INDIAN JOURNAL OF
ENGINEERING

18(50), 2021

To Cite:
Njoku I, Udoka CG. Customers' Expectations and Perceptions of Airport Service Quality Performance in Murtala Muhammed International Airport, Lagos, Nigeria. *Indian Journal of Engineering*, 2021, 18(50), 381-390

Author Affiliation:
[1]Department of Logistics and Transport Technology, Federal University of Technology Akure, Nigeria
E-mail of the author: injoku@futa.edu.ng
Phone number: 08036645117
[2]Department of Logistics and Transport Technology, Federal University of Technology Akure, Nigeria

Peer-Review History
Received: 08 September 2021
Reviewed & Revised: 10/September/2021 to 03/October/2021
Accepted: 04 October 2021
Published: October 2021

Peer-Review Model
External peer-review was done through double-blind method.

DISCOVERY
SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY

Customers' Expectations and Perceptions of Airport Service Quality Performance in Murtala Muhammed International Airport, Lagos, Nigeria

Ikpechukwu Njoku[1], **Chike Godwin Udoka**[2]

ABSTRACT

Expectations assessment is more critical when it comes to airport services. Hence, in this study, customers' expectations and their perceptions of airport service quality and/or performance in Murtala Muhammed International Airport (MMIA), Lagos, was examined. The study involved the use of primary data. Taro Yamane formula was used to generate the sample size and 400 copies of questionnaire was administered via systematic random sampling technique to the passengers at the airport. Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 was used for the data analysis which involved descriptive statistics, factor analysis and independent sample t-test. It was noted that most expectations were placed on service attributes such as; overall satisfaction with the airport, cleanliness of restrooms, feeling of being safe, cleanliness of airport terminal and availability of restrooms. Service attributes that scored high performance includes availability of banking facilities and passport and visa inspection while the service attribute of phone/internet/IT facilities performed low. The significance (significant level ≤ 0.05) between the genders was examined using t-test and it revealed a high significance in the perception of male and female respondents on expectations and performance. The results therefore indicated that the female respondents' perception on expectations and performance of these services was higher than that of the male respondents' perception. The values of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for airport service quality expectations is 0.923 while 0.928 is for performance. Whereas Bartlett's Test of Sphericity values are 5701.461 and 5299.519 with both p=0.000, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis, also with Eigen values of 1.714 and 1.464 respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that customers' expectations were not exceeded.

Keywords: Airport; Service Quality; Expectation and Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Air transport, airport infrastructure, efficient and safe airline services and worldwide air transport networks are essential to sustain tourism (Lohmann & Duval, 2015). In 2014, over half of all international tourists (54%) travelled by air (UNWTO, 2015). Air transport has a major impact on a destination's economy, including the tourism sector and vice versa (Lian & Denstadli, 2010). Doganis (1992) defines airports as "a complex of runways and buildings for the take-off, landing, and maintenance of civil aircraft, with facilities for passengers and freight". He further classified the wide range of services and facilities provided by an airport into three categories: essential operational services, traffic-handling services and commercial activities. The airport is not a destination for tourists travelling by air but rather a transition point (Fodness & Murray, 2007). Even while the airport brings more customers and consequently higher profits for the management, certain problems might be generated as well, such as the airport's distraction from concentrating on passengers' expectations, satisfaction and thinking about short and mid-term commercial income.

Lewis (1993) defines service quality as the extent to which delivered service matches customer expectations. Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1988), who did pioneering work on service quality assessment, recognise service quality as a gap between customers' expectations and their perceptions of service performance. In general, expectations are assessed as if they are met or not. The same goes with meeting or exceeding customer expectations. Service expectations are defined by Parasuraman et al (1994) as what a service should be while Zeithaml, Bitner & Gremler (2006) argues that it is a combination of can be and should be. Bebko (2000) concludes that the service provider should figure out what the expectations are and what level of quality customers expect from the firm then try to meet or exceed these expectations. To be able to measure service quality, it is fundamental to assess whether or not the service provider is providing the customers with what they expect (Douglas & Connor, 2003). Expectations set the standards that form customers' evaluation of service quality and it is vital to understand those of customers (Walker & Baker, 2000). Customer satisfaction is a psychological concept that engages the emotion or welfare and delight as the consequence of what is achieved or anticipated from a product and/or service. It can also be described as a person's feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction resulting from comparing a product's performance with respect to his/her expectations (Kotler, Bloom & Hayes, 2002).

