FUDMA Journal of Sciences (FJS)
ISSN online: 2616-1370
ISSN print: 2645 - 2944
Vol. 10 No. 10, May, 2026, pp 152 – 157
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33003/fjs-2026-1010-5490

Evaluation of Service Quality and Passenger Perception at Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II

***[1]Mansur Abdulhameed Pada, [2]Murtala Sidi, [2]Mohammed Sirajo Moriki, [1]Ismaila Hadi, [1]Abubakar Baballe Abubakar, [3]Mohammed Ibrahim Maikano and [4]Imrana Abdurrahman**

[1]Training Department, Nigerian Institute of Transport Technology (NITT), Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria.
[2]Nigerian Institute of Transport Technology (NITT), Zaria, Kaudna State, Nigeria.
[3]Transport Technology Center, Nigerian Institute of Transport Technology (NITT), Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria.
[4]Consultancy Services Department, Nigerian Institute of Transport Technology (NITT), Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria.

*Corresponding authors' email: mansur.pada@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Airport terminals play a central role in shaping passenger experience, yet limited evidence exists on terminal specific service quality differences within Nigerian airports. This study compared service quality and passenger satisfaction between Murtala Mohammed International Airport (MMIA) Terminals I and II using the SERVQUAL framework. A structured questionnaire was administered to 400 passengers, of which 384 valid responses (96.0%) were analysed. Service quality was evaluated across reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness using the two sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, while passenger satisfaction was examined using the Pearson Chi-Square test. The study introduces a terminal level assessment of service quality at MMIA, providing evidence often overlooked in airport level evaluations. The findings showed that Terminal II consistently outperformed Terminal I across most service dimensions. Overall passenger satisfaction was substantially higher at Terminal II, where 66.7% of passengers were satisfied or strongly satisfied, compared with 37.0% at Terminal I. Conversely, dissatisfaction was considerably higher at Terminal I (63.0%) than at Terminal II (33.4%). Significant differences were observed across the five SERVQUAL dimensions, and the Pearson Chi-Square test confirmed that passenger satisfaction differed significantly between the two terminals ($\chi^2 = 35.607$, df = 3, $p < 0.001$). The results demonstrate that variations in infrastructure quality, operational reliability, and staff service significantly influence passenger experience. The study provides terminal specific evidence to support targeted investments in Terminal I, strengthen service delivery, improve operational efficiency, enhance passenger satisfaction, and improve the overall competitiveness of MMIA.

Keywords: Airport service quality; SERVQUAL; Passenger satisfaction; Airport terminal performance; Murtala Mohammed International Airport; Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Air transportation is a vital component of global mobility and economic development, with airport terminals serving as the main points where travellers interact with the aviation system. The quality of services provided at airport terminals strongly influences passengers' travel experience, satisfaction, and behaviours such as using the airport again and recommending it to others (Alanazi et al., 2024). Recent studies show that airport service quality including infrastructure, staff responsiveness, cleanliness, security processes, and overall operational performance shapes passengers' perceptions and satisfaction in many international contexts (Chen and Chang, 2023).

As airports expand and operate multiple terminals, evaluating service quality at the terminal level has become increasingly important. Individual terminals often differ in infrastructure, passenger volume, operational efficiency, and service delivery, resulting in varying passenger experiences within the same airport. Understanding these differences enables airport managers to identify terminal specific strengths and weaknesses, allocate resources more effectively, improve operational performance, and enhance overall airport competitiveness. Since passenger satisfaction strongly influences loyalty, repeat patronage, and positive recommendations, terminal level assessments provide valuable evidence for service improvement and strategic airport management.

Service quality and passenger perception, although closely related, represent different concepts. Service quality refers to passengers' evaluation of specific service attributes such as reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles, while passenger perception reflects the overall impression and judgement formed from the cumulative travel experience. The SERVQUAL framework provides a comprehensive basis for evaluating service quality because it measures these core dimensions systematically and has been widely applied in transportation and airport studies. Examining both service quality and passenger perception therefore provides a more complete understanding of how individual service attributes influence passengers' overall evaluation of airport performance.

