ISSN 2730-2601
RICE Journal of Creative Entrepreneurship and Management, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 1-23,
May-August 2021

doi: 10.14456/rjcm.2021.25
Received 15.07.21/ Revised 24.07.21/ Accepted 31.07.21

Passenger Experiences of Airport Service Quality at Don Mueang International Airport

Amphai Booranakittipinyo[1]
Nutteera Phakdeephirot[2]
Nutdanai Phuchong[3]

Rattanakosin International College of Creative Entrepreneurship (RICE)
Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin (RMUTR), Thailand
amphai.boo@rmutr.ac.th[1]
Corresponding author

nutteeraphakdeephirot@gmail.com[2]
nut.phuchong@gmail.com[3]

Abstract

This paper reports Airport Service Quality (ASQ) as a research tool for data management on passengers' perceptions of airport goods and services. The researchers selected Don Mueang International Airport (DMK) that has used the ASQ tool to assess passengers' satisfaction with the airport infrastructure and service management. This quantitative study aimed to identify the airport's strengths and areas for improvement as perceived by 350 voluntary passengers traveling on domestic flights from October to December 2020. The obtained data were analyzed for descriptive statistics, mean, chi-square, t-test, and multi-regression to assess passengers' experiential satisfaction with six aspects: (1) access to the airport, (2) check-in, (3) passport/personal ID control, (4) security, (5) finding your way around the airport, and (6) airport facilities. The results showed the airport environment as the highest in passenger satisfaction, followed by check-in, airport facilities, finding your way, and security. Overall, the participating passengers were satisfied with their airport experiences at Don Mueang, but both economy and first-class travelers did not sense differentiation in the provided services. The findings were expected to shed light on the areas of improvement in airport planning and management to meet demands of airport users for more appealing services.

Keywords: *Don Mueang International Airport, airport service quality, passenger experience, customer satisfaction*

1. Introduction

The airport serves as a hub for people traveling to their destinations and represents the country's aviation service image. Before arriving at their destination, passengers transit through an airport; therefore, its service management is of vital importance. The findings of a recent study conducted by the Airports Council International (ACI) point to air travelers having their choice of flying to and from various airports on the basis of differentiated services provided by competing airports (Pabedinskaitė & Akstinaitėa, 2013). Airport management comprises not only the areas within the airport, but also its human resources, environment surrounding the airport, access to the airport, interior decoration, services, restaurants, baggage service, mobile charging, and other airport amenities/ facilities, such as ATMs, waiting areas, and restrooms. It has been widely recognized that airports accelerate tourism growth and a country's national and international trade relations, and that they are no

longer viewed as service just for those who can afford air travel. In March 2019, the topic sparked a fresh controversy on Twitter, in a series of threads involving the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). With several users questioning the claim that aviation drives sustainable growth given the huge carbon footprint of flying, the ICAO responded that international flight lifts communities out of poverty (Berti, 2019).

Airport Service Quality (ASQ) has become the world's leading airport passenger service and benchmarking program. ACI's Airport Service Quality (ASQ) as the world-renowned and globally established global benchmarking methodology measures passenger satisfaction while passing through an airport. The ASQ provides research tools and management information to help airports better understand their passengers' perspectives and what they want from their products and services (ACI, 2019). To meet the ASQ standard, the airport must execute excellent management in all areas. As a result, airport administration has to cope with the ASQ standard, and not many airports have achieved a high level of service management. The total quality of airport services is directly proportional to the number of times an airport is used and the number of times a destination is visited (Prentice, 2019).

The Bangkok IATA code was formerly assigned to Don Mueang International Airport (DMK), and was later reassigned to Suvarnabhumi Airport as an important hub of Asia and that of Thai Airways International. At its peak, it served most air traffics for the entire country, with 80 airlines operating 160,000 flights and handling over 38 million passengers and 700,000 tons of cargo in 2004. It was the 14th busiest airport in the world and the 2nd in Asia by passenger volume (Donmueang Airport, 2020). Domestic flights were also serviced at Don Mueang International Airport, such as Nok Air, Thai AirAsia, and Thai Lion Air. Terminal 1 was for international flights, Terminal 2 for domestic flights with the airport's increased capacity to 30 million passengers per year, and Terminal 3, a previous domestic terminal, was no longer in operation. In the third phase of current airport development, Terminal 3 was in the planning stages as of 2019, with construction projected between 2020–2025 to accommodate 18 million people per year. As part of the 39 billion baht project, Terminals 1 and 2 will be upgraded to 22 million domestic passengers annually, raising overall airport capacity from 30 to 40 million annually.

2. Objectives

The study had two objectives:

(1) To identify the airport's strengths and areas for improvement as perceived by passengers traveling on domestic flights, and

(2) To assess the passengers' satisfaction with the airport infrastructure and service management.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Passengers

The vital part of the airport's service management rests upon passengers who bring income to the airport. Passenger is defined as a person who is traveling in a vehicle but is not driving it, flying it, or working on it: airline/rail/train/car passengers (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020).

3.2 Passenger Experience

Pine & Gilmore (1998) defined customer experience as events that engage individuals in a personal way, and Sheth et al. (1999) explained that customer experience is shaped by social, cultural, and personal variables. Shaw & Ivens (2005) asserted that customer experience has been conceptualized as a psychological construct, which has its origin from a set of interactions between a customer and a product, a company, or part of its organization. Gentile et al. (2007) viewed customer experience as a multi-dimensional construct of elementary components, including sensorial, emotional, cognitive, pragmatic, lifestyle, and relational components. Meyer & Schwager (2007: 118) put it "customer experience is the internal and subjective response customers have to any direct or indirect contact with a company."

As cleanliness can impact customers' first impression of the service, the sanitary condition of such a place as an airport is a fundamental factor (Pijls & Groen, 2012). Hence, airports require regular cleaning and maintenance to maintain their good image. An experienced and knowledgeable facility manager can handle cleaning tasks for better quality faster and more proficiently. Thus, outsourcing airport assistance and cleaning service seem the best solutions to meet the passengers' expectations of the airport facilities at any time. As for operational efficiency, any major airport has a large number of customers and airlines crews. Passengers usually demand facilities when checking in, waiting, and boarding. Airlines require space for airplanes, facilities for routine maintenance, places for passengers and flight crews while on the ground. Air-freight companies need space for cargo airplanes. Pilots and the cabin crew need runways, facilities for aircraft storage and maintenance, and places to relax while on the ground. The growing capacity of the airport requires good planning and operational efficiency.