According to Yang (2003) the characteristics of service (i.e. intangibility, inseparability, heterogeneity and perishability) make the evaluation of service quality difficult. In order to understand service expectations and its effect on service quality, it is imperative to know how services differ from products. The experience of a service is vital because a satisfying result has been promised in advance and should be achieved during delivery. Due to the effect of these characteristics and the named differences with products, consumers have a more difficult time evaluating services than products. Hence, expectations assessment is more critical when it comes to services (Walker & Baker, 2000; Bebko, 2000). Understanding service quality involves recognizing the characteristics of service which are intangibility, heterogeneity and inseparability (Ladhari, 2009). This makes it easy to measure service quality. Therefore, the expectation of customer serves as a footing for evaluating quality of service and as such, quality is high when performance exceeds expectation and quality is low when performance does not meet their expectation (Asubonteng et al., 1996). Thus, expectation could be seen as desires or wants of consumer i.e., what they feel a service provider should offer instead of what he would offer (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Conceptually, the dimensions of airport service quality are servicescape, service personnel and services (Fodness & Murray, 2007). Using an airport as an example, signs and symbols, coupled with other facilities and overall setting of the terminal altogether create a servicescape. Since airports demand passengers' physical presence, the physical environment of the airport can affect passengers' perceptions of the overall quality of the service rendered. Service personnel are the second influence of service quality where customers interact with the service personnel. Fodness & Murray (2007) identified three elements of this dimension which includes behavior, attitudes and expertise. The behavior and attitude of an airport employee are based on five measurements (i.e. tangibles, responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy). Services can be defined as any activities that the airport offers in order to facilitate travelers' choice in spending their waiting time inside the departure lounge (Widarsyah, 2013). Therefore, airport facilities have a major influence on customers' perceptions of the quality of the service rendered.

As airlines and airports transition to a deregulated environment where more commercial and privatized market-lead approaches are the norm (Spasojevic, Lohmann & Scott, 2018), it is expected that studies will have more emphasis on acquiring knowledge on the expectations and performance of quality of service in airports. However, there has been several studies on airport service quality (Fodness & Murray, 2007; Jagoda & Vajira, 2008; Hildur, 2009; Rossi, 2010; Lubbe et al., 2011; Kashif et al., 2012; Bogicevic et al., 2013; Ching, 2014; Yang et al., 2015; Hoang et al., 2016; Malik, 2017); very few empirical research has focused on investigating passengers' expectations and performance of service quality in Nigeria. Therefore, the lack of this knowledge has been identified as a significant barrier to the future growth of the aviation industry, since almost no study has carried out the

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 | OPEN ACCESS

expectations and performance of service quality in MMIA, Lagos, Nigeria. Thus, the purpose of this research is to examine customers' expectations and their perceptions of airport service quality performance in this Airport.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Sources of Data

Primary data was employed for analysis in this work. This was obtained through the administration of questionnaire on respondents which reflects their opinion on expectations and perceptions of airport service quality. In essence the questionnaire was used to elicit relevant information from the respondents.

2.2. Data Analysis Methods

The data set was analyzed by the use of two approaches namely; the Descriptive Statistics and Inferential Statistics. While the inferential statistics like sample t-test was employed to analyze the formulated hypothesis, the factor analysis was also use to analyse the variables.

2.3. Factor Analysis

A principal component analysis was conducted on the 28 variables which addressed expectations and performance of airport service quality to ensure that the variables were not inter-correlated and that the variables were grouped properly. For data to be appropriate for factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) value is 0.6 or more and that the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value is significant at 0.05 or less. Hence, both tools were applied to test for inter-correlation of data.

2.4. Data Estimation

To analyze the questionnaires, the data set was estimated by carrying out the following tests; descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test and factor analysis were employed. While independent sample t-test was used to assess whether the mean of two groups was statistically different, factor analysis was performed to ensure that the variables used in this study were not inter-correlated and that these variables were grouped properly.

