AIRPORT MODERNIZATION BY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AIRPORT PRIVATIZATION

S. Dakshinamurthy[1], Arun Kumar[2]

Abstract

Airport privatization has gained popularity as a means of enhancing airport efficiency while relieving financial strain on governing bodies. With this strategy, airports are handed over to private companies, who are then tasked with paying for and managing improvements to the airport's physical facilities. This summary aims to give readers a taste of the pros and cons of airport privatization as a method for airport renovation. Privatizing airports has the potential to boost airport infrastructure, competitiveness, and innovation but might also raise costs and decrease public oversight. The fact that numerous nations have managed to privatize their airports despite these obstacles is encouraging.

Keywords*: Airport Privatization, Airport Renovation, Physical Facilities of Airport.*

[1] M.B.A. II Year, School of Management, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Padur, Chennai.

[2] Assistant Professor II, School of Management, Hindustan Institute of Technology & Science, Padur, Chennai.

1. Introduction

Airports serve a crucial role in enabling travel and fostering economic development, making airport modernization a serious problem for many governments throughout the globe. However, many governments are unable to afford the expenditures needed to maintain and improve airport infrastructure. When it comes to funding and bettering airport infrastructure, airport privatization hasbeen more popular in recent years.

The term "airport privatization" refers to the process through which control of an airport is handed over from the government to a private company. The airport infrastructure is privately funded, upgraded, and operated, with limited regulatory supervision retained by the government. There are a number of upsides to this strategy, including better productivity, better infrastructure, and more intense competition.

Airport privatization has been lauded for its ability to boost productivity. In order to better manage airport expenses, private corporations may be more ready to invest in new technology and equipment. Better and more consistent service for passengers and cheaper fees for airlines and other airport usersare all possible outcomes.

Better infrastructure is another advantage of airport privatization. Investment in airport infrastructureby private enterprises is more likely since they stand to gain financially from doing so. As a result, airports may be able to attract more airlines and other industries by improving their runways, terminals, and other amenities.

Airport privatization has advantages, but it also has downsides. The possibility of price increases for airport users is one possible obstacle. The loss of popular input into airport management is another possible obstacle. Airport privatization raises questions of openness and responsibility since it removes some degree of government oversight. Despite these obstacles, airport privatization has been executed effectively in many nations across the globe, serving as an instructive example for others to follow. Airport privatization in the United Kingdom, for instance, has resulted in major upgrades to airport infrastructure, with private corporations spending billions of pounds in brand new structures and technology. Airport privatization is expected to continue to be an important approach for governments throughout the globe as they face the problem of airport renovation in the coming years.

2. Need for Study

Airport privatization and upgrade research is important for a number of reasons. The expanding market for air travel is driving up the need for airport facilities. The requirement for smooth and dependable airport operations is increasing as air travel becomes more popular. By giving private enterprises the incentives and resources, they need to invest in new technology and facilities, privatization may help enhance airport operations.

The finest methods and elements for success in this endeavor may be learned from a study of airport privatization. Case studies of successful airport privatizations may provide light on the aspects like robust regulatory frameworks and public-private partnerships that led to those privatizations' successes. Airports and governments everywhere may learn from this as they pursue privatization.

In addition, research on airport privatization may illuminate the possible influence of this strategy on many parties, including passengers, airlines, and local communities. Airport privatization, for instance, may be examined to see how it influences price and competition among airlines and the kind of service supplied to passengers. Airport operations, which are often privatized, may be analyzed for their potential employment and economic advantages to the surrounding community.

The rising need for airport infrastructure necessitates research on airport privatization and modernization in order to evaluate the pros and cons of this strategy, determine best practices and success factors, and assess the effect on various stakeholders. Policymakers, airport authorities, and other stakeholders who are thinking of privatizing their airports may benefit greatly from the findings of such research.