On-time performance is a major parameter for evaluating the operational efficiency of airlines, which is directly associated with customer satisfaction, and is positively correlated with profitability (Mellat-Parast et al., 2015). Top operational efficiency occurs when the right combination of people, processes, and technology come together to optimize business performance. A clean and safe workplace will increase airport staff productivity. Automating daily operations and administrative tasks are crucial to support the airport staff in providing good services consistently. According to a report commissioned by Amadeus Airport, airports can improve operational efficiency through the digital transformation of processes, well-executed data analytics, and insight sharing. While delivering an excellent passenger experience and improve its operational efficiency, airports also need to increase non-aeronautical (retail) revenue. For airports, ensuring passengers enjoy a smooth transit through the airport is vital: Spending increases by 2.5% for every minute a customer is in a retail area and not stuck in a queue (Atalian Global Service, 2019).

As for Safety and Security, unfortunately, airports are targets for terrorist activity. For that reason, it is crucial that airports take extremely strict security measures. The facility manager guarantees that the airport be safe and secure by monitoring, checking, and improving the security systems, video surveillance system, and other airport equipment constantly. Failure to do so may lead to undesirable conditions leading to poor operation, loss, injury, prosecution, and insurance claims to the airports. The security screening procedure is deemed necessary for air travel. However, its strict procedure can be a painful

experience for passengers. According to a survey conducted by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), airport security is one of the unpopular aspects of travel. As a result, some airports are making efforts to make the experience of being touched, scanned, and having suitcases rummaged through as painless as possible while maintaining sensitivity and courtesy toward the passenger. Airports are also introducing effective procedures to optimize the workflow during the security screening in the light of the snail-pace queues. By outsourcing technical maintenance and security service, airports also grant access to innovative ideas and leading practices from passengers that will enhance the quality of facilities and overall airport experience.

Using Innovation and Technology, facility management wants to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in coordinating demand and supply of airport facilities and services. Continuous development of innovation and new technology is useful and necessary to achieve high-quality service offered. According to Skytrax's research, being a global travel leader means constantly striving to improve, innovate and impress. A poll conducted by SITA finds airline passengers happier when technology eases their way through the airports (SITA, 2019). According to ACI World Director General, Angela Gittens in the Connected Aviation Today, investing in new and improved infrastructure, as well as making the most of existing infrastructure, is the bedrock on which smooth airport operations and improved passenger experiences are built (Seawright, 2019). New technology in surveillance monitoring systems enables digital surveillance streams to travel over the Internet so that operators in various airport departments, such as police, customs, fire and medics, baggage, and airport operations, can all monitor the video feeds from separate PC workstations. Airports and airlines can take note that technology solutions can boost passenger satisfaction, every step of the way including the cleanliness of their washrooms.

3.3 Related Research

Allen, Bellizzi, Eboli, Forciniti & Mazzulla (2020) revealed that both direct and indirect effects account for a total effect of ACCESS on OVSERVICE at 0.604. That is to say that having clear information and signposting inside the terminal makes the airport services more accessible and, at the same time, increases the sense of passengers' well-being in the terminal. In turn, passengers' satisfaction with the overall service is improved. On the other hand, having clear information and signposting inside the terminal makes control operations easier and check-in or baggage handling faster, improving passengers' satisfaction with CONTROL and OVSERVICE latent aspects. Evidence from measurement shows that accessibility to the airport services (ACCESS) is better explained for indicators related to information than signposting; specifically, the biggest standardized weight is obtained by the indicator "accessibility of information". However, a higher weight is found for the item considering the airport's physical layout because it permits easy movements of passengers. As expected, CONTROL latent construct (control operations in the terminal) is better explained by indicators related to passenger control and personal security. The terminal environment gives a sense of well-being to the passengers more if the cleanliness of the terminal and toilets are perceived as satisfactory.

Granberg & Munoz (2013) revealed the initial selection of KPI's of both the activity areas and the selection of indicators was based on results from previous work. The activity

areas are (1) airport operations including all physical movements and flows at the airport, (2) airport economy incorporating costs, income, and profit, (3) airport environmental issues consisting of noise considerations, water quality, and energy consumption, (4) airport safety and security incorporating both work to prevent and handle accidents (safety) and threats originating from humans (security) and airport, and (5) Customer Service collecting various aspects of passenger satisfaction.

Angrave (2019) concluded about good and bad passenger experiences depended on what and how customers defined efficiency, not on how airports measured it.

- The ideal passenger experience is in the airport that simply does what it's supposed to and in a pleasant environment.
- The consequences of long queues, inadequate facilities, and the wrong staff attitude are what make people use a different airport next time.
- An airport's obsessive focus on processing efficiency risks doing the wrong things well and spending resources on fixing self-inflicted problems.

The gap between what airports and passengers think is a crucial one. All the while that metrics are being collated and analyzed, if they are the wrong ones, airports will be oblivious to why passengers are exercising their choices and voices. In Barcelona last year, Andy Lester of Christchurch Airport summed it up well when he talked of rebuilding after the 2011 New Zealand earthquake and observed "If you think like an airport, you'll never understand your customers." We've seen recently a flurry of airports celebrating bigger passenger numbers and new routes with new airlines. Yet their customers react with a sigh because many of those airports are already at or beyond passenger numbers that make going through the airport a tolerable experience. At the risk of generalizing, airports aim to get as many people through the airport as possible, as efficiently as possible. It needs to be done in a way that means they can spend as much money as possible, come back as often as possible and tell everyone they know to do the same. If it moves (that is either people or bags) they can barcode, processed, and measured. How many get from A to B in as little time or at least cost becomes the primary, sometimes, sole focus. All of which makes good operational sense, given the complexity and challenges of running an airport in a way that airlines will be confident in using. But what are passengers concerned with and what is their version of what efficiency means? Kiosks with red, orange, and green buttons greet us everywhere to ask how the service was. While that allows an AQS metric to be reported and tracked, there is no qualitative, actionable insight let alone allowances for mischievous kids or cleaners tapping away as they pass. However, the travel industry is blessed with no shortage of customers willing and able to give their feedback – and that in turn creates a vast reservoir of insight not only for customers choosing an airport but for the airports to tap into themselves.

