

# A STUDY ON PERCEPTION OF PASSENGERS REGARDING PARKING FACILITIES AT AIRPORTS IN INDIA

Radha Raman Gupta

Research Scholar, Department of management, Saurashtra University, Rajkot (Gujarat).

**Abstract:** - Air Transport have been giving a fast growth being the quickest mode of transport. In the past, it was limited up to above middle class or higher class and business community due to expensive nature. Now a day, after introduction of low cost carrier, it has become very much popular. Recently, after implementation of Regional Connectivity Scheme (RCS), exponential growth is there in Aviation.

The passengers are using the various facilities at Airports. There is an exhaustive list which is from the start of journey from home and to Airport, after that to board in Aircraft, landing at Airport and again reaching to destination. The main objective of this study was to find out the perception of passengers regarding the parking facilities, with respect to Age, Gender, Occupation, Monthly Income, Number of Trips, Purpose of trip, Class of Travel and Time of arrival before Schedule Departure Time.

**Key words:** Airport, Airports Authority of India, Facility Management, Parking facilities, Perception of Passengers.

## I. INDIAN AIRPORTS AND AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA.

❖ India has more than 476 Airports which include disused and abandoned airports and aerodromes. AAI owns and maintain 125 airports comprising 95 operational airports, 30 Non-Operational airports with no scheduled flights.

### ❖ Functions of Airports Authority of India:

The main functions of Airports Authority of India are elaborated as below:

- Control and management of the Indian Air space (excluding special user air space) extending beyond the territorial limits of the country as accepted by ICAO.
- Provision of communication, navigational and surveillance aids.
- Expansion and strengthening of operational areas viz. Runways, Aprons, Taxiways etc. and provision of ground based landing and movement control aids for aircrafts and vehicular traffic in operational area.
- Design, development, operations and maintenance of passenger terminals.  
(Facility Management comes under the operations of passenger terminals which is governed by operation directorate and responsible for all the activities related to customers i.e., passengers using terminals)
- Development and management of cargo terminals at international and domestic airports.
- Provision of passenger facilities and information systems in the passenger terminals.  
(Adding the infrastructure according to passengers need & expectations to meet out the requirement of airport bench marking).

## II. ABOUT THE STUDY.

❖ For the study of this, Three Airports were chosen named as

- i) Ahmedabad Airport.
- ii) Jaipur Airport.
- iii) Udaipur Airport.

❖ The sample size of total 550 passengers were taken from above three Airports. In the sample of 550 passengers, 200 passengers are from Ahmedabad Airport, 200 passengers are from Jaipur Airport and 150 passengers are from Udaipur Airport.

❖ Airports Authority of India (AAI) is conducting the Thirdparty assessment for evaluation of customer satisfaction at various Airports. For the purpose, Airport Council International (ACI) is conducting the survey on pre-defined frequencies at 11 Airports of India. Ahmedabad Airport and Jaipur Airport are part of these 11 Airports. Other Airports are surveyed by some private agency which is engaged by AAI. Udaipur Airport is one of them.

❖ ACI is doing survey is called Airport Service Quality (ASQ) which is conducted on the basis of 33 parameters and uniform questionnaire for all airports all over the world for more than 250 Airports. Similarly, AAI is also doing customer satisfaction survey called custom satisfaction index (CSI).

❖ In the both surveys, value for money for parking facilities is one parameter.

❖ In this study, this particular parameter i.e. Parking Facility has been elaborated further with a questionnaire of 18 questions and with objective to study the perception of passengers regarding parking facilities at Airports.

## III. ABOUT THE AIRPORTS

The followings are details about the sample Airports named Ahmedabad, Jaipur and Udaipur.

#### ❖ **Ahmedabad Airport:**

Ahmedabad Airport named as **Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel International Airport (SVPIA)** having IATA Code: AMD and ICAO Code: VAAH is an International Airport of Gujarat State and serving the two cities of Gujarat State i.e. Gandhinagar and Ahmedabad City.

The Airport is located in Hansol, 9 kms north of central Ahmedabad. It is named after Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the 1st Deputy Prime Minister of India.

The Airport was set up in 1937, while international operations began on 26<sup>th</sup> January 1991. This Airport was declared and categorized as an International Airport on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2000. The new integrated terminal 2 was inaugurated for handling international passengers in year 2010. The Terminal-1 is operated for Domestic Passengers.