2.5. Test of Hypothesis

The hypothesis formulated was tested with an independent sample t-test; this is used when one wants to compare the mean scores on some continuous variable for two different groups of participants. Thus, the T-test statistics is used to assess whether the mean of two groups statistically differ from each other. The formula for student's t-test is shown below:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{S^2\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} \quad \ldots. \quad \ldots. \quad \ldots. \quad \ldots. \quad (1)$$

Where,

t = t-value

x_1 and x_2 = means of the two groups being compared

S^2 = pooled standard error of the two groups

n_1 and n_2 = number of observations in each of the groups.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research was carried out using questionnaires to investigate passengers' perception of service quality of airport in the different service attributes. The passengers were asked to evaluate 28 attributes designed to assess their expectations of airport services as well as to evaluate the performance of these service attributes in MMIA, Lagos. Therefore, the mean of expectation of service attributes and level of performance was calculated; also, independent sample t-test and factor analysis of airport services was computed.

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS

3.1. Descriptive Analysis of Airport Service Attributes

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis of Airport Service Attributes

Service Attributes	Mean	Expectation Level	Mean	Performance Level
Overall satisfaction with the airport	4.52	Very high	2.90	Moderate
Cleanliness of restrooms	4.49	Very high	2.95	Moderate
Feeling of being safe	4.42	Very high	3.16	Moderate
Cleanliness of airport terminal	4.31	Very high	3.08	Moderate
Availability of restrooms	4.27	Very high	3.14	Moderate
Speed of baggage delivery service	4.20	High	2.79	Moderate
Flight information screens	4.19	High	2.74	Moderate
Comfort of waiting	4.17	High	2.79	Moderate
Ease of finding your way	4.13	High	3.09	Moderate
Phone/Internet/IT facilities	4.10	High	2.49	Low
Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff	4.09	High	3.02	Moderate
Thoroughness of security inspection	4.09	High	3.06	Moderate
Courtesy, helpfulness of check-in staff	4.08	High	3.05	Moderate
Ambience of the airport	4.04	High	2.82	Moderate
Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	4.01	High	2.95	Moderate
Courtesy, helpfulness of airport staff	4.00	High	2.92	Moderate
Availability of banking facilities	3.99	High	3.81	High
Waiting time in check-in queue	3.96	High	2.80	Moderate
Passport and visa inspection	3.75	High	3.52	High
Ground transportation to/from airport	3.89	High	2.90	Moderate
Customs inspection	3.89	High	2.97	Moderate
Waiting time at security inspection	3.89	High	2.88	Moderate
Availability of parking facilities	3.88	High	2.73	Moderate
Value for money of restaurants	3.80	High	2.85	Moderate
Restaurants/eating facilities	3.77	High	2.90	Moderate
Value for money of parking facilities	3.71	High	2.61	Moderate
Value for money of shopping	3.64	High	2.68	Moderate
Opening hours of shopping/restaurant	3.60	High	2.81	Moderate
Grand mean	4.03	High	2.94	Moderate

Table 1 determined the mean scores of each airport service attributes. The respondents placed very high expectation on "Overall satisfaction with the airport" (mean=4.52), "Cleanliness of restrooms" (mean=4.49) ranked second and the third was "Feeling of being safe" (mean=4.42); "Cleanliness of airport terminal" (mean=4.31) and "Availability of restrooms" (mean=4.27) ranked fourth and fifth respectively while the respondents placed high expectation on the other service attributes. Table 1 also addressed the issue of how MMIA, Lagos is performing in their service quality. Respondents scored "Availability of banking facilities" (mean=3.99) and "Passport and visa inspection" (mean=3.75) high performance. According to the result, the airport was seen to perform moderately in most of the airport service attributes except for "Phone/Internet/IT facilities" (mean=2.49) that scored low.

3.2. Factor Analysis of Airport Service Quality

In this study, the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of expectations and performance of airport quality of service are 0.923 and 0.928 respectively. Thus, verified that the employment of factor analysis was appropriate in the study. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value are 5701.461 and 5299.519 respectively with both p=0.000, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The Varimax rotation procedure was used to produce an orthogonal transformation matrix yielding independent factors, which provided unique information. Only the factors with Eigen values equal to or greater than 1 were considered as significant. The Eigen value of a factor represents the amount of the total variance explicated by that factor. Examination of the resulting factors

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS

leads to three factors of both expectations and performance of airport service quality with Eigen values of 1.714 and 1.464 which were greater than 1.00. Statements with loadings of 0.30 or greater on a single factor were used in interpreting the factors.