George & Gomes (2015) underlined implications regarding the use of meaningful service dimensions instead of such a large set of variables as predictors of passenger satisfaction. Moreover, the study emphasizes the need for considering how passenger characteristics may be related to different perceived levels of service quality.

Kraal, Popovic & Kirk (2009) reported potential application to airport terminal design as it advances existing knowledge of user experiences and engagement. The most significant findings presented concern the differences in interactions at the security checking domain—both before and after. This has implications for the consideration of passenger facilitation in the design of future airports.

Atalian Global Service (2019) argued that the first impressions always count. Therefore, passengers' satisfaction depends on their experience from the minute they reach the airport, expecting to feel relaxed throughout the check-in, waiting, and boarding process. The basic requirements for better customer experience at the airport weigh from the speed of baggage delivery, smooth check-in at the airport terminals, little time taken for security checks, and the cleanliness of the facilities. Even though these days most passengers have obtained a boarding pass before they arrive at the airport; however, not knowing how long it will take to move through the terminal, passengers tend to arrive very early for flights and thus spend more time waiting at the airport. The ground experience before passengers board an aircraft can be divided into these segments: getting to the airport, waiting in the terminal before security check, passing through security checkpoints, and finding the gate. It is important that practical check-in facilities improve arrival and departure flow at the airport.

Gerlif & Lund (2016) revealed that the passengers need comfortable seating in a quiet environment, a wide selection of different shops, and bright and spacious airports. Furthermore, by placing the insights from the interview data on economy class experience, the researchers concluded that airport passengers, in general, prefer aesthetic and escapist experiences. The data analysis pointed to a need for a physiological perspective in the conceptual model of passenger experience creation.

Graham, Wattanacharoensil & Schuckert (2017) asserted that air travelers tend to view their experience as a combination of separate activities (e.g., experiences provided by different parties, such as airlines, immigration, security, or duty-free), but they have a holistic judgment of overall airport environment or AE. Helkkula (2011) emphasized the experience of air travelers in an airport as event-specific. The perspectives of air travelers show the two dimensions of AE as a process and a phenomenon; and the dimensions of AE as outcomes are inter-associated. In AE as a process, airport activities concerning functional experience and service personnel received the most passenger comments. These experiences strongly associate the dimension of experience outcome, particularly with the emotional and memory aspects of air travelers.

Kirk et al. (2014) studied the perspective of air travelers even during pre-experience at an airport as mainly centered on necessary activities. These fundamental experiences, namely, functional and service personnel, are highly significant. Passengers only feel that their AE are satisfactory once these fundamental AEs are met. However, the study found that air travelers are unlikely to appreciate any additional experience provided at the airport (e.g., aesthetic and some hedonic activities) when their perceptions and memories are influenced by the negative emotional responses attributed to inefficient fundamental processes.

Ketjutarat (2020) found out that ground staff services have five areas which are (1) plane ticket sales, (2) check-in services, (3) boarding services at the gate, (4) airport

parking area services, and (5) airport services. It was found that service at the point ticket sales requires further improvement concerning service quality provided to customers. The survey of 200 passengers claims that some of 'failure' lies in staff's inability to communicate in English to full understanding for passengers. While providing services at the check-in point, staff should be better prepared when providing for service recipients; their knowledge, understanding and full attention to the passenger's needs for benefits and seat selection are of paramount importance in providing assurance to clients. The ground staff need to provide not only quality service, high reliability, empathy, and responsiveness, but also confidence and assurance toward the clients. This particular study signifies passengers be ascertained in satisfaction and needs. Airlines must collect the information to investigate the existing problem that may affect the customer experience and remedy those identified limitations for better service quality.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Participants

The participants were 350 passengers on domestic flights to Don Mueang International Airport between October–December 2020. They were selected by quota sampling on a voluntary basis at the departure terminal, a total of 350 passengers.

4.2 Instrument

This quantitative research used a questionnaire to collect data in in three parts: the participants' general information, passenger satisfaction with Don Mueang Airport service management, and open-answer questions. The part on general information consists of gender, age, main travel purpose, and section seating in the aircraft. The second part deals with passenger experiences of airport service management in terms of (1) Accessibility to the airport; (2) Check-in; (3) Passport/personal ID control; (4) Security; (5) Finding your way; (6) Airport facilities; (7) Airport environment; (8) Cleanliness of airport terminal, (9) Ambiance of the airport, (10) Decoration of the airport. The third part taps participants' answers to open-ended questions on the cultural decoration effect and revisit intention.

5. Data Analysis

The researchers analyzed general information and the participants' responses on passenger experiences by descriptive statistics, mean, chi-square, and t-test. The response data were at five levels: Level 1= the service should be improved, Level 2 = the service is fair, Level 3 = the service is good, Level 4 = the service is very good, and Level 5 = the service is excellent. And interpretation criteria for mean values were: the average score of 1.00-1.80 for Level 1, the average score of 1.81-2.60 for Level 2, the average score of 2.61 - 3.40 for Level 3, the average score of 3.41 - 4.20 for Level 4, the average score of 4.21 - 5.00 for Level 5. The researchers used multi-regression to find out passenger experiences on the airport environment, finding your way, check-in process, airport facilities, and security. In the third part, the participants' responses to open-ended questions were analyzed by contents.

6. Results

The obtained data on passenger satisfaction with the airport service management in the three parts of the research instrument were presented below.

6.1 General Information

The survey collected passenger data from three airlines: AirAsia, Nok Air, and Thai Lion Air. The largest number of passengers collected was AirAsia at 173 (49.4%), followed by Nok Air at 97 (27.7%), and Thai Lion Air at 80 (22.9%).

Gender: of 350 domestic passengers traveling within the country, there were 222 women (63.4%), and 168 men (36.6%).

Age: of 350 domestic passengers traveling within the country, Age 16-21 years = 37 (10.5%), Age 22-25 years = 51 (14.5%), Age 26-34 years = 106 (30.3%), Age 35-44 = 83 (23.7%), Age 45-54 = 45 (12.9%), and Age 55+ = 28 (8%).

The travel purpose: of 350 domestic passengers traveling within the country, 196 (56%) travel for other purposes, 111 (31.7%) travel for tourism, and 43 (12.3%) travel for business.

