

College Student Transit Safety in two Indonesian cities

Iderlina MATEO-BABIANO, PhD^a, Dr. DEWANTI^b, and Dadang M. UTOMO^c

^{a, c} Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, The University of Melbourne AUSTRALIA

^b Civil Engineering and Environmental Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Gadjah Mada INDONESIA

^a E-mail: imateo@unimelb.edu.au

^b E-mail: dewanti@ugm.ac.id

^c E-mail: dutomo@student.unimelb.edu.au

Abstract: This paper aims to present sexual harassment and victimization in public transport in two Indonesian case study cities, Malang and Yogyakarta. It draws from a small sample survey-based study deployed to college students in two major universities in the said cities. While small to medium cities appear to experience unique mobility needs in comparison to their large city counterparts, results also reveal that students are significantly dependent on indigenous, informal transport modes for daily mobility of students, yet a significant proportion who uses public transport have experienced victimisation. These key insights drawn from the results of the survey may offer and inform a series of planning and policy scenarios that will serve as potential pathways to achieve safer commuting environments, ensuring safety in public transit to advance a more sustainable, resilient and inclusive transport for all.

Keywords: Public Transport, Indigenous Transport, Asia, Safety, Sexual Harassment

1. INTRODUCTION

Emerging economies such as Indonesia is experiencing explosive population growth, rapid motorization and high demand for hypermobility. About 84.1 percent of its population of more than 230 million people largely depend on road transport, placing undue strain on its urban transportation system (Susilo and Joewono, 2017; Soehodho, 2017). In addition to this, incidents of harassment and assault in Indonesia's public spaces, including its streets and transport environments, has become prevalent. In April 2016 in the western island of Sumatra (Indonesia), a schoolgirl was gang-raped while walking home from school (Agence France-Presse, 2016). Geokoski et al (2017) recommended that there should be a strong focus on crime and safety in public transport environments in country (Kirchhoff et al., 2007; Geokoski et al., 2017). A 2007 Jakarta study conducted by Kirchhoff et al. (2007) discovered that two out of three female students, and one out of three male students have experienced sexual violence. In the same study, it was found that female students were twice as likely as male students to have experienced repeat victimization in public transport environments. Although incidents of victimization have increased, crime reporting has persistently remained low (Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014). Dhillon & Bakaya (2014) explained why sexual violence, including the low reporting rates of harassment and assault in public transport, persists in certain contexts is a result of specific cultural and gendered understanding of the public realm as 'male' spaces. As such, while these public spaces privilege male presence, they make women feel 'out of place' (Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014). Understanding gender-based victimization and fear in public transport environments becomes imperative, particularly in smaller to medium sized university towns where majority of college students typically are public transport captive users is an important first step towards a stronger focus on addressing crime and safety in public transport environments in Indonesia (Geokoski

et al., 2017). By implementing a small sample survey-based study to university student, this research aims to examine the experience of college students when they use public transport in two medium-sized cities, Malang and Yogyakarta, respectively. Most research has focused on transport victimization experiences of students in capital cities while there has only been scant scholarly work articulating public transit safety in secondary, smaller to midsized cities. This work fills this gap. The two cities were chosen as research case studies because they represent medium sized cities but with a large university student base, making both cases important to explore.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Article 13 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was published in 1948 declares that “everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.” In cities of the global South, such freedom also translates to the increasing transaction costs involved in living, working/studying and recreating in urban areas. Such transaction cost is also gendered in nature and scale (Turner, 2017). The study of Turner (2012) which was set on Jakarta’s large-scale transport investment examined the gender imperatives with the introduction of the Jabodetabek rail system found that overcrowding was associated with perceptions of safety, particularly from the perspectives of women. Empirical evidence points out that more women in Asian cities use public transport than men. However, one of the major barriers that deter them from using public transport is safety concerns (Bray and Holyoak, 2015; Tjeendra et al., 2010; Nurdden et al., 2007).

Negative perceptions of safety affect the uptake and attractiveness of public transport. Currently, the number of public transport users in Indonesia is still very low, and this is often dominated by students. A Jakarta study examined victimization in public transport of university students found that most students underestimated the risk of sexual violence. Two out of 3 women while 1 out of 3 men reported that they have experienced sexual harassment and violence (Kirchhoff, et al., 2007). However, less is known in smaller sized cities to date.

