# COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS OF URBAN TRANSPORT PERFORMANCE (Case Study of Public Transport 03 Bubulak-Baranang Siang Route, Bogor City)

Prima Jiwa Osly<sup>1</sup>, Wita Meutia<sup>1</sup>, Erlangga Darmawan<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Civil Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Pancasila E-mail: <u>wita.meutia@univpancasila.ac.id</u>

Received 20 September 2023, Accepted 28 October 2023

### ABSTRACT

Angkutan Kota or commonly called "Angkot" is one of the public transportation that is often found in Bogor. One of the Angkot routes in Bogor is Angkot 03 in the Bubulak-Baranangsiang route. This public transportation has a bad category for the service performance dimension with a poor category. This can be seen from public transportation services such as passenger volume, distance traveled, and stopping at any place to look for passengers. With services in the deficient category, it can reduce people's interest in using public transport in this direction, both for existing users and potential potential users. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the satisfaction of users and the satisfaction of the community around the public transportation route towards public transportation in this direction. The aim of this research is to determine the performance of public transportation services based on the perceptions of public transportation users and the surrounding community. Data from this research were obtained from distributing questionnaires to passangers of Angkot 03 in the Bubulak - Baranangsiang route and people living around the public transportation route. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed using the IPA method to determine the gap between expectations and performance of public transportation services. Based on the results of the analysis, it can be seen that there are the same variables that need to be improved between the perceptions of city transport passengers and the surrounding community, namely variable 12 (Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke).

Keywords: Angkot, Index Performance Analysis, Bubulak-Barangsiang, Performance

### INTRODUCTION

One kind of transportation that is frequently available in Bogor, also known as the City of a Thousand Angkot, is Angkutan Kota, or Angkot. On the other hand, there are a number of signs that this mode of transportation is performing poorly. The age of the vehicles, which is fairly old, the lack of a set departure time, the comparatively low fares, the excess capacity of passengers during peak hours, and other services that can be said to be less able to provide more value for passengers are the obstacles seen in Bogor's city public transport services passangers of public transit (Robby et al., 2016). The fact that public transportation options stop everywhere and create traffic, usually on major routes, is guite concerning.

These barriers affect the quality of urban transportation services and their performance, which in turn lowers the amount of urban transportation that is used (Aminah. 2007). Drivers engage in parking activities as a result of the consequences of the decline in passengers using public transit, which also lowers their daily revenue. This check-in process adds time to the journey. If the standard of municipal transportation keeps getting worse, people will be less sympathetic to those who use it because they will believe that it does not meet their needs or expectations. In situations where the performance of public transportation services does not align with the user's expectations or interests, they will explore alternative options, such as purchasing a private vehicle or using online transportation. According to research on commuter line which is a rail based transportation satisfaction, travel time punctuality are one of the characteristics that must be maintained (Meutia and Yuliana, 2019). It is evident that the high usage of commuter lines is caused by the certainty of having to wait for a train, yet this presents challenges for city transit.

According to Iman et al. (2019), City Transport code 03 on the Bubulak-Baranangsiang route falls into the low category for the service performance component.

Passenger volume, public transportation journey distance, and operational performance are the three service performance metrics under consideration. When public transportation performance falls short of expectations, people may become less interested in using it. As a result, when it comes to public transportation in this direction, it is vital to consider how satisfied the community and users are surrounding specific routes, so that in the future, urban transportation services might be improved in accordance with passanger preferences.

It is necessary to assess the services offered in order to determine how well urban transportation services are performing. One approach to evaluate the effectiveness of urban transportation is to collect data via surveys from clients or service users. Surveys are used to find out how satisfied clients or service users are with an individual's or a service unit's performance (Santoso dan Sartono, 2011). The purpose of this research is to evaluate Angkot services' performance by looking at how the general public and public transportation passangers perceive them.

### **METHOD**

Questionnaires were distributed as part of the investigation during October 2021, the Covid-19 epidemic period. People who use the urban transportation system and those who live nearby were the target responders. These target respondents were picked because they are current users of public transportation, and those who live near public transit lines may become users in the future. The questionnaire that has been designed contains 2 parts, namely general data on respondents (Gender, Age, Occupation, Latest Education, Monthly Income and Personal Vehicle Ownership) and questions regarding performance (Security, Safety, Comfort, Affordability, Equality and Regularity) according to Ministerial of Transportation Regulation Number 98 Year 2013.

| Table 1. Variable | s in Performance | Questions |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|------------------|-----------|

| Variable Number  | Performance Variables  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 1  | There is not an overabundance of music playing on public transit               |  |
| 2  | Car windows are transparent in Angkot.   |  |
| 3  | Passengers in Angkot are protected from pickpocketing                          |  |
| 4  | There are health protocols in Angkot   |  |
| 5  | Avoid sexual harassment  |  |
| 6  | There is distance between seats  |  |
| 7 Vehicles are not allowed to pass other cars in front of them |  |  |
| 8  | Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly   |  |
| 9  | The speed of public transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow |  |
| 10   | Modernization of the fleet for public transit                                  |  |
| 11   | The state of cleanliness in transit  |  |
| 12   | Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke                                 |  |

| Variable Number   | Performance Variables  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 13 The driver is well-groomed                             |  |  |
| 14 Passenger capacity does not exceed the available seats |  |  |
| 15  | Angkot implements the health protocols that have been established during the<br>pandemic |  |
| 16 There are no buskers                                   |  |  |
| 17 Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient                |  |  |
| 18 The walking distance to get Angkot is less than 200 m  |  |  |
| 19 Timely departure of Angkot                             |  |  |
| 20 Angkot runs according to the route (Angkot Route)      |  |  |

Respondents were asked to fill out a performance questionnaire and received expectations by giving a rating of 1 to 5 using a Likert scale. Scale information will be shown in Table 2.