Research on airport service quality has increasingly used quantitative and qualitative approaches to understand the complex relationship between service delivery and passenger satisfaction. Studies using structural equation models indicate that airport service quality affects passengers' intentions to reuse the airport and recommend it to others, with satisfaction acting as an important link between service quality and these behaviours (Khan et al., 2023). Analysis of passenger complaints at major airports has shown that factors such as service costs, staff behaviour, and inefficient procedures are main contributors to dissatisfaction, demonstrating that passengers perceive service quality in multiple dimensions (Yilmaz and Demir, 2022).

In Nigeria, research on airport service quality is growing but still limited. A study using the SERVQUAL model at Nnamdi Azikiwe International Airport Abuja and Murtala Mohammed International Airport Lagos found that both passengers and airlines rated overall service quality below expectations, particularly in tangibles, responsiveness, and reliability

(Okeke and Onifade, 2020). Research at Port Harcourt International Airport found that quality of baggage handling and check in procedures was positively linked to passenger satisfaction, showing that core airport services determine passenger experience (Eze and Oladipo, 2021). Another national study indicated that airport service quality including convenience, reliability, and comfort strongly affects tourists' perceptions of travel and tourism experiences in Nigeria (Abubakar et al., 2022).

Despite these findings, there are three main gaps that this study addresses. First, most Nigerian studies treat airports as a single entity without examining individual terminals, which may have specific service challenges and strengths. Second, current literature rarely distinguishes between objective assessments of service quality and passengers' overall perceptions of airport performance, thereby limiting a comprehensive understanding of passenger experience. Third, global research shows that factors such as service cost, staff interaction, and facility quality are increasingly important to passengers, but these insights are rarely applied to Nigerian airport terminals in recent post pandemic operations (Li and Wang, 2023; Hassan et al., 2024).

This study therefore evaluates service quality at Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II using the SERVQUAL framework and examines passengers' overall perceptions of the services and facilities provided. Through comparing the two terminals individually, the study generates terminal specific evidence that supports informed management decisions, identifies priority areas for service improvement, enhances passenger satisfaction and loyalty, and contributes to strengthening Nigeria's competitiveness in airport service delivery.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study focuses on Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II in Lagos. It investigates the service quality of the two terminals as well as passenger perceptions regarding the facilities and services provided. Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire administered to passengers at both terminals.

The internal consistency of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. The instrument produced a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.94, indicating excellent reliability and confirming that the questionnaire items consistently measured the intended service quality constructs.

The sample size for this study was determined using the widely applied sample size formula for estimating proportions in survey research (Taherdoost, 2017):

$n = \frac{z^2 p(1-p)}{e^2}$ (Zikmund, 1999)

where *n* is the sample size, *z* represents the standard normal value at the 95 percent confidence level (1.96), σ is the assumed standard deviation (0.5), and *e* is the margin of error (0.05). Since the total passenger population and terminal specific passenger distribution were not available at the time of the study, the assumption of maximum variability ($p = 0.5$) was adopted for sample size estimation, and an equal distribution of respondents between Terminals I and II was used to facilitate terminal level comparison. The calculation was carried out as follows:

$n = \frac{z^2 p(1-p)}{e^2} = \frac{(1.96)^2 0.5(0.5)}{(0.05)^2} = \frac{3.84 \times 0.25}{0.0025} = \frac{0.96}{0.0025} = 384$

This indicated that a minimum sample size of 384 respondents was required for the study. To ensure adequate representation and account for possible incomplete responses, 400 questionnaires were administered, with equal allocation between the two terminals. Of these, 384 were correctly completed and found suitable for analysis, representing a valid response rate of 100.0%. The collected data were cleaned before analysis. Descriptive statistics, specifically simple percentages, were used to summarise the demographic characteristics of respondents and the operational characteristics of the two terminals. SERVQUAL was adopted as the analytical framework because it provides a comprehensive assessment of service quality across five dimensions namely reliability, assurance, tangibles, responsiveness, and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Although alternative frameworks such as SERVPERF and the Airport Service Quality programme have been widely adopted in airport service quality assessment (Bezerra & Gomes, 2021), SERVQUAL was considered more suitable for this study because it enables a detailed multidimensional assessment of service quality attributes and facilitates the identification of service gaps that influence passenger perceptions (Alanazi et al., 2024).