Moreover, women were more likely to rate public transport service as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ relative to their male counterpart. Some studies have shown that the perception of poor service is significantly associated with conditions of overcrowding (Herrera, 2007). This has also been reported in an earlier study conducted by GTZ (2007) which found significant levels of sexual harassment occurring in overcrowded conditions. However, responses and strategies aimed to manage passenger volume has become a default approach at solving sexual harassment (Herrera, 2007), while well-meaning continue to reinforce the persistent lack of understanding on the social and gender influences on transport. This has further exacerbated the social and spatial inequities already in place, with women, who are significantly dependent on public transport, generally bear the brunt of these impacts. As a result of these discriminations, women have modified their individual behaviours such as not traveling during evenings, traveling with companions or sending a text message to family every time they take a taxi, among others.

Individuals who commit crimes are set in specific places where these offenses happen (Weisburd, 1997). This supports what Smith and Clarke (2000) argue that it is not only crowding but also the lack of supervision of (public transport) facilities that appear to instigate crime, reinforcing what Loukaitou-Sideris (1999) argues that built environment attributes and place-based characteristics have been found to affect the nature and incidence of crime in transport

environments. The notion of whole of journey approach is critical to understand why and how crime concentrations have been discovered at each phase of the journey (Newton 2008; Tompson et al. 2009) and the environments which this takes place, when walking to, waiting in and riding public transport. For instance, the extent to which the design of stops and terminals contribute to increasing/lessening levels of crime in an area. The whole journey approach is important to better understand and reduce crime which happen in public transport venues (Loukaitou-Sideris et al. 2002; Newton 2004; Ceccato 2013, 2014; Natarajan et al. 2015; Natarajan 2016). Therefore, it would be difficult to find effective strategies to solve crime without a comprehensive understanding of the context in which they happen.

Beyond the physical aspect, another important dimension is acknowledging and understanding the extent to which cultural and societal attitudes impact our use of transport (Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014). It is understood that better mobility empowers as it enables our participation in different opportunities. Yet different social and cultural assemblages (e.g. forms of identity, including age, class, race/ethnicity, marital status) may impact influence the mobility of both women and men. There has been limited attention focused on understanding difference and its impact on design within the sphere of transport.

A coping mechanism of victims of sexual crimes is disclosure. Disclosure is a help-seeking behaviour where one reveals a traumatic event to someone, either to a family member or by formally reporting to police, to seek assistance. While police reporting could potentially lower a repetition of offence, the incident of reporting is generally low, and this figure is much lower with victims of sexual violence (BJS 2014).

Moreover, while most policies and plans have mainly focused on alleviating challenges in megacities such as Jakarta, including Malang and Yogyakarta, while are emerging as the new engines of economic growth, receive very limited attention. The most common policy response to address safety issues and concerns is the implementation of women-only public transit cars. Implementation of this policy can be found across the globe, in countries such as Malaysia, India, Philippines, Japan, among others) (Abadi & Ruskandi, 2016). Yet this provides a temporal respite from victimization happening but does not really address the core of the matter. Gender-specific narratives have continuously been the subject of several earlier studies on commuter safety, yet what has been missing in the literature is a better understanding of victimization and fear in commuting amongst college students, a demographic which is largely dependent on public transport, particularly when discussing the issue within the context of smaller Indonesia cities. This study contributes to this debate.

3. CASE STUDIES: MALANG AND YOGYAKARTA

The research case study locations are in two Indonesian cities, Yogyakarta and Malang. Most victimisation studies have focused on megacities such as Jakarta. While victimisation experience might provide similar insights amongst different megacities, midsized cities such as Yogyakarta and Malang, offers different conditions for analysis, and it is reasonable to assume that victimisation results can potentially be similar, but strategies to address safety concerns might not be applicable. Therefore, this study offers two case studies that would provide an alternative dimension to understanding victimisation in small to medium sized cities in Indonesia.

Yogyakarta is in central Java. It covers two districts (Sleman and Bantul) and one city

(Yogyakarta). It has an area of 96.8 km² and physically bordered by the Yogyakarta ring road. There are 1,268,343 inhabitants (2015 figures) with population density of 13,103 people/km². Its built-up area within the ring road has increased by 4.95% from 2002 to 2008 and 15.27% from 2008 to 2015 revealing its rapid development marked by the emergence of various trade centers, schools and colleges and widening informal settlements. Yogyakarta is home to a large student population and is also known as a university town as there are more than 350,000 students in 2018 attending 137 public and private universities and colleges. As such, students are captive public transport users, hence are highly dependent on the support of public transport facilities and infrastructures.