Table 2a: Factor Analysis of Expectations of the Quality of Service of Airport

Service Quality Attributes (Importance)	Factor 1 Servicescape	Factor 2 Services	Factor 3 Service Personnel	Commu-nalities
Factor 1: Servicescape				
Ease of finding your way	0.773			0.566
Passport and visa inspection	0.756			0.551
Customs inspection	0.723			0.425
Availability of banking facilities	0.672			0.511
Ground transportation to/from airport	0.652			0.481
Flight information screens	0.643			0.564
Thoroughness of security inspection	0.635			0.476
Waiting time in check-in queue	0.609			0.450
Value for money of parking facilities	0.594			0.439
Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	0.567			0.427
Availability of parking facilities	0.551			0.494
Overall satisfaction with the airport	0.331			0.394
Feeling of being safe	0.313			0.630
Waiting time at security inspection	0.303			0.306
Factor 2: Services				
Value for money of shopping		0.817		0.571
Opening hours of shopping/restaurant		0.783		0.531
Restaurants/eating facilities		0.763		0.555
Availability of restrooms		0.747		0.560
Speed of baggage delivery service		0.703		0.543
Cleanliness of restrooms		0.683		0.646
Value for money of restaurants		0.659		0.438
Comfort of waiting		0.526		0.505
Cleanliness of airport terminal		0.517		0.611
Phone/Internet/IT facilities		0.501		0.401
Ambience of the airport		0.474		0.425
Factor 3: Service Personnel				
Courtesy, helpfulness of check-in staff			0.820	0.640
Airport staff's courtesy and helpfulness			0.716	0.607
Courtesy and helpfulness of airport security			0.711	0.556
Eigenvalues	10.399	2.187	1.714	
Variance Explained (%)	37.138	7.811	6.120	
Cumulative Variance (%)	37.138	44.949	51.069	

Note: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO): 0.923. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 5701.461, p = 0.000

After analyzing expectations of airport quality of service variables, computing the data with principal component analysis of factor analysis to delete the inter-correlations among the dimensions, the results were three factors with 28 variables. These factors are namely; Servicescape, Services and Service Personnel. In Table 2a, the first factor was labeled as "Servicescape," consisted of fourteen variables and explained 37.138% of the variance in the data with an Eigen value of 10.399. The second factor was labeled as "Services," consisted of eleven variables and explained 7.811% of the variance in the data with an Eigen value of 2.187. The third factor was labeled as "Service Personnel", consisted of three variables and the total variance explained was 6.120% with an Eigen value of 1.714. Also, after using factor analysis to delete the inter-correlation variables among the dimensions of performance of

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 | OPEN ACCESS

airport service quality. The results were three factors with 28 variables: the first factor was labeled as "Servicescape," consisted of fourteen variables and explained 37.248% of the variance in the data having an Eigen value of 10.430. The second factor was labeled as "Services," consisted of eleven variables and explained 6.316% of the variance in the data with an Eigen value of 1.768. The third factor was labeled as "Service Personnel", consisted of three variables and the total variance explained was 5.230% having an Eigen value of 1.464 (Table 2b).

Table 2b: Factor Analysis of Performance of Airport Service Quality

Service Quality Attributes (Performance)	Factor 1 Servicescape	Factor 2 Services	Factor 3 Service Personnel	Commu-nalities
Factor 1: Servicescape				
Passport and visa inspection	0.762			0.562
Feeling of being safe	0.663			0.494
Ease of finding your way	0.604			0.469
Waiting time in check-in queue	0.589			0.424
Customs inspection	0.586			0.446
Availability of banking facilities	0.579			0.427
Ground transportation to/from airport	0.564			0.464
Overall satisfaction with the airport	0.552			0.652
Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	0.551			0.449
Money for parking facilities	0.505			0.437
Availability of parking facilities	0.488			0.401
Time spent at security inspection	0.470			0.456
Flight information screens	0.394			0.340
Thoroughness of security inspection	0.319			0.355
Factor 2: Services				
Value for money of restaurants		0.798		0.581
Cleanliness of restrooms		0.797		0.610
Restaurants/eating facilities		0.778		0.539
Availability of restrooms		0.743		0.543
Baggage delivery service speed		0.693		0.495
Cleanliness of airport terminal		0.660		0.541
Comfort of waiting		0.636		0.487
Value for money of shopping		0.632		0.497
Ambience of the airport		0.629		0.501
Opening hours of shopping/restaurant		0.613		0.458
Phone/Internet/IT facilities		0.599		0.407
Factor 3: Service Personnel				
Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff			0.782	0.637
Courtesy helpfulness of airport staff			0.636	0.523
Courtesy, helpfulness of check-in staff			0.401	0.468
Eigenvalues	10.430	1.768	1.464	
Variance Explained (%)	37.248	6.316	5.230	
Cumulative Variance (%)	37.248	43.564	48.794	