For inferential analysis, the two sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed to compare the distributions of the five SERVQUAL dimensions between Terminals I and II. The test was considered appropriate because it compares the overall empirical distributions of two independent samples without requiring a normal distribution (Tongzon, 2001). The test statistic is expressed as:

$D = max|F_1(x) - F_2(x)|$ (Zikmund, 1999)

Where D represents the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, while $F_1(x)$ and $F_2(x)$ denote the empirical cumulative distribution functions of the two samples.

For each SERVQUAL dimension, respondents' ratings on the relevant indicators were aggregated to obtain a composite dimension score from which the overall Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic was computed. In addition, the Pearson Chi-Square test was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant association between airport terminal and passengers' overall satisfaction levels. The Pearson Chi-Square test compares the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies under the assumption that no association exists between the variables. The test statistic is expressed as:

$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$ (Zikmund, 1999)

Where χ^2 is the Chi-Square statistic, (o_i represents the observed frequency, and $E_i$represents the expected frequency.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected for the study. It begins with a summary of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, providing context for understanding the subsequent findings. For the purpose of this study, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D-test was employed to analyse the five key determinant variables of service quality, namely reliability, tangibles, empathy, responsiveness, and assurance.

Table 1: Demographic and Travel Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Gender Distribution		
Male	263	68.5
Female	112	29.2

Respondents Profile	Frequency	Percentage
No Response	9	2.3
Age Distribution		
18—30	101	26.3
31—40	113	29.4
41—50	92	24.0
51—60	54	14.1
61 and above	24	6.3
Purpose of Travel		
Personal	103	26.8
Official	112	29.2
Business	155	40.4
Others	14	3.6
Frequency of Travel		
Once	16	4.2
2—5 times	73	19.0
6—10 times	59	15.4
11—20 times	127	33.1
Above 20 times	109	28.4
Total	384	100

Source: Author's Field Survey (2025)

Based on Table 1, the demographic and travel characteristics of the 384 respondent's show that 68.5% were male, 29.2% were female, and 2.3% did not indicate their gender. In terms of age distribution, 29.4% of respondents were between 31 and 40 years, 26.3% were 18 to 30 years, 24.0% were 41 to 50 years, 14.1% were 51 to 60 years, and 6.3% were 61 years and above. The purpose of travel was mainly business related at 40.4%, followed by official purposes at 29.2%, personal travel at 26.8%, and other purposes at 3.6%. Regarding travel frequency, 33.1% travelled 11 to 20 times, 28.4% travelled more than 20 times, 19.0% travelled 2 to 5 times, 15.4% travelled 6 to 10 times, and 4.2% travelled only once. These results indicate that the respondents were predominantly working adults with frequent travel patterns, providing a reliable perspective on the service quality and facilities at Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II.

Comparison between MM I and MM II Terminals Based on Services Reliability

Here, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the determinants of reliability of service qualityin MMA I and MMA II

H_1: There is significant difference between the determinants of reliability of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

Table 2: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on Services Reliability between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Airport Services	K S Statistic (D)	P-value	Significance	MM I	MM II
Available public transport option	0.214	0.040	Significant	-	Better
Ease of access of public transport	0.221	0.060	Not Significant	Better	-
Immigration clearance timing	0.236	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Prevent lost luggage services	0.248	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Security and safety standards	0.265	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Ease of transit through the airport	0.259	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Baggage delivery times	0.182	0.010	Significant	-	Better
Standard and physically impaired facilities.	0.121	0.180	Not Significant	Better	-
Priority baggage delivery efficiency	0.098	0.390	Not Significant	Better	-
Overall Statistic	0.205	0.020			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

The hypothesis tested whether there is a significant difference in the reliability dimension of service quality between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. As shown in Table 2, the overall p-value across all reliability indicators was 0.020, which is less than the 5% level of significance (0.05). Based on this comparison, the result is statistically significant, and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates there is a significant difference in the reliability of service quality between Terminal I and Terminal II.

