3.85	0.28	NS
10	Upgrade perimeter fencing	3.24	0.77	3.28	0.80	3.26	-0.29	NS
11	Allocate budget for security equipment	4.14	0.69	4.10	0.75	4.12	0.32	NS
12	Organize neighborhood safety forums	4.14	0.62	4.10	0.68	4.12	0.33	NS
13	Deploy metal detectors at entrances	3.49	0.85	3.45	0.78	3.47	0.29	NS
14	Enforce bag-check policies	2.94	0.88	2.90	0.81	2.92	0.31	NS
15	Share security alerts with guests	4.52	0.71	4.48	0.65	4.50	0.30	NS
16	Engage guests in safety briefings	4.57	0.79	4.55	0.58	4.56	0.14	NS
17	Conduct background checks on new hires	3.76	0.83	3.72	0.77	3.74	0.29	NS
18	Collaborate on public safety campaigns	3.82	0.90	3.78	0.85	3.80	0.28	NS
19	Ensure clear evacuation signage	3.67	0.71	3.63	0.69	3.65	0.29	NS
20	Monitor social media for threat alerts	4.48	0.65	4.44	0.72	4.46	0.27	NS

N_1 (Number of Employers) = 70; N_2 (Number of Community Members) = 60; $\bar{X}_1$ = Mean of Employer; SD_1 = Standard Deviation of Employer; $\bar{X}_2$ = Mean of Community Members; SD2 = Standard Deviation of Community Mmebers; $\bar{X}_g$ = Grand Mean; t-cal = Calculated t-test result; df (Degree of Freedom) = 128; Critcal t = 1.98; S = Significance at 0.05 level of significance; NS = Not Significance.

Table 7 shows strong, convergent support for training and communication measures (safety-awareness training and guest briefings ($\bar{X}_g$= 4.56; incident reporting ($\bar{X}_g$= 4.42; sharing alerts ($\bar{X}_g$=4.50; social-media monitoring ($\bar{X}_g$=4.46), indicating stakeholders prefer proactive, informational and capacity-building responses. Lower support for bag-checks and perimeter fencing ($\bar{X}g \approx 2.92$ and 3.26) suggests concern about intrusive measures or cost/feasibility. The overall lack of significant group differences reinforces a cross-sector consensus that training, transparent communication and

coordinated community approaches should be prioritised in mitigation plans.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that insecurity exerts a clear and measurable deterrent effect on patronage behaviours in Jos Metropolis, a pattern consistent with evidence from other Nigerian contexts. High grand means for booking cancellations, room-upgrade requests and walk-in patronage indicate that spontaneous and premium purchasing behaviours are especially sensitive to safety perceptions, corroborating reports of occupancy declines in insecure environments (Ajayi et al., 2022; Oladele et al., 2023). The results accord with perceived-risk and behavioural-reasoning perspectives, which posit that potential guests weight safety concerns heavily when forming travel and booking intentions (Chen, 2023; Tan et al., 2021; Pizam et al., 2024). The observed significant group differences on referral behaviour, no-show rates and group bookings reveal that employers and community respondents hold subtly different risk appraisals—a finding that echoes local studies suggesting heterogeneity in stakeholder perceptions (Akinruwa, 2023; Majebi et al., 2023). Practically, these results suggest that revenue protection strategies should prioritise flexible booking policies, targeted reassurance messaging, and incentive structures for advance and group bookings to counteract the most affected patronage segments.

At the operational level, insecurity produces pervasive adjustments across service domains. Reception bottlenecks (enhanced CCTV, longer wait times), constrained dining offerings (reduced hours, menu simplification), curtailed bar activities (limited hours, suspended entertainment), kitchen disruptions (delivery screening, suspension of open kitchens) and restrictive accommodation measures (room access controls, facility closures) all registered elevated grand means (Tables 2–6). These operational adaptations are consistent with empirical work showing that security measures slow service flows and increase operating complexity (Oladehinde et al., 2024; Cruz-Milán, 2022; Stella Chinelo et al., 2022). From an organizational resilience standpoint, such adaptations represent legitimate protective responses but carry trade-offs for service quality and guest satisfaction (Agbebi, 2023; Udodiugwu & Okafor, 2021). The absence of widespread group differences suggests broad consensus about the types of operational pressures hotels face. However, absent a cost-benefit appraisal, managers remain uncertain which combinations of interventions (e.g., visible screening vs. contactless technologies) yield the best safety–service balance; this gap mirrors calls in the literature for economic evaluation of security investments (Oladehinde et al., 2024; Oloyede et al., 2024).

Stakeholder preferences for mitigation emphasise training and communication: safety-awareness training, guest briefings, incident logging, security alerts and social

media monitoring recorded the highest grand means (Table 7). This multi-layered preference structure aligns with stakeholder and governance perspectives that advocate coordinated public–private–community responses to crises (Majebi et al., 2023; Usman & Ogbole, 2023). Management's prioritisation of equipment budgets and community forum organisation further resonates with studies that highlight the complementary roles of infrastructure and local engagement in restoring confidence (Agbebi, 2023; Pizam et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the study did not examine potential impediments to implementation—resource constraints, competing priorities, or inter-stakeholder mistrust—which the literature identifies as common barriers (Majebi et al., 2023; Egbuna et al., 2025).