Note: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO): 0.928. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 5299.519, p = 0.000

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS

3.3. Passengers' Perception of Airport Service Quality

Table 3a: Passengers' Expectations of Service Quality by Gender

Service Attributes (Expectations)	Mean		T-test	
	Male	Female	t-value	p-value
Overall satisfaction with the airport	4.50	4.55	-0.561	0.575
Cleanliness of restrooms	4.41	4.45	-0.379	0.705
Feeling of being safe	4.38	4.49	-1.098	0.273
Cleanliness of airport terminal	4.28	4,38	-0.974	0.331
Availability of restrooms	4.28	4.23	0.418	0.676
Speed at which baggage is delivered	4.14	4.32	-1.798	0.037
Flight information screens	4.16	4.24	-0.690	0.491
Comfort of waiting	4.13	4.25	-1.106	0.269
Ease at which you find your way	4.08	4.23	-1.502	0.134
Phone/Internet/IT facilities	4.12	4.06	0.550	0.582
Helpfulness and courtesy of security staff	4.00	4.29	-3.004	0.003
Thoroughness of security inspection	4.03	4.20	-1.659	0.098
Courtesy, helpfulness of check-in staff	4.03	4.18	-1.383	0.167
Ambience of the airport	4.06	4.01	0.440	0.660
Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	3.97	4.08	-1.082	0.280
Courtesy, helpfulness of airport staff	3.95	4.11	-1.443	0.150
Availability of banking facilities	3.94	4.03	-0.790	0.430
Waiting time in check-in queue	3.99	3.89	0.883	0.378
Passport and visa inspection	3.85	4.11	-2.437	0.015
Ground transportation to/from airport	3.81	4.03	-1.964	0.049
Customs inspection	3.84	3.98	-1.390	0.166
Security inspection waiting time	3.88	3.91	-0.290	0.772
Availability of parking facilities	3.80	4.05	-2.262	0.024
Value for money of restaurants	3.78	3.83	-0.462	0.645
Restaurants/eating facilities	3.74	3.81	-0.602	0.547
Value for money of parking facilities	3.67	3.79	-1.005	0.316
Value for money of shopping	3.61	3.70	-0.833	0.406
Opening hours of shopping/restaurant	3.58	3.62	-0.336	0.737

Note: T-test two tail probability ≤0.05 (significance level)

Tables 3a & 3b present passengers' perception on expectations and performance of service quality between genders with the mean score of each airport service attributes. Table 3a shows that both male and female respondents placed the most expectation on "Overall satisfaction with the airport", Mean=4.50 (male), 4.55 (female) and also placed the least on "Opening hours of shopping/restaurants" Mean=3.58 (male), 3.62 (female). According to the result in Table 3b, MMIA was seen to perform moderate in most service areas. The male respondents placed the most emphasis on "Feeling of being safe" (mean=3.18) while the female respondents focused on "Passport and visa inspection" (mean=3.20), whereas, the lowest performance of service quality were placed on "Phone/Internet/IT facilities" (mean=2.27) by male respondents and on "Value for money of parking facilities" (mean=2.65) by female respondents.