Passenger class on board: of 350 domestic passengers traveling in the country, 332 (94.9%) travel in economy class, and 18 (5.1%) travel in business class.

Airplane travel frequency in the past 12 months: of 350 domestic passengers traveling in the country, 139 (39.7%) on 1-2 trips, 112 (32.0%) on 3 -5 trips, and 60 (17.1%) on 6 -10 trips.

Airport at the end of the domestic passenger: of the top 3 destinations for domestic passengers, the most frequent is Chiang Mai Airport 47 (13.4%), Phuket International Airport 33 (9.4%), and Ubon-Ratchathani Airport 29 (8.3%).

Travel types of passenger to the airport: 166 (48.1%) by taxi, 96 (27.8%) by private car, and 60 (17.2%) by bus.

Period for passengers to arrive at the airport before departure: for both domestic and international passengers, 85 (24.3%) came to the airport 1 hour-1 hour 15 minutes before departure, 79 (22.6%) 1 hour 30 minutes - 2 hours, and 56 (16.0%) 45-60 minutes before departure.

The Check-in methods: 202 (57.7%) check-in over the counter, 95 (27.1%) by telephone check-in, and 77 (22.0%) via the Internet.

The age ranges of passengers classified by airlines: 28 (33.7%) of Nok Air travelers age between 35-44, 57 (53.8%) of AirAsia travelers age between 26-34, and 22 (20.8%) of Thai Lion Air travelers age between 26-34.

The travel purpose classified by gender: 197 (56.2%) travel for returning home or studying, 110 passengers (31.5%) for tourism, and 43 (12.3%) for business.

6.2 Passenger Experiences

Table 1: Scores from Passenger Experiences in Using Service

Passenger Experiences	Measure Variable	Average	SD	Service Level
Access to the airport	A. Ground transportation to/from airport	3.78	.889	very good
	B. Parking facilities	3.39	1.087	good
	C. Value for money of parking facilities fee	3.29	1.025	good
	D. Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	3.77	.896	very good
	Total	**3.55**	**.851**	**very good**
Check-in (at this airport)	E. Waiting time in check-queue/line	4.06	.850	very good
	F. Efficiency of check-in staff	4.08	.861	very good
	G. Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	4.07	.867	very good
	Total	**4.07**	**.796**	**very good**
Passport/personal ID control	H. Waiting time at passport/personal ID inspection	4.08	.863	very good
	I. Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	4.07	.884	very good
	Total	**4.075**	**.835**	**very good**
Security	J. Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff	4.04	.879	very good
	K. Thoroughness of security inspection	4.00	.852	very good
	L. Waiting time at security inspection	3.96	.867	very good
	M. Feeling of being safe and secure	4.03	.863	very good
	Total	**4.00**	**.788**	**very good**
Finding your way	N. Ease of finding your way through the airport	3.95	.871	very good
	O. Flight information screens	4.01	.864	very good
	P. Walking distance inside the terminal	3.76	.966	very good
	Q. Ease of making connections with other flights	3.82	.908	very good
	Total	**3.89**	**.798**	**very good**

Passenger Experiences	Measure Variable	Average	SD	Service Level
Airport Facilities	R. Courtesy and helpfulness of airport staff (Excluding check-in, passport control and security)	3.99	.831	very good
	S. Restaurant/Eating facilities	3.91	.885	very good
	T. Value for money of restaurant/eating facilities	3.43	1.065	very good
	U. Availability of bank/ATM facilities/Money changers	3.85	.904	very good
	V. Shopping facilities	3.72	.888	very good
	W. Value for money of shopping facilities	3.46	1.038	very good
	X. Internet access/Wi-Fi	3.41	1.062	very good
	Y. Business/Executive lounges	3.72	.921	very good
	Z. Availability of washrooms/toilets	3.92	.936	very good
	AA. Cleanliness of washrooms/toilets	4.07	.846	very good
	BB. Comfort of waiting/gate areas	4.04	.838	very good
	Total	**3.78**	**.708**	**very good**
Airport Environment	CC. Cleanliness of airport terminal	4.18	.825	very good
	DD. Ambience of the airport	4.09	.796	very good
	Total	**4.135**	**.790**	**very good**
Overall Satisfaction with the airport		**4.09**	**.767**	**very good**

Table 1 shows results of the passengers' experience at Don Mueang International Airport. the study found that the service scores were very good. The service users were most satisfied with the cleanliness of the terminal building with a mean score of 4.18 (S.D. = .825), followed by overall satisfaction with Don Mueang International Airport with a mean score of 4.09 (S.D. = .767), and an overall atmosphere of the airport with a mean score of 4.09 (S.D. = .824). All three criteria were at a very good service level. The points with the low scores were C "Value for money of parking facilities fee" at 3.29 (S.D. = 1.025), followed by B "Parking facilities" at 3.39 (S.D. = 1.087), at a good service level.

The overall service quality of passengers on their experiences at Don Mueang International Airport was very good, which had an overall satisfaction mean of 4.09 (S.D. = .767)

Table 2: Experience Scores of Don Mueang International Airport Service Classified by Gender

Passenger Experiences	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	**S.D.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
Access to the airport	3.4109	.89001	3.6190	.82421	3.5474	.79614
A. Ground transportation to/from airport	3.67	.901	3.84	.877	3.78	.889
B. Parking facilities	3.22	1.145	3.49	1.047	3.39	1.087
C. Value for money of parking facilities fee	3.15	1.024	3.36	1.021	3.29	1.025
D. Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	3.69	.960	3.81	.859	3.77	.896
Check-in (at this airport)	4.0560	.84533	4.0691	.76835	4.0643	.79614
E. Waiting time in check-queue/line	4.01	.934	4.10	.798	4.06	.850
F. Efficiency of check-in staff	4.09	.895	4.07	.844	4.08	.861
G. Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	4.09	.886	4.06	.857	4.07	.867
Passport/personal ID control	4.0413	.86020	4.0936	.82209	4.0750	.83496
H. Waiting time at passport/personal ID inspection	4.05	.880	4.09	.855	4.08	.863
I. Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	4.04	.907	4.08	.872	4.07	.884
Security	3.9667	.80108	4.0283	.78215	4.0060	.78839
J. Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff	3.98	.914	4.07	.859	4.04	.879
K. Thoroughness of security inspection	3.98	.837	4.01	.863	4.00	.852
L. Waiting time at security inspection	3.90	.954	4.00	.813	3.96	.867
M. Feeling of being safe and secure	4.01	.846	4.04	.874	4.03	.863
Finding your way	3.9183	.81880	3.8832	.78750	3.8958	.79770
N. Ease of finding your way through airport	3.95	.886	3.95	.864	3.95	.871
O. Flight information screens	4.00	.867	4.02	.864	4.01	.864
P. Walking distance inside the terminal	3.76	1.037	3.76	.926	3.76	.966
Q. Ease of making connections with other flights	3.82	.944	3.82	.890	3.82	.908
Airport Facilities	3.8114	.63366	3.8561	.74117	3.8419	.70760
R. Courtesy and helpfulness of airport staff (excluding check-in, passport control and security)	4.00	.789	3.99	.856	3.99	.831
S. Restaurant/Eating facilities	3.86	.830	3.94	.916	3.91	.885
T. Value for money of restaurant/eating facilities	3.28	1.113	3.51	1.031	3.43	1.065
U. Availability of bank/ATM facilities/Money changers	3.88	.870	3.84	.925	3.85	.904
V. Shopping facilities	3.70	.858	3.73	.906	3.72	.888