##### ▪ **Infrastructure of Ahmedabad Airport**

**Terminal 1 (Domestic Terminal)** is having total terminal area approximately 29,500 Square meter with peak hour capacity for departure 600 PAX and for Arrival 600 PAX. Equipped with 04 numbers Aerobridges, 07 numbers boarding gates and 03 numbers conveyor belts in arrival. All 23 Check-In-Counters are equipped with (CUTE – Common User Terminal Equipment). This Terminal has 4 numbers Escalators (2 in Arrival and 2 in Departure) and 7 numbers Elevators.

**Terminal 2 (International Terminal)** is having total terminal area approximately 41,000 Square meter with peak hour capacity for departure 800 PAX and for Arrival 800 PAX. Equipped with 02 numbers Aerobridges, 09 numbers boarding gates and 05 numbers conveyor belts in arrival. All 32 Check-In-Counters are equipped with (CUTE – Common User Terminal Equipment). This Terminal has 4 numbers Escalators (2 in Arrival and 2 in Departure), 7 numbers Elevators and 02 numbers Travellators.

**Inter Terminal Link:** There is link between two terminals having Area of 4,800 Square meter with 04 numbers (02 numbers at each end) Escalators, 06 numbers Travellators (100-Meter-Long each) and 04 numbers Elevators.

Ahmedabad Airport has only one Runway designated as 05-23 is having length 3505 meters with 2 numbers of Aprons and 30 numbers of Bays for Parking the various size Aircrafts. The runway traffic handling capacity per hour is 20 (Arrivals and Departures).

#### ❖ **Jaipur Airport:**

Jaipur International Airport having IATA code: JAI and ICAO code: VIJP is an International Airport of Rajasthan State. Jaipur Airport is the 11<sup>th</sup> busiest Airport in India and is located at Sanganer, 13 Kms south of Jaipur. Jaipur Airport was granted the status of International Airport on 29 December 2005.

##### ▪ **Infrastructure of Jaipur Airport**

The New Terminal Building Operations were started after inauguration on 1 July 2009. This New Terminal Building has an area of approximate 23,000 Square meter with all modern facilities. The Terminal has peak hour capacity of 500 Arrival PAX and 500 Departure PAX. The Terminal has 14 numbers Check-In-Counters, equipped with (CUTE – Common User Terminal Equipment), Six numbers Immigration Counters, four numbers Custom Counters and Four Numbers Security counters to provide the hassle free passengers traffic flow.

The Terminal has 2 numbers Aerobridges, 4 numbers Escalators, 2 numbers Elevators / lifts and 2 numbers Conveyor Belts in Arrival Hall.

There are 2 numbers Runways, one is designated as 09/27 and having length of 3505 meters and other one is designated as 15/33 with a length of 1592 meters. The apron is having the 14 numbers parking bays for various size Aircrafts.

#### ❖ **Udaipur Airport:**

Udaipur Airport named as Maharana Pratap Airport having IATA code: UDR and ICAO code: VAUD is an International Airport at Udaipur, Rajasthan. It is situated at Dabok, 22 Km East of Udaipur.

The Airport is named after Maharana Pratap who was the ruler of the Princely state of Mewar in north-western India.

##### ▪ **Infrastructure of Udaipur Airport**

Udaipur Airport is having New Terminal Building having total Terminal area 12,000 Square meter approximately with peak hour capacity for Departure 300 PAX and Arrival 300 PAX. The Terminal is equipped with 02 numbers Aerobridges, 05 numbers boarding gates and 02 numbers Conveyor Belts in Arrival Hall. The Airport is equipped with modern navigational and landing aids like DME / DVOR.

The Building is an Integrated Building for Operations of Domestic and International flights. Being an international tourist place, the foreign tourists are visiting during winters. The Terminal having 11 numbers Check-In-Counters with CUTE (Common User Terminal Equipment).

Udaipur Airport has only one Runway with designation as 08/26 and having length of 2281 meters. The Apron is having 12 numbers parking bays for various size of Aircrafts.

## IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The perception of passengers is an important factor in Airport Management to evaluate the service quality (Park & Jung, 2011). The study about the perception of passengers regarding one attribute i.e. parking facility is to be studied in detailed with respect to eight demographic parameters of passengers. The Airports are the transition point for final destination hence Airports as a service industry, providing the various services either tangible or intangible for passengers (Subha & Arachana, 2013)

The perception of passengers has a significant impact which is resulting the number of passengers in future and ultimately affecting the flow or travelers to the particular county (Yeh & Kuo, 2003)

The parking facility is considered as airport non-processing domain and one attribute among the various more than 30 attributes.

Hence, it is important to evaluate the perception of passengers regarding parking facilities at Airport and menace the ways for improvements to get the final aim i.e. customer satisfaction.