Table 3b: Passengers' Perception on Performance of Service Quality by Gender

Service Attributes (Performance)	Mean		T-test	
	Male	Female	t-value	p-value
Overall satisfaction with the airport	2.91	2.86	0.543	0.587
Cleanliness of restrooms	2.73	2.89	-1.901	0.038
Feeling of being safe	3.18	3.12	0.549	0.583
Cleanliness of airport terminal	3.09	3.07	0.166	0.868

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS

Availability of restrooms	3.15	3.13	0.159	0.874
Speed of baggage delivery service	2.76	2.83	-0.630	0.529
Flight information screens	2.75	2.73	0.097	0.923
Comfort of waiting	2.54	2.80	-2.507	0.013
Ease of finding your way	3.09	3.10	-0.115	0.909
Phone/Internet/IT facilities	2.27	2.59	-3.014	0.003
Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff	3.04	2.96	0.822	0.412
Thoroughness of security inspection	3.10	2.95	1.371	0.171
Courtesy, helpfulness of check-in staff	3.01	3.12	-1.075	0.283
Ambience of the airport	2.81	2.83	-0.116	0.908
Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	2.93	2.98	-0.481	0.631
Courtesy, helpfulness of airport staff	2.93	2.89	0.342	0.733
Availability of banking facilities	3.11	3.08	0.247	0.805
Waiting time in check-in queue	2.76	2.89	-1.277	0.202
Passport and visa inspection	3.16	3.20	-0.395	0.693
Ground transportation to/from airport	2.90	2.89	0.048	0.961
Customs inspection	2.97	2.95	0.188	0.851
Time at security inspection	2.90	2.83	0.720	0.472
Availability of parking facilities	2.74	2.70	0.396	0.693
Value for money of restaurants	2.85	2.86	-0.088	0.930
Restaurants/eating facilities	2.93	2.83	0.930	0.353
Money for parking facilities	2.59	2.65	-0.564	0.573
Value of money of shopping	2.68	2.87	0.086	0.932
Opening hours of shopping/restaurant	2.79	2.85	-0.626	0.532

Note: T-test two tail probability ≤0.05 (significance level)

Using t-test to examine the significance (significant level ≤ 0.05) between the gender, there was significance difference between male and female respondents' perception on expectation (Table 3a) as follows; "Speed of baggage delivery service" (p=0.03), "Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff" (p=0.00), "Passport and visa inspection" (p=0.01), "Ground transportation to/from airport" (p=0.04) and "Availability of parking facilities" (p=0.02). While there was also significance difference (Table 3b) in perception between male and female in the performance of "Cleanliness of restrooms" (p=0.03), "Comfort of waiting" (p=0.01) and "Phone/internet/IT facilities" (p=0.00). The results therefore indicated that the female respondents' perception on expectations and performance of these services was higher than that of the male respondents.

4. CONCLUSION

In this research, the expectations and performance of service quality in MMIA, Lagos, Nigeria was examined. It was noted that most expectations were placed on service attributes such as; general satisfaction with the airport, cleanliness of restrooms, feeling of being safe, cleanliness of airport terminal and availability of restrooms. Service attributes that scored high performance includes availability of banking facilities and passport and visa inspection while the service attribute of phone/internet/IT facilities performed low. Using t-test to examine the significance (significant level ≤ 0.05) between the genders, there was a significance difference in perceptions of gender of respondents on expectation. The results therefore indicated that the female respondents' perception on expectations and performance of these services was higher than that of the male respondents' perception. The values of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of expectations and performance of service quality of airport are: 0.923 and 0.928 respectively while Bartlett's Test of Sphericity values are 5701.461 and 5299.519 with both p=0.000, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis, also with Eigen values of 1.714 and 1.464 respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that customers' expectations were not exceeded.

Based on the findings of this study, the recommendations for improving quality of airport service in Nigeria includes that live Flight Information Display Systems (FIDS) are adequately provided within and outside the airport in an attempt to communicate a variety of critical travel information such as; arrivals, departures, flight number, flight status, airline information, flight delays, flight cancelations, gate information, baggage delays etc. Also, the airport management should devise an effective measure of

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS

handling passengers' complaints. This can be achieved by paying more attention to address customers' challenges and then solving their problems immediately or as quickly as possible; this mechanism is to be applied so as to reduce customers' dissatisfaction.

Funding

This study has not received any external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests.