Passenger Experiences	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
W. Value for money of shopping facilities	3.34	1.068	3.52	1.018	3.46	1.038
X. Internet access/Wi-Fi	3.38	1.100	3.42	1.042	3.41	1.062
Y. Business/Executive lounges	3.65	.985	3.75	.889	3.72	.921
Z. Availability of washrooms/toilets	3.94	.857	3.90	.979	3.92	.936
AA. Cleanliness of washrooms/toilets	4.15	.795	4.03	.874	4.07	.846
BB. Comfort of waiting/gate areas	4.09	.804	4.02	.858	4.04	.838
Airport Environment	4.1339	.74920	4.1312	.81379	4.1322	.78974
CC. Cleanliness of airport terminal	4.20	.787	4.16	.848	4.18	.825
DD. Ambience of the airport	4.07	.765	4.10	.814	4.09	.796
Overall Passenger Experiences	4.05	.719	4.12	.793	4.09	.767

Table 2 shows the passengers' experience of Don Mueang International Airport service, classified by gender, that females and males were satisfied with the airport environment. Males were satisfied with a mean score of 4.1339 (S.D. =. 74920), while females were satisfied with a mean score of 4.1312 (S.D. =. 81379) at a very good service level.

Table 3: Overall Passenger Experience Score of Don Mueang International Airport

Score	Number	Percentage	Service Level
3	88	25.1	Good
4	142	40.6	Very Good
5	120	34.3	Excellent
Total	**350**	**100.0**	

Table 3 affirms the overall of passenger experience at Don Mueang International Airport at 40.6% as very good.

Table 4: Passenger Experiences at Don Mueang Airport Service in Order of Importance

No	Passenger Experiences		Number of passengers	Percentage
1	A	Ground transportation to/from the airport	51	14.6
2	N	Ease in finding your way through the airport	25	7.1
	B	Parking facilities	25	7.1
3	E	Waiting time in check-queue/line	24	6.9
4	C	Value for money of parking facilities fee	17	4.9
5	J	Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff	11	3.1
6	H	Waiting time at passport/personal ID inspection	10	2.9
	M	Feeling of being safe and secure	10	2.9
7	O	Flight information screens	9	2.6
8	K	Thoroughness of security inspection	8	2.3

No	Passenger Experiences		Number of passengers	Percentage
9	Z	Availability of washrooms/toilets	7	2.0
10	R	Courtesy and helpfulness of airport staff (Excluding check-in, passport control and security)	6	1.7
	X	Internet access/Wi-Fi	6	1.7
11	D	Availability of baggage carts/trolleys	5	1.4
	G	Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	5	1.4
12	I	Courtesy and helpfulness of inspection staff	4	1.1
13	F	Efficiency of check-in staff	3	.9
	P	Walking distance inside the terminal	3	.9
	S	Restaurant/Eating facilities	3	.9
	U	Availability of bank/ATM facilities/Money changers	3	.9
	W	Value for money of shopping facilities	3	.9
14	L	Waiting time at security inspection	1	.3
	V	Shopping facilities	1	.3
	Y	Business/Executive lounges	1	.3
	T	Value for money of restaurant/eating facilities	1	.3
Total			**243**	**69.1**
Passenger who did not respond			**107**	**30.6**

Table 4 indicates that 243 respondents viewed the quality of service as the first in importance. Considering service quality, 107 (30.6%) identified the top 10 indicators that affect the quality of service as follows:

1) A Ground transportation to/from the airport
2) N Ease of finding your way through the airport
3) E Waiting time in check-queue/line
4) C Value for money of parking facilities fee
5) J Courtesy and helpfulness of security staff
6) H Waiting time at passport/personal ID inspection
7) O Flight information screens
8) K Thoroughness of security inspection
9) Z Availability of washrooms/toilets
10) R Courtesy and helpfulness of airport staff (excluding check-in, passport control, and security)

The relationship between gender and the travel purpose is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Number and Chi-square Values of Relationship between Gender and Travel Purpose

Travel Purpose	**Gender**				
	Male		**Female**		
	Number	**%**	**Number**	**%**	
Business	23	18.1	19	8.7	Pearson Chi-square P=.098
Tourism	40	31.5	69	31.7	
Others	64	50.4	130	59.6	
	127	100.0	218	100.0	

* Significantly at the .05 level

Statistical assumptions

H_0: p = 0 travel purpose in not dependent on gender

H_1: p ≠ 0 travel purpose is dependent on gender

P (probability) = 0.098, α (significance level) = .05.

Therefore, the P-value is more than the α, so accepted H0 and rejected H1.
In conclusion, the travel purpose is not dependent on gender at the significance level 05.
Table 5 shows the travel purpose is independent on gender at the significance level .05, with 64 people (50.4%) with other purposes for travel, and 130 women (59.6%) also with other travel purposes.