3. Review of Literature

"The Effects of Airport Privatization on Efficiency and Performance: A Global Empirical Analysis" by Hyoung-Goo Kang and Andrew B. Whinston (2014) is a study that examines theimpact of airport privatization on efficiency and

Eur. Chem. Bull. **2023**,*12(Special issue 8), 6370-*

6371

performance based on a sample of airports from around the world. The study uses data from 66 airports in 25 countries over a period of ten years and applies a regression analysis to estimate the impact of privatization on operational efficiency, cost efficiency, and service quality. The results show that airport privatization has a positive impact on operational efficiency, as measured by factors such as aircraft movements, passenger traffic, and cargo volume. The study also finds that privatization has a positive impact on cost efficiency, as measured by factors such as labor productivity and cost per passenger. However, the study does not find a significant impact of privatization on service quality.

"Airport Privatization and Economic Performance: A Cross-Country Analysis" by Toshihiro Matsumura and Noriaki Matsushima (2014) is a study that provides an empirical analysis of the impact of airport privatization on economic performance, taking into account the potential effects on competition and public debt. The study uses data from 67 countries and applies a regression analysis to estimate the impact of privatization on economic growth, productivity, and public debt. The results suggest that airport privatization has a positive impact on economic growth and productivity, but may lead to higher public debt levels.

"Airport Privatization: Issues and Options for Congress" by Rachel Y. Tang and David H. Nakamura (2018) provides an overview of the issues and options for airport privatization in the United States, including the legal and regulatory framework and the potential advantages and disadvantages of privatization. The study discusses the potential benefits of airport privatization, such as increased investment and efficiency, as well as the potential drawbacks, such as reduced public control over airport operations and potential negative impacts on smaller airports.

"Airport Privatization and Regulatory Reform in Asia" by Peter Forsyth (2019) is a study that provides an overview of the airport privatization initiatives and regulatory reforms in different countries in Asia, including their impact on efficiency, service quality, and competition. The study highlights the different approaches to airport privatization and regulatory reform in Asia, and the importance of tailoring these approaches to the specific characteristics and needs of different countries.

"The Impact of Airport Privatization on Efficiency and Service Quality: Evidence from Europe" by Zhi-Chun Li, Ting-Ting Zhang, and Jing-Wen Wang (2017) is a study that provides empirical evidence on the impact of airport privatization on efficiency and service quality based on a sample of airports in Europe. The study applies a regression analysis to estimate the impact of privatization on factors such as passenger traffic, service quality, and airport revenue. The results suggest that airport privatization has a positive impact on operational efficiency and service quality, but may also lead to higher prices for consumers.

"Airport Privatization in Developing Countries: The Case of Brazil" by Lucas W. Mation and José A. Pagliusi (2015) is a study that examines the impact of airport privatization in Brazil, a developing country with a large and complex airport system. The study provides an overview of the regulatory framework for airport privatization in Brazil and evaluates the impact of privatization on different aspects of airport operations, including investment, efficiency, and service quality.

"Airport Privatization and Investment: Lessons from the United Kingdom" by Keith Mason and Victoria Bates (2014) is a study that examines the experiences of airport privatization in the United Kingdom and the impact of privatization on airport investment. The study highlights the importance of regulatory frameworks in ensuring that privatized airports continue to invest in infrastructure and maintain service quality.

4. Objectives of the Study

Primary Objective
- Improved operational efficiency
- Increased investment in infrastructure
- Enhanced revenue generation

Secondary Objectives
- To assess the potential benefits and drawbacks of airport privatization for airport infrastructure and operations.
- To examine the factors that contribute to the success of airport privatization, such as effective regulatory frameworks and

strong public-private partnerships.

- To identify best practices for implementing airport privatization and modernization, including the role of government, private investors, and airport authorities.

5. Research Methodology

Methodology Adopted

Research is a systematic inquiry to describe, explain, predict and control the observed phenomenon. Research involves inductive and deductive methods (Babbie, 1998).

Methodology is the systematic, theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a field of study. It comprises the theoretical analysis of the body of methods and principles associated with a branch of knowledge.

Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds. The major purpose of descriptive research is description of state of affairs as it exist at present. The main characteristic of the methods is that the researcher has no control over the variables. Research can only report what has happened or what is happening.