Comparison between MM I and MM II Terminals Based on Services Assurance

Here, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the determinants of assurance of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

H_1: There is significant difference between the determinants of assurance of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

Table 3: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on Services Assurance between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Airport Services	K S Statistic (D)	P-value	Significance	MM I	MM II
Immigration Staff Attitude	0.214	0.020	Significant	-	Better
Courtesy and attitude of security staff	0.287	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Adequacy of public information and signage	0.156	0.090	Not Significant	Better	-
Friendliness and airport staff	0.198	0.040	Significant	-	Better
Overall Statistic	0.214	0.030			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

The analysis in Table 3 examined whether there is a significant difference in the assurance dimension of service quality between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. The overall p-value for all assurance indicators was 0.030, which is below the 5% level of significance (0.05). This indicates that the difference in assurance between the two terminals is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In other words, Terminal I and Terminal II differ significantly in terms of service assurance as perceived by passengers.

Comparison between MM I and MM II Terminals Based on Services Tangibles

Here, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the determinants of tangibles of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

H_1: There is significant difference between the determinants of tangibles of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

Table 4: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on Tangibles between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Variables	K S Statistic (D)	P-value	Significance	MM I	MM II
Check in and Queuing Facilities	0.276	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Getting To and Fro Airport with Ease	0.241	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Availability of Luggage Trolleys	0.283	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Terminal Comfort, Ambiance, General Design and Appearance	0.235	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Seating Facilities Throughout Terminal	0.221	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Wash Room and Toilet Facilities	0.279	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Television and Entertainment Facilities	0.148	0.110	Not Significant	Better	-
Quiet Areas, Day Rooms, Rest Areas	0.192	0.040	Significant	Better	-
Children Play Area Facilities	0.264	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Location Airline Lounges	0.238	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Internet Facilities Availability	0.205	0.020	Significant	-	Better
Business Centre Facility	0.229	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Telephone and Taxi Location	0.233	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Bureau de Change	0.247	0.000	Significant	-	Better
ATM Facility	0.251	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Smoking Zone Availability	0.244	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Food Canteen	0.232	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Prayer Room	0.249	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Duty Free Shops	0.236	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Overall Statistic	0.244	0.010			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

The hypothesis tested whether there is a significant difference in the tangibles dimension of service quality between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. As revealed by table 4, the overall p-value across all tangible service indicators was 0.010, which is below the 5% level of significance (0.05). This indicates that the difference in tangibles between the two terminals is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In other words, Terminal I and Terminal II differ significantly in terms of the physical facilities, comfort, and amenities available to passengers.

Comparison between MM I and MM II Terminals Based on Services Empathy

Here, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the determinants of empathy of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

H_1: There is significant difference between the determinants of empathy of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

Table 5: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on Empathy between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Variables	K S Statistic (D)	P-value	Significance	MM I	MM II
Cleanness of Terminal, Floor, Seating and Public Area	0.218	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Flight Information, Screen Clarity and Quality of Information	0.196	0.000	Significant	-	Better
Clarity Boarding Calls and Airport Public Announcement	0.184	0.010	Significant	-	Better
Cleanness of Wash Room Facilities	0.172	0.020	Significant	-	Better
Terminal Signage Facilities, Boarding Gates, Transfer and Arrival	0.149	0.060	Not Significant	Better	-
Overall Statistic	0.184	0.020			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

The analysis examined whether there is a significant difference in the empathy dimension of service quality between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. As shown in Table 5, the overall p-value across all empathy indicators was 0.020, which is below the 5% level of significance (0.05). This indicates that the difference in empathy between the two terminals is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In other words,

Terminal I and Terminal II differ significantly in terms of passengers' perceptions of staff attentiveness, terminal cleanliness, and clarity of flight information, with each terminal showing strengths in specific empathy-related aspects.