Yogyakarta is also known as a city of culture, tourism and education. Because of this, there is high level of community mobility. Several public transport services support the daily mobility needs of its residents and visitors, including: 1) conventional city buses, 2) Trans Jogja (semi BRT), 3) traditional transport (pedicabs/rickshaws, horse drawn cart), 4) taxis consisting of regular taxi, motorcycle taxi, on-line taxi (motorcycle and car). Between 2002 and 2008, city buses served the city's commuters. In 2008, TransJogja, a semi-BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) public transport service, was introduced to replace conventional buses with a safer, more comfortable and reliable alternative to reduce private vehicle use in the city (Transjogja Operational Report, 2017). However, demand for public transport has not been met by the semi-BRT system, and as a result, private vehicle has continued to increase at an overwhelming 9.7% per year until 2010, and 9% up to 2012 (Tarigan and Saputra, 2013). Aside from formal transport, the city is also publically serviced by indigenous traditional public transport, including becaks/pedicabs and horse drawn carriage, mainly for tourism purposes. While these modes are at present popular, their existence is being threatened by the emergence of regular as well as online taxi services (i.e. motorbikes and cars).



Figure 1. Research location Yogyakarta (left) and Malang (right, source: maps.google.com)

The second case study is Malang City (Figure 1, right). Malang City is in East Java. The city has a land area of 145.28 km² accommodating about 887,443 residents. Fifty percent of Malang City's population are immigrating students from different parts of Indonesia. However, a slightly larger proportion of these student population are female. For instance, 52.14% of the student population are female in Universitas Brawijaya (UB), the largest university in Malang by population size; 56.13% of the whole student body in the State Islamic University (UIN) are female students; and 88% of the total student population at Medical Polytechnic (Poltekkes) are female (Statistics of Malang, 2018). The most predominant mode is the Angkutan Kota (Angkot). This is a mini-bus seating around 12 people. This type of public transport has been in

operation since 1990s. Due to lack of maintenance, the current models are mostly aging and in need of immediate repair. Currently, the Angkot runs in 25 different routes. However, there are multiple gaps preventing passengers to travel seamlessly and economically (Priandani, Tolle, & Yuniato, 2016). Apart from Angkot, other public transport modes available in Malang include bus and train (for inter-city commuting), school bus (exclusively for primary education students), taxis (including the emerging Grab, GoCar, Gojek, and GrabBike), and indigenous transport (becak). Like Angkot, these public transport options are gradually losing ridership, especially due to the rise of popularity of online-based taxis. These hassle-free transport choices are much more flexible in their operations, for they do not operate on a regulated route and enables door-to-door services, accountable in the fare scheme, offers exclusivity to passengers, and overall, much more reliable than their older predecessors. However, as ideal as they may seem, surveys have revealed that crime also occurs on this type of transit. Figure 2 shows different types of indigenous public transport in Indonesia.



Figure 2. Horse drawn carriage, pedicabs, TransJogja bus

4. METHODS

This study examines college student victimization in both Yogyakarta and Malang (Indonesia). Participants were sought for this study via convenience sampling at several universities in the two cities. To be eligible in this study, students who were currently enrolled in a tertiary-level course or program in the city were invited to participate in a survey via – an online platform, a survey link which was emailed to students or by filling up a questionnaire. The survey was implemented between February and early March 2019. Students demonstrate their willingness to participate in the study by completing the survey. The study did not pose a direct risk to survey respondents as it was anonymous and confidential. There were no children nor individuals below 18 years old surveyed. By completing the survey, respondents indicated their willingness to participate in the study. They were asked to answer a survey which probed on their personal data and travel behaviour, crime ecology in transit environments, self-reported victimization experience, perceived safety and crime reporting in transit environments; public transport use and participation; and respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. Questionnaires were designed to capture both closed and opened questions, and if respondents objected to the question given, they are given the option not to answer the question. No children or individuals below 18 years old were surveyed. While the study may not pose a direct risk to survey respondents as it was anonymous and confidential. Local crime victim hotline telephone numbers were also included in the survey questionnaire if participants still felt distressed.

The collected data is then subsequently analyzed via descriptive statistical methods to provide an overview of the key themes. It is intended that this information may provide a better understanding of the issue and a base for future efforts to improve safer public transport.