Data and materials availability

All data associated with this study are present in the paper.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Asubonteng, P., McCleaty, K. J., & Swan, J. E. (1996). SERVQUAL Revisited: A Critical Review of Service Quality. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 10(6), 62-81.
2. Bebko, C. P. (2000). Service Intangibility and Its Impact on Consumer Expectations of Service Quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(1), 9-26.
3. Bogicevic, V., Yang, W., Bilgihan, A., & Bujisic, M. (2013). Airport Service Quality Drivers of Passenger Satisfaction. *Tourism Review*, 68(4), 3-18.
4. Ching, M. K. (2014). *Passenger Perception on Airport Service Quality and Satisfaction.* Paper Presented at Proceedings of the 10th International Academic Conference, Vienna.
5. Doganis, R. (1992). The Airport Business. London: Routledge.
6. Douglas, L., & Connor, R. (2003). Attitudes to Service Quality-The Expectation Gap. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 33(4), 165-172.
7. Fodness, D. & Murray, B. (2007). Passengers' Expectations of Airport Service Quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21(7), 492-506.
8. Hildur, B. B. (2009). Airport Service Quality, Satisfaction and Loyalty Membership (The Case of Kaflavik and Landvetter airports).
9. Hoang, T., & Dang, M., & Nguyen, T., & Kim, H. (2016). Factors Affecting the Service Quality Standards at International Airports when Vietnam Integrates TPP: A Case Study at Tan- son Nhat Airport, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
10. Jagoda, J., & Vajira, B. (2008). Passengers' Perceptions of Airport Service Quality: An Exploratory Study. *Transportation.*
11. Kashif, M., Shahbaz, T., Shiquran, C., Raza, S. (2012). The Impact of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction and the Moderating Role of Word-of-mouth.
12. Kotler, P., Bloom, P., & Hayes, T. (2002). Marketing Professional Services: Forward Thinking Strategies for Boosting your Business, your Image and your Profits (2nd ed.) Paramus, New Jersey; Prentice Hall press.
13. Ladhari, R. (2009). A Review of Twenty years of SERVQUAL Research, *International Journal of Quality and Service Science*. Vol. 1, Number 2, P. 172-198.
14. Lewis, B. R. (1993). Service Quality Measurement. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 11(4), 4-12.
15. Lohmann, G., & Duval, D. T. (2015). Tourism and Transport. In C. Cooper (Ed.), Contemporary Tourism Reviews (Vol. 1, pp. 129–182). Oxford: Good fellow.
16. Lian, J. I., & Denstadli, J. M. (2010). Booming Leisure Air Travel to Norway – The role of Airline Competition. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(1), 1–15.
17. Lubbe, B., Douglas, A., & Zambellis, J. (2011). An Application of the Airport Service Quality Model in South Africa. *Journal of Air Transport Management,* 17(4), 224-227.
18. Malik, M. O. (2017). Airport Service Quality and Passengers Satisfaction (A Case Study Khartoum International Airport). Master's Thesis, Sudan University of Science and Technology.
19. Parasuraman, A, Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50.
20. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. (1994). Alternative Scales for Measuring Service Quality: A Comparative Assessment based on Psychometric and Diagnostic Criteria. *Journal of Retailing*, 70(3), 201-230.
21. Rossi, D. S. (2010). Service science perspective on customer satisfaction for improving airport performance.
22. Spasojevic, B., Lohmann, G., & Scott, N. (2018). Air Transport and Tourism–A Systematic Literature Review (2000–2014), *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21:9, 975-997
23. UNWTO. (2015). Tourism Highlights. Retrieved from http://mkt.unwto.org/publication/unwtotourism-highlights-2015-edition

24. Walker, J. & Baker, J. (2000). An exploratory Study of a Multi-Expectation Framework for Services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(5), 411-431.
25. Widarsyah, R. (2013). The Impact of Airport Service Quality Dimensions on overall Airport Experience and Impression.
26. Yang, C. C. (2003). Establishment and Applications of the Integrated Model of Service Quality Measurement. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(4), 310-324.
27. Yang, J. S., Park, J. W., & Choi, Y. J. (2015). Passengers' Expectations of Airport Service Quality: A Case Study of Jeju International Airport. *International Journal of Business Society Resources*, 5(7), 30–37.
28. Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). *Services Marketing, Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm* (4th Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill International Edition.

ISSN 2319–7757 EISSN 2319–7765 I OPEN ACCESS