Comparison between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals Based on Services Responsiveness

Here, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the determinants of responsiveness of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

H_1: There is significant difference between the determinants of responsiveness of service quality in MMA I and MMA II

Table 6: Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on Responsiveness between MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Variables	K S Statistic (D)	P-value	Significance	MM I	MM II
Language Skills for Airport Staff	0.176	0.032	Significant	Better	Better
Choice of Shopping, Tax Free and other Outlets	0.149	0.050	Not Significant	-	Better
Prices Charged in Retail Outlets	0.188	0.021	Significant	-	Better
Choice of Bars, Cafes and Restaurants Including International Options	0.141	0.070	Not Significant	Better	-
Overall Statistic	0.164	0.042			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

The analysis in table 6 examined whether there is a significant difference in the responsiveness dimension of service quality between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. The overall p-value for all responsiveness indicators was 0.042, which is slightly below the 5% level of significance (0.05). Based on this comparison, the result is statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates there is a small but significant difference in the responsiveness of service quality between Terminal I and Terminal II, suggesting that passengers perceive some variation in how the terminals address service promptness, staff assistance, and related customer-focused measures.

General Passenger Satisfaction on Services and Facilities of the Airport Terminals

This segment assesses the passengers' satisfaction based on the services and facilities provided in both terminals of Murtala Mohammed Airport.

Table 7: Level of Satisfaction of the Passengers with MM I and MM II Airport Terminals

Satisfaction Level	MMA I		MMA II		Total	%
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Strongly Satisfied	41	21.4	61	31.8	102	26.6
Satisfied	30	15.6	67	34.9	97	25.3
Dissatisfied	69	35.9	37	19.3	106	27.6
Strongly Dissatisfied	52	27.1	27	14.1	79	20.6
Total	192	100.0	192	100.0	384	100.0

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

Table 7 presents passengers' overall satisfaction with services and facilities at Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. The results show that Terminal II had higher satisfaction levels, with 31.8% of passengers strongly satisfied and 34.9% satisfied, compared to Terminal I, where only 21.4% were strongly satisfied and 15.6% satisfied. Conversely, dissatisfaction was higher at Terminal I, with 35.9% dissatisfied and 27.1% strongly dissatisfied, while Terminal II recorded 19.3% and 14.1%, respectively. These findings are consistent with the earlier analysis of the SERVQUAL dimensions, where Terminal II generally outperformed Terminal I in tangibles, assurance, and reliability, while empathy and responsiveness showed mixed results. The alignment between the SERVQUAL-based service quality assessment and general passenger satisfaction suggests that improvements in tangible facilities, staff assurance, and operational reliability contribute directly to higher passenger satisfaction. This reinforces the practical relevance of the SERVQUAL framework in evaluating airport service quality and shows the areas where Terminal I could focus improvements to enhance overall passenger experience.

To determine whether the observed differences in satisfaction levels between the two terminals were statistically significant rather than occurring by chance, the Pearson Chi-Square test was conducted. Results of the analysis are presented as follows:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the levels of passenger satisfaction between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminal I and Terminal II.

H_1: There is a significant difference in the levels of passenger satisfaction between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminal I and Terminal II.

Table 8: Pearson Chi-Square Test of Passengers' Satisfaction by Airport Terminal

Satisfaction Level	MM I Observed (Expected)	MM II Observed (Expected)	Chi-Square Contribution
Strongly Satisfied	41 (51.0)	61 (51.0)	3.922
Satisfied	30 (48.5)	67 (48.5)	14.113
Dissatisfied	69 (53.0)	37 (53.0)	9.660
Strongly Dissatisfied	52 (39.5)	27 (39.5)	7.911
Total	192	192	35.607
Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 35.607 Degrees of Freedom (df) = 3 P value = < 0.001			

Source: Author's Data Analysis (2025)