## V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### ❖ Scope of Study:

To study the perception of passengers regarding parking facilities at Airports. For this purpose, the primary data were collected from Three Airports named Ahmedabad Airport, Jaipur Airport and Udaipur Airport by questionnaire method.

### ❖ Hypotheses for the study

- i. H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Age.
- ii. H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Gender.
- iii. H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Occupation.
- iv. H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Monthly Income.
- v. H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Number of Trips.
- vi. H<sub>06</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Purpose of Trip.
- vii. H<sub>07</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Class of travel.
- viii. H<sub>08</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time.

### ❖ Limitations.

Only Three Airports were selected and the sample of 550 numbers were taken from these Airports.

The responses were collected from passengers in questionnaire methods, hence may be biased with individuals own views and particular approach of Respondent toward the question.

### ❖ Tools Used

The following tools are used for the analysis of data.

- Kruskal-Wallis Test
- Chi-Square Test

## VI. ANALYSIS OF HYPOTHESES

- ❖ **Age:** The following Table shows the Age details of 550 Respondents.

		Age			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<=20 yrs	52	9.5	9.5	9.5
	21-40 yrs	348	63.3	63.3	72.7
	>=40 yrs	150	27.3	27.3	100.0
Total		550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Gender:** The following Table shows the Gender details of 550 Respondents.

		Gender			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	425	77.3	77.3	77.3
	Female	125	22.7	22.7	100.0
Total		550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Occupation:** The following Table shows the Occupation details of 550 Respondents.

		Occupation			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Business	200	36.4	36.4	36.4
	Govt/ PSU	57	10.4	10.4	46.7
	Housewife	61	11.1	11.1	57.8
	Professional	135	24.5	24.5	82.4
	Student	68	12.4	12.4	94.7
	Others	29	5.3	5.3	100.0

**Occupation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Business	200	36.4	36.4	36.4
	Govt/ PSU	57	10.4	10.4	46.7
	Housewife	61	11.1	11.1	57.8
	Professional	135	24.5	24.5	82.4
	Student	68	12.4	12.4	94.7
	Others	29	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Monthly Income:** The following Table shows the Monthly Income details of 550 Respondents.

**Monthly Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<50000	205	37.3	37.3	37.3
	50001-100000	225	40.9	40.9	78.2
	>100000	120	21.8	21.8	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Number of Trip:** The following Table shows the Number of Trip details of 550 Respondents.

**Number of Trips**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-5	341	62.0	62.0	62.0
	6-10	120	21.8	21.8	83.8
	11-15	52	9.5	9.5	93.3
	>15	37	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Purpose of Trip:** The following Table shows the Purpose of Trip details of 550 Respondents.

**Purpose of Trip**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Busi/ Official	304	55.3	55.3	55.3
	Leisure/ Tourist	133	24.2	24.2	79.5
	Other	113	20.5	20.5	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Class of Travel:** The following Table shows the Class of Travel details of 550 Respondents.

**Class of Travel**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Economy	485	88.2	88.2	88.2
	Business	61	11.1	11.1	99.3
	First Class	4	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

- ❖ **Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time:** The following Table shows the Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time details of 550 Respondents.

**Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	>3 hrs	81	14.7	14.7	14.7
	2-3 hrs	210	38.2	38.2	52.9
	1-2 hrs	225	40.9	40.9	93.8
	< 1 hr	34	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	100.0	

❖ **H01: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Age**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
Age	550	2.18	.580	1	3

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Ranks**

	Age	N	Mean Rank
PFT	<=20 yrs	52	360.94
	21-40 yrs	348	274.38
	>=40 yrs	150	248.48
	Total	550	

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	PFT
Chi-Square	19.400
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test  
b. Grouping Variable: Age

▪ **H01 – Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Age Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 19.400, p = 0.000$ , with a mean rank score of 360.94 for <=20 yrs, 274.38 for 21-40 yrs and 248.48 for >=40 yrs. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Age.

❖ **H02: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Gender**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
Gender	550	1.23	.419	1	2

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Ranks**

	Gender	N	Mean Rank
PFT	Male	425	252.26
	Female	125	354.52
	Total	550	

Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>

	PFT
Chi-Square	40.024
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis st  
b. Grouping Variable: Gender

▪ **H<sub>02</sub> – Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Gender Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 40.024, p = 0.000$ , with a mean rank score of 252.26 for Males and 354.52 for Females. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Gender.