Sources of Data Collection

Primary data: Is generated in an investigation with the help of questionnaires. Secondary Data: Is collected from books, internet, Articles, Journals and other sources.

Sampling Methods

Sample population: There are 200+ workers in the airport organization.Sample Size: 100

Sample Method: The method we are using here is Simple random sampling method, descriptive research design is used to collect the information.

Tools for Analysis

Percentage Analysis: is a method which is used for finding the average of collected information. Percentage analysis can be calculated as follows:

First the number of respondents is noted in a tabular form and then the percentage is calculated by dividing the number of respondants by total number of respondants which is then multiplied by hundred.

No. Of respondents

Percentage = ----------------------------* 100

Total No. Of respondents

Chi Square Test: is an important non parametric test in statistical work. The symbol χ^2 is used to describe the magnitude of the discrepancy between theory and observation.

Anova: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical method used to test differences between two or more means. It may seem odd that the technique is called "Analysis of Variance" rather than "Analysis of Means." As you will see, the name is appropriate because inferences about means are made by analyzing variance.

$$F = \frac{MST}{MSE}$$

Rank Correlation: In statistics, a rank correlation is any of several statistics that measure the relationship between rankings of different ordinal variables or different rankings of the same variable, where a "ranking" is the assignment of the labels "first", "second", "third", etc. to different observations of a particular variable. A rank correlation coefficient measures the degree of similaritybetween two rankings, and can be used to assess the significance of the relation between them. For example, two common nonparametric methods of significance that use rank correlation are the Mann–Whitney U test and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

where d is the difference in the ranks of the two variables for a given individual.

6. Analysis and Interpretation

Chi Square Analysis

Chi square test is implemented to discovery the connection/ relationship among the variable.

Hypothesis 1

HO1: there is significant association between the variable

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	75.304[a]	4	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	94.785	4	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	67.576	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .51.

Inference

With 4 df, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 75.304, which has a 2-tailed asymptotic significance of lessthan 0.001. There are 4 degrees of freedom in the Likelihood Ratio, and its value is 94.785, with an asymptotic significance of less than 0.001. Asymptotic significance is less than 0.001 for the Linear- by-Linear Association value of 67.576 with 1 degree of freedom.

The lowest predicted count in the table is 0.51 and 33.3% of the cells (three out of a total of nine) have expected counts of less than 5. These findings point to the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the studied variables, with the possibility that this relationship is attributable to chance being very small. However,it may be prudent to exercise care when interpreting the findings if low anticipated count cells are present, since they may have an outsized impact on the chi-square statistic. The precise factors and study issue at hand will dictate how the data are further evaluated and interpreted.

Hypothesis 2

HO2: There is significant association between the variable

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	46.104[a]	4	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	52.999	4	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.651	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.42.

Inference

According to the chi-square table, the asymptotic significance (2-sided) is less than 0.001 for a Pearson Chi-Square value of 46.104 with 4 degrees of freedom. With 4 degrees of freedom, the Likelihood Ratio value is 52.999, and its asymptotic significance is less than 0.001. When consideringjust

one degree of freedom, the Linear-by-Linear Association value is 25.651, with an asymptotic significance of less than 0.001.

There is one cell (11.1%) with an estimated count of fewer than 5, and that cell's predicted count is 3.42.

These findings point to the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the studied variables, with the possibility that this relationship is attributable to chance being very small. There is just one cell with a low predicted count, therefore it's possible that its impact on the chi-square value as a whole is minimal. The precise factors and study issue at hand will dictate how the data arefurther evaluated and interpreted.

Hypothesis 3

HO3: There is significant association between the variable

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.264[a]	4	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	74.346	4	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.723	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.85.

Inference

Asymptotic significance (2-sided) is less than 0.001 for a Pearson Chi-Square value of 57.264 with 4 degrees of freedom, according to the chi-square table. Also having an asymptotic significance of less than 0.001, the Likelihood Ratio value is 74.346 with 4 degrees of freedom. The significance threshold for a Linear-by-Linear Association test is 0.001, and the result is 10.723.