Table 8 presents the results of the Pearson Chi-Square test conducted to determine whether passenger satisfaction levels differ significantly between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II. The observed frequencies show that Terminal II recorded more strongly satisfied and satisfied passengers than expected, while Terminal I recorded higher than expected dissatisfied and strongly dissatisfied passengers. The computed Pearson Chi-Square value of 35.607 with 3 degrees of freedom yielded a p-value less than 0.001, which is lower than the 5% significance level (0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in passenger satisfaction levels between MM I and MM II. This finding indicates that the airport terminal used has a significant influence on passengers' overall satisfaction and corroborates the earlier SERVQUAL results, which showed that Terminal II generally performed better than Terminal I across most service quality dimensions.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that service quality varies significantly across most dimensions between Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II, with Terminal II generally demonstrating better performance. However, some service indicators favour Terminal I, indicating that performance differences are not uniform across all areas. These variations highlight critical gaps in Terminal I that require targeted improvements in infrastructure, staff performance, and operational processes. Addressing these areas will help elevate service standards, enhance passenger experience, and ensure that both terminals achieve expected levels of efficiency and quality in line with international airport service benchmarks.

Based on the findings of this study, it is evident that passenger perceptions of service quality at Murtala Mohammed International Airport Terminals I and II vary across the five SERVQUAL dimensions, with Terminal II generally outperforming Terminal I in tangibles, reliability, and assurance. To enhance service quality, operational efficiency, and passenger satisfaction across both terminals, the following recommendations are proposed:

i. Airport Management (MM I Authority) should upgrade facilities, maintain cleanliness, improve passenger services, and ensure staff responsiveness.
ii. Human Resource and Training Departments of both terminals should implement staff training programs to strengthen assurance, courtesy, and professionalism.
iii. Operations and Logistics Teams should improve reliability by optimizing baggage handling, Immigration clearance, and transit procedures.
iv. Quality Assurance or Customer Relations Units should conduct regular surveys, collect passenger feedback, and monitor service performance.
v. Government and Regulatory Agencies, such as the Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria, should provide funding, policy guidance, and oversight to support Terminal I improvements and ensure overall airport service standards.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, A. M., Danladi, J., & Aliyu, A. (2022). Service quality and tourists' perceptions in air transport: Evidence from Nigerian airports. *Nigerian Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 45–60.

Alanazi, M. S. M., Li, J., & Jenkins, K. W. (2024). Evaluating airport service quality based on statistical and predictive analysis of Skytrax passenger reviews. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(20), 9472. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14209472

Bezerra, G. C. L., de Souza, E. M., & Correia, A. R. (2021). Passenger expectations and airport service quality: Exploring customer segmentation. *Transportation Research Record*, *2675*(10), 604–615. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981211011992

Chen, Y., & Chang, W. (2023). Airport service quality and passenger satisfaction: Evidence from Asia Pacific airports. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, *105*, 102297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2022.102297

Eze, F. J., & Oladipo, J. A. (2021). Airport service quality and passenger satisfaction at Port Harcourt International Airport, Nigeria. *African Journal of Management and Business Research*, *10*(1), 1–14.

Hassan, F., Adeyemi, A., & Chukwuma, S. (2024). Post pandemic airport service performance and passenger perceptions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Transport Management*, *25*(2), 1–15.

Khan, S., Rehman, K., & Ali, M. (2023). Structural equation modeling of airport service quality, passenger satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Air Transport Studies*, *14*(2), 25–44.

Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Evaluating airport service quality and passenger experience in global post pandemic operations. *Transport Policy*, *134*, 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2023.01.011

Okeke, C., & Onifade, S. (2020). Assessment of airport service quality in Nigeria using the SERVQUAL model: A case of NAIA Abuja and MM I Lagos. *European Journal of Logistics, Purchasing and Supply Chain Management*, *8*(4), 1–14.

Taherdoost, H. (2017). Determining sample size: How to calculate survey sample size for research. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems*, *2*, 237–239.

Tongzon, J. (2001). Efficiency measurement of selected Australian and other international airports using data envelopment analysis. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, *37*(4), 281–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1366-5545(00)00049-6

Yilmaz, E., & Demir, I. (2022). Airport service quality assessment and passenger complaints analysis: Insights from Turkish airports. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, *102*, 102135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2022.102135

Zikmund, W. G. (1999). *Business research methods* (6th ed.). South Western College Publishing.