❖ **H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Occupation**

## Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
Occupation	550	2.82	1.657	1	6

## Kruskal-Wallis Test

## Ranks

	Occupation	N	Mean Rank
PFT	Business	200	254.10
	Govt/ PSU	57	235.74
	Housewife	61	396.84
	Professional	135	269.73
	Student	68	321.19
	Others	29	165.76
	Total	550	

Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>

	PFT
Chi-Square	62.435
Df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test  
b. Grouping Variable: Occupation

▪ **H<sub>03</sub> – Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Occupation Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 62.435, p = 0.000$ , with a mean rank score of 254.10 for Business, 235.74 for Govt./PSU, 396.84 for Housewife, 269.73 for Professional, 321.19 for Students and 165.76 for Others. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Occupation.

❖ **H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Monthly Income**

## Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
MonthlyInc	550	1.85	.754	1	3

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

Ranks			
	MonthlyInc	N	Mean Rank
PFT	<50000	205	286.32
	50001-100000	225	273.79
	>100000	120	260.23
	Total	550	

Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
	PFT
Chi-Square	2.087
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.352

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: MonthlyInc

▪ **H<sub>04</sub> – Accepted**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically no significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Monthly Income Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 2.087, p = 0.000$ , with a mean rank score of 286.32 for <50000, 273.79 for 50001-100000 and 260.23for >100000. It can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Monthly Income.

❖ **H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Number of Trips**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
NTrips	550	1.61	.912	1	4

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

Ranks			
	NTrips	N	Mean Rank
PFT	1-5	341	276.59
	6-10	120	272.39
	11-15	52	280.67
	>15	37	268.30
	Total	550	

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	PFT
Chi-Square	.193
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.979

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: NTrips

▪ **H<sub>05</sub> – Accepted**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically no significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Number of Trips Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 0.193, p = 0.979$ , with a mean rank score of 276.59 for 1-5 trips, 272.39 for 6-10 trip, 280.67 for 11-15 trips and 268.30 for more than15 trips. It can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Number of Trips.

❖ **H06: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Purpose of Trip**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
PTrip	550	1.65	.799	1	3

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Ranks**

	PTrip	N	Mean Rank
PFT	Busi/ Official	304	245.25
	Leisure/ Tourist	133	338.67
	Other	113	282.54
	Total	550	

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	PFT
Chi-Square	32.279
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test  
 b. Grouping Variable: PTrip

▪ **H06 – Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Purpose of Trip Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 32.279, p = 0.000$ , with a mean rank score of 245.25 for Business/Official trip, 338.67 for Leisure/Tourist trip and 282.54 for other. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Purpose of Trip.

**H07: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Class of travel**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
Class	550	1.13	.353	1	3

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Ranks**

	Class	N	Mean Rank
PFT	Economy	485	281.23
	Business	61	239.04
	First Class	4	136.63
	Total	550	

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	PFT
Chi-Square	6.902
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.032

a. Kruskal Wallis Test  
 b. Grouping Variable: Class

▪ **H<sub>07</sub>– Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Class of travel Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.902, p = 0.032$ , with a mean rank score of 281.23 for Economy Class, 239.04 for Business Class and 136.63 for First class. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Class of travel.

❖ **H<sub>08</sub>: There is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PFT	550	61.21	14.730	19	90
ArrivalTime	550	2.39	.810	1	4

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Ranks**

	ArrivalTime	N	Mean Rank
PFT	>3 hrs	81	315.90
	2-3 hrs	210	258.09
	1-2 hrs	225	276.66
	< 1 hr	34	279.10
	Total	550	

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	PFT
Chi-Square	7.790
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.041

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: ArrivalTime

▪ **H<sub>08</sub> – Rejected**

A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in perception about Parking Facilities with respect to different Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time Groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.790, p = 0.041$ , with a mean rank score of 315.90 for >3 hrs, 285.09 for 2-3 hrs, 276.66 for 1-2 hrs and 279.10 for <1 hr. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time.

**VII. FINDINGS**

The followings are finding and conclusion after analysis the collected data.

- The majority of respondents are from Age Group of 21-40 Years.
- The majority of respondents are from Males Group
- The majority of respondents are from Group of Business man and professionals
- The majority of respondents are Group of Monthly income between Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000 and less then Rs. 50,000/-
- The majority of respondents are from number of trips between 01 to 05.
- The majority of respondents are from group of business trip or official trip.
- The majority of respondents are from Group of passengers who are traveling with economy class.
- The majority of respondents are from the group of passengers who are reaching at Airport 2 to 3 hours and 1 to 2 hours before schedule Departure time of flight.
- As H<sub>01</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Age. It means, the different age group have the different perception about Parking facilities which may be due to individual different need for different age group. This need may be psychological as well as physical. Hence, need the further study.
- As H<sub>02</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Gender. It means, the different gender group have the different perception about Parking

facilities which may be due to individual different need for different gender group. This need may be psychological as well as physical. Hence, need the further study.