4.1. Student travel behavior

Respondents' demographic and travel characteristics are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents, Yogyakarta and Malang

Character of respondents and the use of transport modes	Description	Yogyakarta (%) N = 195	Malang (%) N = 114
Sex	Male	52.6 %	31.6%
	Female	47.4 %	65.8%
	Rather not say		1.8%
Age (Year)	18-29	92.8 %	82.5%
	30-39	5.6 %	12.3%
	50-59	1.5 %	5.3%
Highest education	High school	65.1 %	49.1%
	S1	31.3 %	35.1%
	S2/S3	2.5 %	14.9%
	S3	1.1 %	0.9%
Marriage status	Single	93.3 %	84.2%
	Married	5.1 %	14.9%
	Divorced		0.9%
Occupation	unemployed	71.8 %	
	Government sector	8.2 %	
	Private sector	4.1 %	

In total, there were 195 and 114 respondents in Yogyakarta and Malang, respectively. There was more female (65.8%) than male (31.6%) respondents in Malang while there was slightly more male (52.6%) than female (47.4%) respondents in Yogyakarta. University towns generally cater to a younger population base, with at least 80% of respondents in both cities belonging to the age range 18-29 years old.

Table 2. Travel characteristics of respondents, Yogyakarta and Malang

Character of respondents and the use of transport modes	Description	Yogyakarta (%) N = 195	Malang (%) N = 114
Travel time prediction from home to University	15 minutes or less	54.4 %	53.5%
	15-30 minutes	30.8 %	30.7%
	30 minutes – an hour		9.6%
	More than an hour		6.1%
Frequency of bus usage per week	Never	85.1 %	72.8%
	less than 1 per week	13.3 %	20.2%
	1-2 times a week		4.4%
	3-4 times a week		2.6%
Frequency of train usage per week	Never	70.8 %	70.2%
	Less than 1 per week	27.7%	25.4%
	1-2 times a week		2.6%
	3-4 times a week		0.9%
	Everyday		0.9%
Frequency of taxi usage	Almost everyday		3.5%
	Quite often		10.5%
	Not often	51.8 %	40.4%
	Several times per month	16.4 %	17.5%
	Never	25.6 %	28.1%

Frequency of on-line taxi usage	Always	16.4 %	32.5%
	Often	23.1 %	28.1%
	Several times per month	16.4 %	14.0%
	Not often	26.7 %	21.9%
Frequency of car usage	Never	23.6 %	24.6%
	Do not have a car	27.2 %	35.1%
	Less than 1 per week	22.1%	14.9%
	1-2 days a week		12.3%
	3-4 days a week		6.1%
	Everyday		7.1%
Frequency of motorcycle usage	Everyday	72.3 %	43.0%
	Blank response		20.2%
	Don't own a motorcycle		9.6%
	Less than once a week		8.8%
Frequency of bike usage	Never	26.67 %	27.2%
	Do not have a bike	27.69 %	34.2%
	Less than 1 per week	30.26 %	16.7%
	Everyday		9.7%

In both cities, one out of two students responded that it took them 15 minutes or less to travel to the university. While approximately 30 percent of the respondents conveyed that they travelled between 15 and 30 minutes one way. This figure is realistic given that both Yogyakarta and Malang are served by a diverse suite of public transport alternatives, either formal (i.e. bus and trains) or informal (i.e. pedicab and horse drawn cart). Conventional city bus is a previous public transport service in Yogyakarta in 2002-2008, operated by operators incorporated in cooperatives. This transportation serves 16 routes ranging from 25 to 62 km and having 591 fleets in early 2008. Types of vehicles used are small buses with a capacity of 20-30 people without air conditioning. In 2008, a semi-BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) public transport service was introduced, called TransJogja it replaced conventional city bus public transportation with a safer, more comfortable and reliable type of transportation that aims to reduce private vehicle use in Yogyakarta (Transjogja Operational Report, 2017). Transjogja operates in three main corridors, every corridor consists of two lines for go back and forth operation with route lengths of 33-36 km and round-trip time 2-2.5 hours in average. TransJogja fleet consist of 128 AC buses (with a capacity of 20 seated passengers and 20 standing passengers) and 12 reserved buses with bus fare of Rp. 3,500 (0.25 USA \$) for non-card user and Rp.2,500 (0.18 USA \$) for card users. Its service starts from 05.30 a.m. to 09.30 p.m. covering 17 routes (Kaledi, 2018). TransJogja has not been able to meet the expectations of Yogyakarta people, so that private vehicles continue to increase 9.7% per year until 2010, and 9% up to 2012 (Tarigan and Saputra, 2013). In addition, Yogyakarta is also served by indigenous (and often informally operated) public transport such as pedicabs and horse drawn carts. Those services are more enjoyable for tourists to go around the city or to access tourist destinations in the city. Many pedicabs or cycle rickshaws have now been modified into motorized pedicabs, yet the number of those two types of dwindling because these are unable to compete with on-line taxi services.