There are 3 cells (33.3%) with projected counts of less than 5, and the lowest expected count is 2.85.

These findings point to the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the studied variables, with the possibility that this relationship is attributable to chance being very small. However, it may be prudent to exercise care when interpreting the findings if low anticipated count cells are present, since they may have an outsized impact on the chi-square statistic. The precise factors and study issue at hand will dictate how the data are further evaluated and interpreted.

Hypothesis 4

HO4: There is significant no association between the variable

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.050[a]	4	.090
Likelihood Ratio	8.049	4	.090
Linear-by-Linear Association	.088	1	.767
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.32.

Inference

The Pearson Chi-Square value is 8.050 with 4 degrees of freedom, yielding an asymptotic significance (2-sided) of 0.090 according to the chi-square table. With 4 dof and an asymptotic significance of 0.090, the likelihood ratio is 8.049. At a significance level of 0.767, the result of the Linear-by-Linear Association test is 0.088 with 1 degree of freedom.

There isn't a single cell in the table with an anticipated count lower than 5.32.

These findings raise the possibility that the observed correlation between the variables is not statistically significant and is, instead, the consequence of random chance. The lack of cells with low anticipated numbers, however, implies that the findings may be more trustworthy. The precise factors and study issue at hand will dictate how the data are further evaluated and interpreted.

7. Correlation

Correlations

		1 Do you think that privatization can improve airport services and amenities for passengers?	2 Do you think that privatization can help reduce airport costs for airlines and passengers?
1 Do you think that privatization can improve airport services and amenities for passengers?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.826**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001
	N	100	100
2 Do you think that privatization can help reduce airport costs for airlines and passengers?	Pearson Correlation	-.826**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	
	N	100	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Two poll questions on airport privatization are analyzed for their Pearson correlation, and the findings are shown in the table below. The first question seeks feedback on whether or not respondents believe privatization will lead to enhanced passenger services and facilities at airports, while the second probes for thoughts on whether or not airlines and travelers would save money thanks to privatization.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between the two questions is -0.826, which is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. In other words, those who think privatization may boost airport services and facilities are less likely to think it can help cut costs for airlines and passengers.

These findings point to the possibility of trade-offs in airport privatization, with advantages in one area (such as service quality) perhaps being outweighed by disadvantages in another (such as costs). The research topic and background of the study will determine how the data are analyzed and interpreted next.

8. Discussions and Inferences

The need to increase productivity, save expenses, and entice private investment in airport infrastructure has led to the widespread privatization of airports in various regions of the globe. The purpose of this study was to look at the pros and cons of airport privatization, namely how it would affect airport productivity, service quality, competition, and social welfare.

The literature review confirms that airport privatization may have different results depending on the circumstances and the specifics of the privatization effort. Researchers have reached different conclusions on the effects of privatization on efficiency and service quality. Some have found positive results, while others have expressed concerns about the possibility of detrimental effects on social welfare and competitiveness.

It is unlikely that the observed correlation between the study's variables (such as the effect of airport privatization on efficiency and performance) is just coincidental, as shown by t he chi-square analysis. However, care must be taken when interpreting the findings because of the potential effect of cells with low predicted numbers on the total chi-square value.

There seems to be trade-offs associated with airport privatization, as seen by the high negative connection between two poll items. When asked if they thought privatization would help lower airport

expenses for airlines and passengers, those who thought it would enhance airport services and facilities were less likely to say it would help cut prices.

Taken together, these results indicate that airport privatization is a nuanced topic that calls for thoughtful evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages, as well as the unique circumstances and goals, of every given privatization effort. Airport privatization has the potential to improve efficiency and attract private investment, but it might also have unintended consequences for things like competitiveness and social welfare. Therefore, it is essential to weigh the pros and cons, as well as any trade-offs that may arise, before making a final choice about privatizing airports.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, airport privatization is a multifaceted topic that calls for analysis of the pros and downsides, as well as the context and goals of the privatization effort. Increased efficiency and private investment are two potential upsides of privatizing airports, but there is also the risk that competitiveness, social welfare, and other facets of airport management would suffer as a result.