Table 6: Number and Chi-square of the Relationship between Age and Travel Purpose

Age	**Travel Purpose**						
	Business		**Tourism**		**Others**		
	Number	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**	
16-21	1	2.3	8	7.3	26	13.4	Pearson Chi-square P = .144
22-25	6	14.0	13	11.8	32	16.5	
26-34	9	20.9	42	38.2	55	28.4	
35-44	17	39.5	22	20.0	44	22.7	
45-54	8	18.6	14	12.7	22	11.3	
55-64	2	4.7	8	7.3	10	5.2	
65-75	0	0	3	2.7	4	2.1	
more than 76	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	
Total	**43**	**100**	**110**	**100**	**194**	**100**	

* Significantly at the .05 level

Statistical assumptions

H_0: p = 0 travel purpose is not dependent on age

H_1: p ≠ 0 travel purpose is dependent on age

P (probability) = 0.144, α (significance level) = .05.

Therefore, the P-value is more than the value α, so accepted H_0 and rejected H_1.
In conclusion, the purpose of the trip is not dependent on the age range at the significance level .05.

Table 6 shows the travel purpose not dependent on age at the significance level 05.

Age 35-44, 17 respondents (39.5%) with the travel purpose for business,
Age 26-34, 42 respondents (38.2%) with the travel purpose for tourism,
Age 26-34, 55 respondents (28.4%), or 28.4%, with travel purposes for other reasons.

Comparison of differences between independent variables with Independent – Samples T-Test is shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Mean, Standard Deviation and Experience in Using Airport Services Classified by Gender

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service	**Male**		**Female**		**t**	**p**
	Mean	**S.D.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**		
Transportation	*2.8366*	*1.22854*	*3.1044*	*1.24330*	*-1.938*	*.053*
Transport	3.44	1.247	3.56	1.309	-.821	.412
Parking	2.47	1.697	2.85	1.649	-2.047	.041*
Value of money of parking	2.39	1.623	2.64	1.652	-1.351	.177
Baggage carts	3.08	1.631	3.38	1.461	-1.746	.082
Check-in	*4.0052*	*.93622*	*4.0336*	*.82764*	*-.293*	*.770*
Check-in waiting	3.95	1.052	4.05	.922	-.971	.332
Check-in efficiency	4.02	1.023	4.04	.917	-.167	.867
Check-in courtesy	4.06	.954	4.01	.965	.428	.669
Passport	*3.8398*	*1.20356*	*4.0550*	*.89247*	*-1.759*	*.080*
Passport waiting	4.06	.926	4.06	.926	-1.725	.085
Inspection staff	3.82	1.276	4.05	.942	-1.776	.077
Security	*3.9063*	*.83419*	*3.9493*	*.93093*	*-.431*	*.667*
Security staff	3.83	1.185	3.92	1.131	-.732	.464
Thoroughness	3.98	.837	3.94	1.039	.335	.738
Inspect timing	3.81	1.114	3.92	1.004	-.912	.363
Feeling in safety	4.01	.846	4.00	.979	.075	.940
Finding a way	*3.6953*	*.92213*	*3.7087*	*.89804*	*-.133*	*.895*
Easy to find a way	3.95	.886	3.92	.940	.304	.762
Screens	3.94	.994	3.98	.976	-.361	.718
Walking distance	3.73	1.085	3.73	.990	-.065	.949
Connections	3.16	1.683	3.20	1.639	-.205	.838
Facilities	*3.4374*	*.82852*	*3.5718*	*.84380*	*-1.436*	*.152*
Airport staff	3.84	1.097	3.87	1.097	-.190	.849
Restaurants	3.77	1.008	3.84	1.104	-.658	.511
Value of money of restaurant	3.16	1.264	3.46	1.120	-2.312	.021*
Bank	3.51	1.408	3.66	1.243	-.989	.323
Shopping	3.23	1.466	3.54	1.219	-2.064	.040*
Value of money of shopping	3.05	1.388	3.33	1.271	-1.913	.057
Internet	2.85	1.593	3.07	1.447	-1.299	.206
Lounge	2.11	1.957	2.58	1.892	-2.217	.027*
Adequacy of washroom	3.91	.922	3.91	.975	.055	.956

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service	**Male**		**Female**		**t**	**p**
	Mean	**S.D.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**		
Cleanliness of washroom	4.15	.795	4.04	.866	1.145	.253
Comfortable	4.16	.867	4.15	.890	.631	.529
Environment	*4.1172*	*.76971*	*4.1193*	*.85706*	*-.023*	*.982*
Cleanliness of terminal	4.16	.867	4.15	.890	.129	.897
Ambience	4.07	.765	4.09	.857	-.184	.855
Overall	***4.05***	***.719***	***4.12***	***.791***	***-.904***	***.355***

* Significantly at the .05 level

Statistical assumptions

(1) Parking

Statistical assumptions

H_0: $\mu_{male} = \mu_{female}$ Male and female have no different opinions on their experiences of using parking services at Don Mueang International Airport

H_1: $\mu_{male} \neq \mu_{female}$ Males and females have different opinions about their experiences in using the parking services at Don Mueang International Airport.

P (probability) = .041, α (level of significance) = .05.

Therefore, the value of P is less than the α (equivalent to Sig.), thus rejected H_0, accepted H_1.

It can be concluded that males and females have different opinions on their experiences of using parking services at Don Mueang International Airport, at the significance level .05.

(2) Restaurants and dining places

Statistical assumptions

H_0: $\mu_{male} = \mu_{female}$ Male and gender have no difference in their experience of using restaurants and dining places

H_1: $\mu_{male} \neq \mu_{female}$ Males and genders have different opinions on their experiences of using restaurants and dining places at Don Mueang International Airport.

P (probability) = .021, α (level of significance) = .05.

Therefore, the value of P is less than the α (equivalent to Sig.), thus rejected H_0, accepted H_1.

It can be concluded that males and females have different opinions on experiences in using restaurants and dining places at Don Mueang International Airport, at the significance level .05.

(3) Duty-free shops/other shops

Statistical assumptions

H_0: $\mu_{male} = \mu_{female}$ Male and gender have no different opinion on duty-free shops/other shops at Don Mueang International Airport.

H_1: $\mu_{male} \neq \mu_{female}$ Males and gender have different opinions on duty-free shops/other shops at Don Mueang International Airport.

P (probability) = .040, α (significance level) = .05.

Therefore, the value of P is less than the α (equivalent to Sig.), thus rejected H_0, accepted

H_1.
It can be concluded that males and females have different opinions about their experiences in duty-free shops/other shops at Don Mueang International Airport, at the significance level .05.