Unlike Yogyakarta, there has been limited investment on Malang's public transport. The nature of operation of angkot allows passengers to hail public transport at any point along a transport route and to get off anywhere, without specific stops. This practice is generally accepted as appropriate by both drivers and commuters. Pedestrian infrastructure is also limited and fragmented. The infrastructure of angkot, in the same light, also requires immediate attention. Many researchers suggest that the provision of stops and terminals is crucial to the angkot's

mode choice behaviour. In most locations, stops are all found vandalised, inaccessible for pedestrians, let alone for those people with transport aids, and lacking security supports i.e. proper lighting, surveillance camera, and emergency buttons/phones. The sense of insecurity as a result of such condition has contributed to people not willing to use Angkot in Malang (Abadi & Ruskandi, 2016).

Based on the participant responses in both cities, buses and trains were not very popular options. In Yogyakarta, 85.1% of respondents have never used buses while 70.8% have never used trains while in Malang around 70% have not used trains or buses. This was because of the limited-service scope provided by the formal public transport, while train services only catered for both regional and inter-city mobility. For example, in Malang, bus and train services accommodated inter-city travel which is commonly used for workers who commuted from surrounding the cities of Sidoarjo and Surabaya. In addition, there was a significant proportion of student respondents who reported that they depended on other transport options such as angkot, taxi and online taxis (i.e. ridesharing Grab/Uber). About 72.3% of respondents in Yogyakarta and 43% in Malang responded that they used motorbikes as their main means of transport for educational travel purposes. Meanwhile in Malang, there has been a clear behavioural shift from the use of conventional taxis to online based ones. This has been largely driven from the poor service quality of the angkutan kota or angkot. Angkot, a local indigenous mode, has been labelled as slow operating, poor in travel coverage and service. Despite being significantly more expensive compared to Angkot, taxis were the more popular option amongst those not owning cars. This may be due to its service characteristics of being able to offer door-to-door service, flexibility in changing weather, and overall reliability.

The increasing uptake and stronger preference for flexible transport options imply that these types of services better respond to unmet transport needs, support diverse student travel patterns and certainly open opportunities for improved mobility for students. However, there is fragmented scholarly work in examining student safety in relation to the use and uptake of these modes (Herrera 2007). Herrera (2007) recommends specific strategies that could assist in improving safety and security of these modes, including driver profiling, incorporating in-vehicle emergency alert devices, increasing the number and building capacities of female drivers/operators, improving coordination with police and enhancing awareness of commuters. Some of these suggested interventions have already been taken up in some cities and universities worldwide.

5. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This section presents results and findings from the survey that was conducted. The survey investigated the victimization of college students in public transport facilities in two Indonesian cities, Yogyakarta and Malang.

5.1. Feeling safe when using public transportation

One of the key performance indicators for public transport provision is safety. Respondents were queried on the extent to which they feel safe when they are in public transport environments. Table 3 presents perception of public transport safety, which is based on the number of respondents indicating that they felt safe when using public transport service.

Table 3. Frequency of feeling safe when using public transport

Feel safe in public transport	Frequency	Yogyakarta N = 195 (%)	Malang N =144 (%)
Feel safe using a bus during the day	Always	34.5 %	35.5%
	Often	27.6 %	12.9%
	Sometimes	31.0 %	41.9%
	Not taking bus during day		9.7%
Feel safe waiting at the bus stop during the day	Always		27.6%
	Often	34.5 %	20.7%
	Sometimes	37.9 %	31.0%
	Never		3.4%
	Not waiting at bus stop during day		24.1%
Feel safe using a bus after dark	Always		6.5%
	Often	17.2 %	22.6%
	Sometimes	41.4 %	51.6%
	Seldom (Never)	17.2 %	16.1%
	Not taking bus at night		3.2%
Feel safe waiting at the bus stop at night	Always		6.0%
	Often		6.7%
	Sometimes		51.7%
	Never		20.7%
	Not waiting at bus stop at night		20.7%
Feel safe using train during the day	Always	35.1 %	54.8%
	Often	33.3 %	9.7%
	Sometime	14.0 %	6.5%
	No train ride	10.5 %	29.0%
Feel safe waiting on the station platform during the day	Always	40.4 %	58.8%
	Often	28.1 %	23.5%
	Sometimes	17.5 %	4%
	No train ride		2%
Feel safe using train when it's dark	Always	24.6 %	32.4%
	Often	35.1 %	38.2%
	Seldom	22.8 %	23.5%
	No train ride at night		5.9%%
Feel safe when walking to or waiting on the station platform	Always	21.1 %	29.4%
	Often	28.1 %	32.4%
	Sometimes	29.8 %	35.3%
	Never walk to platform at night		2.9%
Feel safe using a taxi service	Always	19.3 %	24.4%
	Often	37.9 %	29.3%
	Seldom	15.2 %	15.9%
	Sometimes	26.9%	28.0%
	Never		2.4%
Feel safe using on-line public transport	Always	24.1 %	32.9%
	Often	49.2 %	41.5%
	Sometimes	24.1 %	24.4%
	Seldom		1.2%
Feel safe in the parking lot	Always	9.2 %	21.1%
	Often	31.8 %	31.6%
	Sometimes	49.7 %	44.7%
	Never	7.7 %	2.6%