Conclusion

Insecurity in Jos Metropolis substantially reduces hospitality patronage and disrupts core service domains, notably bookings, walk-ins and reception, dining and accommodation operations. Employers and community members largely agree on these impacts and on preferred mitigation measures—particularly training, transparent communication and incident reporting—although differences exist for referral behaviour, no-shows and group bookings. Gaps in proprietor-led training and community awareness remain. The findings call for adaptive operational changes, targeted technology adoption, and coordinated stakeholder engagement, alongside future evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of security investments and ongoing monitoring of local perceptions.

Recommendations

1. Increased staffing at reception desks during peak hours and the deployment of advanced, contactless screening technologies to ease bottlenecks while maintaining security standards.
2. Strategic reduction in menu options to streamline kitchen operations and a flexible adjustment of bar operating hours based on real-time risk assessments.
3. Contingency plans with suppliers to ensure consistent delivery of essential items and regular emergency preparedness training for hospitality staff to improve response to crises.
4. Designated communication officers to share security updates with guests professionally and the unobtrusive integration of visible security infrastructure to enhance guest comfort and safety.

References

Agbebi, P. A. (2023). Apparent Control Measures of Tourism and Hospitality Practitioners to Curb Insecurity in Ogun State Southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences and Environmental Management*, *27*(2), 209-216.

Ajayi, E. A., Ojo, S. S., Jimoh, D. M., & Chinansa, J. (2022). Evaluating the effects of insecurity on the hospitality industry in northern Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, *10*(2), 51-58.

Akinruwa, T. E. (2023). Location: an antecedent factor of customer patronage

among selected hotels in southwest, Nigeria. *Acu Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, *4*(1).

Chen, W. J. (2023). The Relationship between a Hotel's Safe Image and Tourists' Patronage Intention under the Threat of COVID-19.

Cruz-Milán, O. (2022). Hotels' marketing mix responses at insecurity-stricken destinations: a study in the US–Mexico border. *International Hospitality Review*, *36*(1), 131-155.

Egbuna, A., Eyisi, A. P., Ololo, N. G., Okonkwo, E., & Uzuegbu, J. (2025). Impact of Insecurity on the Hospitality Industry: A Study of selected Hotels in Nnewi Town of Anambra State, Nigeria. *Nsukka Journal of the Humanities*, *33*(1), 115-134.

Etehadi, B., & Karatepe, O. M. (2019). The impact of job insecurity on critical hotel employee outcomes: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *28*(6), 665-689.

Majebi, E. C., Adesina-UTHMAN, G. A., Adedokun-Fagbolu, O. D., & Obaka, A. I. (2023). Stakeholders' Perception of Socioeconomic Implications of Crises on Tourism in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Sociological Research and Innovation*, *1*(1).

Oladehinde, G. J., Oladele, A. F., Adeniyi, L. A., Oladeji, P. B., & Ogungbe, M. A. (2024). Crime Occurrence and Hotel Operating Performance: An Empirical Investigation in Ibadan M unicipality, Nigeria. *International Journal of Tourism Business Research*, *3*(2), 199-225.

Oladele, A. F., Oladehinde, G. J., Adeniyi, A. L., & Lawal, O. L. (2023). Feelings of insecurity in hotels and host communities, Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, *22*.

Oloyede, A. O., Ajani, F., Odekanmi, A., Saka, A. B., & Samuel, T. Y. (2024). Assessing the Factors Affecting Hotel Management in Ikire, Osun State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *12*(2), 57-70.

Pizam, A., Ozturk, A. B., Hacikara, A., Zhang, T., Balderas-Cejudo, A., Buhalis, D., ... & State, O. (2024). The role of perceived risk and information security on customers' acceptance of service robots in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *117*, 103641.

Stella Chinelo, N., Priscilla Chinyere, I., & Ifeoma Pethronila, O. (2022). Insecurity in Nigeria and business sustainability in selected hotels in Awka. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, *6*(3), 1571-1580.

Tan, L. L., Abd Aziz, N., & Ngah, A. H. (2021). Examining green hotel patronage intention from the perspective of behavioural reasoning theory. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *22*(2), 901-921.

Thiong'o, S., Rop, W., & Akunja, L. (2022). Insecurity impacts, effects and implications for the Tourism industry–a survey of selected incidences of terrorism, and safety issues during election years in Kenya. *Journal of Tourism Quarterly*, *4*(1-2), 21-37.

Udodiugwu, M. I., & Okafor, J. N. (2021). Security and sustainability of hospitality industry in Awka south local government area of Anambra state, Nigeria. *Journal of the Management Sciences (JOMAS)*, *57*, 63.

Usman, J. G., & Ogbole, J. E. (2023). Geospatial analysis of insecurity and its threat on road transportation in Kaduna state Nigeria. *Fudma Journal of Sciences*, *7*(4), 369-373.