(4) Lounge for business/management
Statistical assumptions
H_0: $\mu_{male} = \mu_{female}$ Males and genders have no different opinions on their business/management lounge experiences at Don Mueang International Airport
H_1: $\mu_{male} \neq \mu_{female}$ Males and genders have different opinions on their business/management lounge experiences at Don Mueang International Airport
P (probability) = .027, α (level of significance) = .05.
Therefore, the value of P is less than the α (equivalent to Sig.), thus rejected H_0, accepted H_1.
It can be concluded that males and females have different experiences in using management business/ lounges at Don Mueang International Airport, at the significance level .05.
Table 7 shows the results of the data analysis comparing the differences of service experience at Don Mueang International Airport classified by gender, that the overall service experience satisfaction was not different at the significance level .05. There were statistically significant differences at the level .05 of 4 items as follows: (i) Parking: the female respondents were more satisfied with the parking experience than the male respondents; (ii) Restaurants and dining places: the female respondents were more satisfied with the restaurant service and dining experience than the male respondents; (iii) Duty-free shops/shops, the female respondents were more satisfied with the service experience in duty-free shops/other stores than the male respondents; (iv)Business/management lounges, the female respondents were more satisfied with the business/executive lounge experience than the male respondents.

Table 8: Coefficients of Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
Airport Environment	1.463	.151		9.680	.000
	.628	.035	.689	17.737	.000
Airport Environment	1.087	.150		7.253	.000
Finding Your Way	.495	.038	.543	13.121	.000
	.247	.034	.303	7.322	.000
Airport Environment	.865	.154		5.630	.000
Finding Your Way	.442	.038	.485	11.537	.000
Check-in Process	.181	.036	.222	5.061	.000
	.171	.037	.201	4.605	.000

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Airport Environment	.793	.152		5.203	.000
Finding Your Way	.404	.039	.443	10.293	.000
Check-in Process	.133	.038	.163	3.518	.000
Airport Facilities	.157	.037	.184	4.258	.000
	.135	.038	.159	3.579	.000
Airport Environment	.745	.152		4.890	.000
Finding Your Way	.380	.040	.417	9.479	.000
Check-in Process	.103	.039	.127	2.639	.000
Airport Facilities	.134	.038	.157	3.541	.000
Security	.123	.038	.144	3.250	.001
	.099	.039	.120	2.511	.013

Table 9: Analysis of Variance of Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Airport Environment	Regression	97.367	1	97.367	314.591	.000
	Residual	107.707	348	.310		
	Total	205.074	349			
Finding Your Way	Regression	111.780	2	55.890	207.880	.000
	Residual	93.294	347	.269		
	Total	205.074	349			
Check-in Process	Regression	117.168	3	39.056	153.725	.000
	Residual	87.906	346	.254		
	Total	205.074	349			
Airport Facilities	Regression	120.315	4	30.079	122.431	.000
	Residual	84.759	345	.246		
	Total	205.074	349			
Security	Regression	121.840	5	24.368	100.711	.000
	Residual	83.234	344	.242		
	Total	205.074	349			

Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis of Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service

Experience of Don Mueang International Airport Service	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Airport Environment	.689	.475	.473	.55633
Finding Your Way	.739	.545	.542	.51852
Check-in Process	.756	.571	.568	.50405
Airport Facilities	.766	.587	.582	.49566
Security	.771	.594	.588	.49189

Tables 9, 10, and 11 show the airport environment as the most significant factor that can explain passenger satisfaction, followed by a process-oriented experience, starting from check-in, to airport facilities and finding your way, and security perception—all equally important. The other two factors--passport control and arrival services--are considered not indirectly explaining satisfaction, but could play a moderating role; that is, the less favorable experience is associated with less favorable of the factors affecting satisfaction. For connecting flights, finding your way becomes significantly more important than the other factors. Overall, passengers of all flight classes are quite satisfied with the airport experiences. It was noted that those in the economy class had a rather relatively low level of satisfaction. Overall, the airport has not been able to differentiate its services for the first class passengers. In this regard, the airport should take the point on service differentiation into a serious consideration when planning for improvements in passengers' service experiences for the airport's overall images of quality service.

6.3 Open-Ended Questions

The open-ended questions asked passengers to identify the service elements they consider of the best quality. The results were the top ten best and the top ten worst as follows:

(1) Employee service and support including politeness, friendliness, and smiling staff,
(2) Airport cleanliness and environment including the cleanliness of the bathroom and the waiting area, nice and quiet atmosphere,
(3) Check-in system,
(4) Speed of service both in terms of check-in, passport examination, security check,
(5) Good overall,
(6) Information search including results at getting to the boarding gate,
(7) Facilities especially having enough seats,
(8) Access to various shops and money exchange points,
(9) Security systems, and
10) Food and beverage shops.

The top ten worst service elements were:

(1) Food and drinks are expensive and lack variety on menu, particularly vegetarian dishes,
(2) Cleanliness / Bathroom queuing,
(3) Information search for combined routes and exits too distant,
(4) Facilities inside the airport with unpleasant smell, insufficient chairs in the waiting area,
(5) There is no smoking area,
(6) Check-in staff not polite with poor attitude toward passengers waiting in long lines,
(7) Parking services too expensive,
(8) Internet / Wireless access Wi-Fi not connected well to the system,
(9) Employees not paying attention to the service, rather laxed in security, for example, officers pass without passport check, and
(10) delayed service.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to identify the airport's strengths and areas for improvement as perceived by passengers traveling on domestic flights, and to assess the passengers' satisfaction with the airport infrastructure and service management. This study found that *the airport environment* is the most important factor that can explain passenger satisfaction, in accordance with Subha, Bina & Archana (2012) who emphasized passenger satisfaction as stemming from airport service quality being fulfilled or exceeding the passenger expectation. While airport service cannot meet passengers' expectations of accomplished needs, Pijls & Groen (2012) asserted that cleanliness be the key to customers' first impression of the service and experience regarding sanitary conditions as a fundamental factor. Hence, airports require regular cleaning and maintenance to maintain their sanitation image. An experienced and knowledgeable facility manager will be able to monitor cleaning tasks for good quality services. Angrave (2019) highlighted the airport's pleasant environment as the first priority in an ideal passenger experience for a pleasant environment.