As expected, public transport users typically felt safer using public transport during the day than at night. About 62.1% (Yogyakarta) and 68.1% (Malang) of respondents using the bus during the day reported always or often felt safe. Perception of safety became significantly lower for those who were surveyed during evenings. This is in comparison to using the bus during evenings, where only approximately 17.2% in Yogyakarta and 22.6% in Malang reported that they felt safe. For most train users, 68.4% reported that they always and often felt safe, also when they wait on the station platform during the day. Feeling of safety decreased slightly at night with 59.7% reporting that they felt always or often safe. This is also true for those walking or waiting at the station platform (49.2%). For conventional taxi service users, 57% reported that they often and always felt safe. In general, 48.4% of the respondents reported that they felt always and often safe using the bus during the day and 48.3% of respondents, when waiting at the bus stop during the day. The response to the level of safety in using public transport in Malang suggests that it is overall safe to use the public transport in the city. Even for those travelling inter-city using bus and train, most respondents are confident with the safety in using the transit. This situation is also reflected on the usage of taxi and parking space.

5.2. Factors determine the use of public transportation

Various factors determine the use of public transport, these are based on consideration to the character of public transport services and is illustrate in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Factors that influence the use of public transport

Public transport considerations	Influential Factors	Yogyakarta (%)	Malang* (%)
Factors that influence the uptake of buses	Slow trip	10.3 %	
Important problems on the bus usage	Pickpocketing	10.3 %	
Factors make use of trains less frequent	Ticket fare	%	
	Slow travel time	5.3 %	
	Run out of ticket	3.5 %	
	Less schedule information	3.5 %	
Serious problems when using the train	Full of queues	22.8 %	
	Often late	3.5 %	
	Bad design	3.5 %	
Serious problems when on the train platform	Full of people	19.3 %	
	Poor platform design	7.0 %	
	Violent Crime	3.5 %	
	Poor ventilation	3.5 %	
	No problem	5.3 %	
Factors that prevent using motorbikes more often	Afraid of accidents	30.3 %	
	Fear of motorbikes being stolen	12.4 %	
	Inadequate facilities	16.9 %	
Factors that prevent using bicycles more often	Afraid of stolen bikes	12.4 %	
	Inadequate facilities	%	

* No information for Malang*

Factors considered by a person when deciding to use public transport can be categorized according to: vehicle operations (slow travel, frequent overdue, ticket prices and availability,

schedule information), vehicle conditions (design), security and safety of vehicles (pickpocketing, violent crime, fear of accidents), supporting facilities and infrastructure (inadequate facilities, ventilation), and comfort (too full of passengers). The results from the questionnaire show that the dominant factor of bus use is travel speed and safety 10.3%, while the use of train is the presence of too long queues (22.8%) and the density of people at platform (19.3%). An important factor that discourages people from riding bicycles is the inadequate supporting infrastructure and facilities (39.1%) while motorbikes are very much determined by the fear factor of accidents (30.3%).