Insights into how airport privatization could affect productivity, service quality, competition, and social welfare have been gleaned from this study's literature review and statistical analysis. The findings imply that airport privatization can have different effects depending on the unique circumstances and type of the privatization attempt, and that privatization may include trade-offs. A thorough evaluation of the pros and cons, as well as the opportunities and risks, should inform any decision on the privatization of airports. The choice should be informed by a transparent, accountable, and trustworthy regulatory structure that takes into consideration the unique circumstances and goals of the privatization effort.

Overall, airport privatization may be a good approach to improve airport infrastructure and attract private investment, but it has to be carried out carefully so that the positive outcomes are maximized and the bad ones are minimized. Decision-makers may improve airports' long-term sustainability and competitiveness by implementing the research's suggested practices and recommendations.

References

[1] Nitsch, V. (2012). The privatization of airports: A simple model with social concerns. Journal of Public Economic Theory, 14(6), 989-1015.

[2] Forsyth, P. (2013). Public-private partnerships and airport infrastructure development. Journal of Air Transport Management, 30, 13-26.

[3] Matsumura, T., & Matsushima, N. (2014). Airport privatization and economic performance: A cross-country analysis. Journal of Transport Economics and Policy, 48(2), 263-282.

[4] Tang, R. Y., & Nakamura, D. H. (2018). Airport privatization: Issues and options for Congress. Congressional Research Service.

[5] García-Santillán, A., Quintero-Rojas, C. F., & Martínez-Rivera, J. A. (2018). Impact of privatization on airports' efficiency and quality of service: Evidence from Latin America. Transport Policy, 69, 1-8.

[6] Yamaguchi, K. (2018). The impact of airport privatization on competition and welfare. Journal of Air Transport Management, 72, 1-11.

[7] Forsyth, P. (2019). Airport privatization and regulatory reform in Asia. Journal of Air Transport Management, 75, 95-102.

[8] Li, Z. C., Zhang, T. T., & Wang, J. W. (2017). The impact of airport privatization on efficiency and service quality: Evidence from Europe. Journal of Air Transport Management, 58, 105-113.

[9] Germán, L., & Kitchen, H. (2018). Airport privatization in Canada: A review of the Canadian experience. Journal of Air Transport Management, 70, 63-73.

[10] Bel, G., & Fageda, X. (2018). Airports in the new era of transportation: A review essay. Transport Reviews, 38(6), 704-725.

[11] Baumol, W. J., & Willig, R. D. (1981). Fixed costs, sunk costs, entry barriers, and sustainability of monopoly. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 96(3), 405-431.

[12] Brueckner, J. K. (2003). Airport congestion pricing. Journal of Public Economics, 87(5-6), 973-987.

[13] Graham, A. (2007). Airport regulation, competition, and public policy. Journal of Transport Economics and Policy, 41(3), 317-345.

[14] Gillen, D., & Morrison, W. G. (2014). Regulatory and ownership issues in airport management. In The Routledge Companion to Air Transport Management (pp. 301-316). Routledge.

[15] Hulten, C. R. (2009). Airports as engines of economic growth. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 45(2), 286-295.

[16] Mason, K. J., & Swinburn, G. (2016). Global airport competition. Journal of Air Transport Management, 52, 1-12.

[17] Morrison, W. G., & Winston, C. (2007). Another look at airport congestion pricing. Journal of Air

Eur. Chem. Bull. **2023**,*12(Special issue 8), 6370-6377*

6376

Transport Management, 13

[18] Oum, T. H., Yan, J., & Yu, C. (2008). Privatization, corporatization, ownership forms and their effects on the performance of the world's major airports. Journal of Air Transport Management, 14(1),14-25.

*Eur. Chem. Bull. **2023**,12(Special issue 8), 6370-6377*

6377