As for the process-oriented experience, starting with "check-in, to airport facilities and finding your way, of course, security perception is crucial. The other two elements--passport control, and arrival services--are thought to play a moderate influence on satisfaction, rather than directly accounting for it. The less pleasant experience is also linked to the less favorable of the previously stated characteristics as well as contentment. Finding your way becomes far more essential than not finding your way on connecting flights. Overall, passengers in all flight classes are pleased with their airport experiences at Don Mueang International Airport. However, the economy class passengers were less satisfied than those in the business and first class. Overall, the airport has not been able to differentiate its services for first-class travelers, and it is possible that the airport could investigate into this matter to enhance its overall image and experiences for economy-class visitors, as earlier discussed by Angrave (2019).

Passenger experiences have been widely recognized as one of the most important factors for airport service excellence. Where good encounters were reported, 98 percent of the remarks fell into one of two categories: it worked or it was in a pleasant atmosphere. Each category may appear self-evident, and it is to a considerable extent. Definitely, it is clear why passengers are constantly complaining to one another about those situations when things are not working. The outcome usually turns out as a result of inefficiency in service management. Airport encounters don't have to be all that exciting, but all the essentials in service provision need to be delivered effectively and regularly as expected by customers. In their assessments, a significant percentage of passengers used the word "efficient," referring to items of their concerns. Everything should function as it is supposed to, and when passengers need to interact with personnel, they look for greetings with politeness and helpfulness. Getting to the airport is in fact simple, but giving a pleasant experience is complex. It takes good and proactive service management to be able to deliver to passengers a pleasant environment that satisfies them with experiential services to ensure their revisit to the airport of their choice.

8. The Authors

Amphai Booranakittipinyo, MBA, and Nutteera Phakdeephirot, Ph.D., are lecturers in the BBA and MM Programs, Department of Business Administration in International Creative Industry Entrepreneurship, Rattanakosin International College of Creative Entrepreneurship (RICE), Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin (RMUTR), Salaya, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand. Both have their academic and research interest in management and creative entrepreneurship, tourism and hospitality industry, customer relations, and current issues in the trend of creative economy.

Nutdanai Phuchong is also working at RICE as an academic officer and assistant researcher in the projects under funding by Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin (RMUTR), Thailand.

9. References

Allen, J, Bellizzi, M. Eboli, L., Forciniti, C. & Mazzulla, G. (2020). Latent factors on the assessment of service quality in an Italian peripheral airport. *Transportation Research Procedia, 47*, 91–98.

Angrave, J. (2019). Passenger Experiences. (Online). https://empathyce.com/passenger_ experience_research/

Atalian Global Service. (2019). The Important of Airport Facility Management. (Online). https://atalian.co.th/2019/07/05/the-important-of-airport-facility-management/

Aviation Council International (ACI). (2019). Airport Service Quality. (Online). https://aci.aero/customerexperience-asq/services/airport-customer-experience-accreditation/

Berti, A. (2019). Can airports help lift communities out of poverty? (Online). https://www.airporttechnology.com/features/importance-of-airports-to-a-country/

Cambridge Dictionary. (2020). Passenger definition. (Online). https://dictionary. cambridge.org/dictionary/english/passenger.

Donmueang Airport (2020). Donmueang Airport Background. (Online). https://donmueang.airportthai.co.th/

Gentile, C., Spiller, N. & Noci, G. (2007). How to sustain the customer experience: an overview of experience components that co-create value with the customer. *European Management Journal 25*(5), 395-410.

George, C. L., Gomes, C. F. (2015). The effects of service quality dimensions and passenger characteristics on passenger's overall satisfaction with an airport. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 44–45,* 77-81.

Gerlif, J & Lund, C.P.H. (2016). Airport Passenger Experiences towards an Understanding of the Concept from a Passenger Perspective. A Master thesis in MSc in Social Sciences in Service Management, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark.

Graham, A., Wattanacharoensil, W. & Schuckert, M. (2017). An analysis of the airport experience from an air traveler perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 32,* 124-135.

Granberg, T.A. & Munoz, A.Q. (2013). Developing key performance indicators for airports. ENRI Int. *Workshop on ATM/CNS, Tokyo, Japan*. (EIWAC 2013)

Ketjutarat, C. (2020). Passenger satisfaction in LCC in Don Mueang Airport, Thailand. *Journal of Local Governance and Innovation, 4*(3), 201-210.

Kirk, P., Harrison A., Popovic, V. & Kraal B. (2014). Deconstructing expected passenger experience in airports. *DRS201 4 International Conference of the Design Research Society Proceedings.* Umea, Sweden.

Kraal, B. J., Popovic, V, & Kirk, P. J. (2009). Passengers in the airport: artifacts and activities. *Design: Open 24/7, 25-27 November 2009,* Melbourne, Victoria.

Mellat-Parast, M., Davood, G., McFaddenc, K.L. & Miller, J. (2015). Linking business strategy to service failures and financial performance: empirical evidence from the U.S. domestic airline industry. *Journal of Operations Management, 38,* 14-24.

Meyer, C. & Schwager, A. (2007). Customer experience. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(2), 116-126.

Pabedinskaitė, A. & Akstinaitėa, V. (2013). Evaluation of the airport service quality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 110,* 398 – 409.

Pijls, R. & Groen, B.H. (2012). *Cleanliness Translated into Sensory Clues of the Service Environment.* Conference: EFMC 2012, May 2012.

Pine, B. & Gilmore, J. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy, *Harvard Business Review, 76*(4), 97–105.

Prentice, C. (2019). The role of airport service quality in airport and destination choice. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 47,* 40-48.

Seawright, S. (2019). Modernizing Infrastructure for Future of Airports Requires Investment. Retrieved from https://connectedaviationtoday.com/modernizing-infrastructure-future-of-airports-requires-investment/#.YNrPZhMzaqA.

Shaw, C. & Ivens, J. (2005). *Building Great Customer Experiences.* New York: MacMillan.

Sheth, J.N., Mittal, B. & Newman, B.I. (1999). *Customer Behavior: Consumer Behavior and Beyond.* New York: Dryden Press.

SITA. (2019). Passengers happier when technology smooths their way. (Online). https://www.sita.aero/resources/surveys-reports/passenger-it-insights-2019/

Subha, M. V., Bina, T. & Archana, R. (2012). A Study on level of passenger satisfaction of services delivered in Chennai International Airport: a research paper. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 33*(2), 289 – 297.