5.3. Negative experience when using public transport

Someone's experience in using public transportation will determine his decision to choose the same option or type of services, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Negative experience in their use of the public transport

Bad experience in various public transportation	Type of experience	Yogyakarta (%)	Malang (%)
Bad experiences in buses in the last 3 years	No experience	55.2 %	12.3%
	No answer (Blanks)	10.3 %	72.8%
	Use of abusive language	6.9 %	4.4%
	Being followed		2.6%
	Cat call		1.8%
	Physical harassment		6.1%
Bad experiences at the bus stop in the last 3 years	No experience	62.1 %	14.9%
	No answer (Blanks)	6.9 %	72.8%
	Whistling (cat call)	6.9 %	4.4%
	Rather not answer		0.9%
	Being followed		1.8%
	Use of offensive language		2.6%
	Physical harassment		1.8%
	Exhibitionism		0.9%
Bad experiences when heading to or from bus stops in the last 3 years	No experience	62.1 %	14.9%
	Whistling (cat call)	13.8 %	6.14%
	Blanks		72.8%
	Rather not answer		0.9%
	Being followed		3.5%
	Use of offensive language		0.9%
	Exhibitionism		0.9%
Bad experiences during traveling by train	No experience	70.2 %	25.4%
	Someone stalks	3.5 %	0.9%
	Using obscene language	3.5 %	0%
	Blanks		70.2%
	Cat call		0.9%
	Exhibitionism		1.8%
	Physical harassment		0.9%
Bad experiences during in the train platform	No experience	80.7 %	26.3%
	Someone stalks	3.5 %	1.8%
	Using obscene language	3.5 %	1.8%
	Blanks		70.2%
Bad experiences when heading to or from the train station	Nothing (no experience)	82.5 %	23.7%
	Whistling (cat call)	5.3 %	1.8%
	Obscene language	5.3 %	0.9%

	Being followed		3.5%
	Blanks		70.2%
Serious problems when on the train platform	Too full	19.3 %	
	Poor platform design	7.02 %	
Experiencing sexual abuse when on a bus, train, bus stop, station	No	90.8 %	91.2%
	Yes	5.6 %	5.3%
	No answer	2.1 %	3.5%
Experiencing other serious crimes (severe attacks, robberies, rape)	No	95.4 %	94.7%
	Ever	4.6 %	5.3%
Serious crimes suffered	Pickpocketing	4.4 %	
	theft	4.4 %	
Experiencing pickpocketing in the last 3 years	No	94.9 %	94.7%
	Yes		5.3%

Most respondents (70%) did not respond to the question “*Have you ever become a victim of crime when using public transport?*” Even though it has been explained that the overall satisfaction of safety in the public transport appears to be positive, there is a need to further study how respondents respond to questions regarding their experience in becoming a victim of crime during travel or transit.

5.4. Witnesses of crime, prevention and reporting efforts

All respondents unanimously agreed that there is a need to prevent and fight crime and victimisation. Various prevention efforts that were recommended were carried out, including: traveling during the day only, always traveling with other people and not wearing jewelry. Especially for the safer use of buses need CCTV in the bus and on the bus stop, more police patrol in the bus, availability of hotline number direct to the police office in the bus and good lighting on the bus stop. Likewise, prevention against criminal crime is needed when using trains by always traveling with other people, dressing in certain ways, and not wearing jewelry. Police patrol in the trains will make passengers feel safer. If there is a criminal incident, reporting to the police is the most chosen step by respondents. But there are also respondents who reluctant to report it as to avoid more problems, do not trust the police would arrest criminals. Of the total bus and train users, only 26.7% have witnessed sexual violence or harassment. It turned out 75% of respondents who state that other people pretended not to see that occurrence and the remaining 25% asked for help. In the case of serious crime, 80% respondents reported the crime.

Like the responses of participants in Yogyakarta, 100% of Malang’s respondents expressed the necessity to provide crime prevention on public transport in Malang. Currently, crime prevention efforts are situated only at terminals and stations that cater for inter-city commuting. Whereas intra-city transit has not been given sufficient effort. Bus stops are not equipped with proper lighting that is crucial for providing more sense of safety at night, no publication of the police’s hotline for quick crime response on boards, and no surveillance camera on public places or access to public transport. However, crime prevention efforts have been taken on by taxi providers, both the conventional and the online-based ones. Passengers are given the freedom to pick their pickup points wherever they feel safe, and there is clear identification of the driver on board that allows passenger to report any crime cases to the company.

On crime reporting, respondents also reported that it is not common practice to report harassment incidents to authorities, reinforcing earlier literature. People (e.g. in Malang) were not accustomed to reporting crime reporting but instead, shared these incidents with close friends or on social media. Given the low reputation of the police and a perception that the police take too slow to respond, most respondents perceive that using social media attracts greater attention, and therefore, action and resolution to crime events are perceived to be more reliable.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research focused on college students as a particularly captive users of public transport. It presented sexual victimisation survey results on public transport in two Indonesian case study cities. Yogyakarta and Malang are university towns, with students comprising a significant proportion of its populace. The study found that most students rely heavily not on formal public transport but rather, on informal public transport such as ojek or motorbikes (72.3%), on-line taxis (16.4%), and private car (11%).