- As H<sub>3</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Occupation. It means, the requirements may be different for business man, Govt. / PSU employees, House Wife, Professional, Students for the facilities in parking area the parameters covered in questionnaire need the further study for the changes / improvements in parking facilities.
- As H<sub>4</sub> hypothesis is accepted. It can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Monthly Income. It means, the parking facilities do not differ with monthly income group rather effected with the occupation, gender and age group.
- As H<sub>5</sub> hypothesis is accepted. It can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to number of trips. It means, the Parking facilities do not differ with number of trips rather effected with the occupation, gender and age group.
- As H<sub>6</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to purpose of trip. It means, the purpose the trip is related to the perception of passengers regarding Parking facilities and needs the further study for the changes.
- As H<sub>7</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to class of travel. It means, the class of travel is related to the perception of passengers regarding Parking facilities and needs the futher study for the changes.
- As H<sub>8</sub> hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the perception of passengers regarding Parking Facilities with respect to Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time. It means, the Time of Arrival before Schedule Departure Time is related to the perception of passengers regarding parking facilities and needs the further study for the changes.

### VIII. SUGGESTIONS

The Analysis is carried out with different 08 numbers parameters for findings the perceptions of passengers, the following suggestion are these.

- The further study may be carried out with the need of various groups like with respect to Age, Gender, Occupation, Purpose of Trip etc. which are elaborated in particular hypothesis.
- Necessary changes may be made in parking area to accommodate these requirements and fulfil of the needs. This will definitely enhance the passenger satisfaction at Airports and shall be helpful for the consistency in customer satisfaction index with respect to parking facilities.

### REFERENCES

1. Airport Council International. (2008). ASQ Survey: Benchmarking the Global Airport Industry. [http://acina.org/static/enrtransit/ASQ\\_Brochure2008.pdf](http://acina.org/static/enrtransit/ASQ_Brochure2008.pdf)
2. Correia, A. R., &Wirasinghe, S. C. (2013). Modeling Airport Landside Performance (K. G. Zografos, G. Andreatta& A. Odoni, R. Eds.): John Wiley & Sons Ltd
3. De Barros, A. G., Somasundaraswaran, A. K., &Wirasinghe, S. C. (2007). Evaluation Level of Service for Transfer Passengers at Airports. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 13, 293-298.
4. Fodness, D. & Murray, B. (2007) Passengers' expectations of airport service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21, 7, pp. 492-506.
5. George, I. (2013). Modified Importance-Performance Analysis of Airport Facilities - A Case Study of Cochin International Airport Limited. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 17(4), 09-15.
6. Kramer, L. S., Bothner, A., & Spiro, M. (2013). How Airports Measure Customer Service Performance. Washington D.C.: Transportation Research Board
7. Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L. &Zeithaml, V.A. (1988) SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64, 1, pp. 12-40.
8. Park, J. W. & Jung, S. Y. (2011) Transfer passengers' Perceptions of airport service quality: A case study of Incheon International airport. *International Business Research*, 4, 3, pp. 75-82.
9. SKYTRAX. (2014a). Skytrax Annual Survey. Retrieved 28 March 2014, from <http://www.worldairportawards.com/>
10. Subha, M. V. &Arachana, R. (2013) Identifying the Dimensions of Service Quality as Antecedents to Passenger Satisfaction of Rajiv Gandhi International Airport. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Management*, 8, 2, pp. 25-33.
11. Tong, H. Y. & Leung, W. C. (2012) Passengers' perceived satisfaction and quality of bus services. *Proceedings of the 17th HKSTS International Conference*,
12. Yeh, C. H. &Kuo, Y. L. (2003) Evaluating passenger services of Asia Pacific international airports. *Transportation Research, Part E*, 29, 1, pp. 39-48.
13. [WWW.AAL.AERO](http://WWW.AAL.AERO)
14. [WWW.GOINDIGO.IN](http://WWW.GOINDIGO.IN)
15. [WWW.JETAIRWAYS.COM](http://WWW.JETAIRWAYS.COM)
16. [WWW.SPICEJET.COM](http://WWW.SPICEJET.COM)
17. [WWW.WIKIPEDIA.ORG](http://WWW.WIKIPEDIA.ORG)