The need for security in society cannot be separated from the daily life of society. The limitations of police personnel in overcoming various issues of public security need to be strengthened by various sectors to improve the police role and performance and to reduce the complexity of public security. One idea in overcoming the challenge of safety and security in public transport is to work in partnership with the community and the police, including with all other stakeholders. One of the partnership programs developed is the establishment of the Police and Community Partnership Forum. This forum has community members who are directly fostered by the subdistrict police office which has an active role in maintaining security and orderliness in the settled community (Himawati, 2017). The community is supported with an understanding of the existing law, so it can resolve the civil society problems based on their capacity.

Other possible preventive strategies, efforts and policies include:

- 1) Develop routine operations and patrols at times prone to crime between 00.00 - 03.00 in crime-prone locations as well.
- 2) Prepare an opened and closed anticipation at the level of province and sub district
- 3) Installation of CCTV to help tracking and identifying the perpetrators and the criminal motivation occurred
- 4) Incorporate community leaders, religious leaders and youth leaders and collaborate with them in the efforts of crime prevention or dismantling
- 5) Improve environmental security together with community members.
- 6) Disseminate actions that people can take if they see a crime.
- 7) Guide young people to always avoid, to prevent in crime involvement

Several key insights that have been drawn from the paper may inform a series of planning and policy scenarios that will serve as potential pathways to achieve safer commuting environments, ensuring safety in public transit to advance a more sustainable, resilient and inclusive transport for all.

7. REFERENCES

- Biro Pusat Statistik, 2017, Statistik Politik dan Keamanan, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, BPS Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta.
- Himawati, Nilma, 2017, The 6th , Pembentukan Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat Sebagai Upaya Reduksi Gejala Gangguan Kamtibmas, University Research Colloquium, Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang
- Syafik, Muhammad, 2018, Faktor-faktor Terjadinya Kejahatan Begal dan Upaya Penanggulangannya di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. (Thesis)
- Priandani, N. D., Tolle, H., & Yuniyanto, D. R. (2016, December). Design and Implementation of Mobile-Based Application for Malang City Public Transportation Route Search. *Int. J. Advance Soft Compu. Appl*, 8(3), 49-58.
- Statistics of Malang. (2018). Malang in Figures. Malang: ASIA.
- Abadi, K., & Ruskandi. (2016, February). Evaluation the needs of public transport passengers in Malang Town. *Media Teknik Sipil*, 14(1), 73-83.
- Kirchhoff, G. F., Morosawa, H., Barkhuizen, J., Bussinger, C., Sutseyo, H., & Bey, J. F. (2007). The Asian Passengers' Safety study of Sexual molestation on trains and buses: The Indonesian Pilot study, *Acta Criminologica*, 20 (4), pp. 1-13.
- Rivera, R. L. K. (2007). Culture, gender, transport: Contentious planning issues. *Transport and Communications Bulletin for Asia and the Pacific*, 76, 1-20.
- Gekoski, Anna, Gray, Jacqueline M., Adler, Joanna R. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2973-8503> and Horvath, Miranda A. H. (2017) The prevalence and nature of sexual harassment and assault against women and girls on public transport: an international review. *Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice*, 3 (1). pp. 3-16. ISSN 2056-3841.
- Dhillon, M., & Bakaya, S. (2014). Street harassment: A qualitative study of the experiences of young women in Delhi. *SAGE Open*, 4(3), 1-11.
- Turner, J. (2012). Urban mass transit, gender planning protocols and social sustainability—The case of Jakarta. *Research in transportation economics*, 34(1), 48-53.
- Soehodho, S. (2017). Public transportation development and traffic accident prevention in Indonesia. *IATSS research*, 40(2), 76-80.
- Muniz, C. N. (2019). Sexual Assault and Robbery Disclosure: An Examination of Black's Theory of the Behavior of Law (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida).
- Geokoski, Anna, Jacqueline Gray, and Joanna Adler. 2012. "What makes a homicide newsworthy? UK national tabloid newspaper journalists tell all." *British Journal of Criminology* 52(6):1212–1232.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). Criminal victimization, 2014.
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (1996). Hot spots of bus stop crime: The importance of environmental attributes. *Journal of the American Planning association*, 65(4), 395-411. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3zt8q1kj>