### Table 2. Likert Scale Assessment

| Scale | Performance       | Expectation      |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1     | Strongly Disagree | Very unimportant |
| 2     | Disagree          | Not important    |
| 3     | Simply Agree      | Quite important  |
| 4     | Agree             | Important        |
| 5     | Strongly Agree    | Very important   |
|       | Stioligiy Agree   | very important   |

Importance Performance Analysis (IPA)

IPA analysis is used to measure urban transportation performance based on satisfaction felt by respondents. To analyze IPA a formula is needed, namely (Solichin I, 2010):

 $T_k = \frac{Xi}{Yi} \times 100\%$ 

Whereas:

 $T_k$  = Performance Level

- X<sup>i</sup> = Value of Consumer Performance
- Y<sup>i</sup> = Value Expectations of Consumers

IPA-model is divided into 4 quadrants as shown in Figure 1

| Very<br>Important | A. Concentrate He | re B. Keep Up The Good Work |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| tation            |                   |                             |
| Expect            | C. Low Priority   | D. Possible Overkill        |
| Less<br>Important |                   |                             |
|                   | Low               | Performance High            |

#### Figure 1. Importance Performance Analysis Quadrant

The following is an explanation of each quadrant of the IPA model:

- a. Quadrant A: Top Priority (Concentrate Here) Factors in this quadrant are considered very important compared to other factors, the management is obliged to provide more resources and pay more attention to this quadrant.
- b. Quadrant B: Keep Up The Good Work Factors in this quadrant are expected to be supporting factors for customer satisfaction, the management is obliged to maintain the achievements that have been achieved.
- c. Quadrant C: Low priority Factors in this quadrant have a lower priority level than other factors. Management does not need to prioritize this quadrant.
- d. Quadrant D: Excessive (Possible Overkill) Factors in this quadrant are considered not very important. So the management needs to allocate this factor to other factors. This factor requires more handling from the management

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

obtained data on the characteristics of respondents as presented in Table 3.

The results of the survey conducted in October 2021

Table 3. Respondent Data Characteristics

| Passanger   routes used by Angkot     Gender   Male (40%);<br>Female (60%)   Female (20%);<br>Female (80%)     Age   <18 Years Old (16%);<br>25-40 Years Old (52%);<br>25-40 Years Old (23%);<br>40-60 Years Old (2%);<br>52-40 Years Old (2%);<br>25-40 Years Old (2%);<br>40-60 Years Old (2%);<br>52-40 Years Old (2%);<br>52-40 Years Old (2%);<br>52-40 Years Old (2%);<br>60 Years Old (2%);<br>52-40 Years Old (0%)     Occupation   Student (32%);<br>Civil Servant (8%);<br>Self-employed (44%);<br>Wiraswasta (12%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Dethers (0%)   Student (18%);<br>Civil Servant (2%);<br>Self-employed (44%);<br>Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Betried (0%);<br>Civil Servant (8%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Self-employed (44%);<br>Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (2%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Bachelor (4%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (44%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (44%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (44%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (4%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 2,5 Million (2%);<br>Costs/Month   > 10 Million (44%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>2 (46%);<br>2 (46%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>3 (2%)   1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>3 (2%)   > 1 Minutes (2%);<br>3 (2%)   > 1 Minutes (2%);<br>3 (2%)   3 (0%);<br>3 (2%)   > 0 Minutes (2%);<br>3 (2%)   > 0 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 0 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 0 Minutes (0%);<br>3 - 0 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 0 Minutes (0%);<br>3 - 0 Min   |                       | Percentage of Angkot      | Those who reside near     |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Gender   Male (40%);<br>Female (60%)   Male (20%);<br>Female (80%)     Age   <18 Years Old (16%);<br>25-40 Years Old (52%);<br>40-60 Years Old (30%);<br>25-40 Years Old (22%);<br>40-60 Years Old (22%);<br>40-60 Years Old (0%)   >60 Years Old (22%);<br>50 Years Old (22%);<br>40-60 Years Old (0%)     Occupation   Student (32%);<br>Civil Servant (2%);<br>8elf-employed (44%);<br>Self-employed (44%);<br>Wiraswasta (12%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Doctor (2%)<br>Doctor (2%)  |                       | Passanger                 | routes used by Angkot     |
| Female (60%)   Female (80%)     Age   <18 Years Old (16%);  | Gender                | Male (40%);               | Male (20%);               |
| Age   <18 Years Old (16%);  |                       | Female (60%)              | Female (80%)              |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | Age                   | <18 Years Old (16%);      | <18 Years Old (10%);      |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | 0                     | 18 – 25 Years Old (52%);  | 18 – 25 Years Old (26%);  |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | 25–40 Years Old (30%);    | 25 – 40 Years Old (22%);  |
| > 60 Years Old (0%)   > 60 Years Old (0%)     Occupation   Student (32%);<br>Civil Servant (8%);<br>Self-employed (44%);<br>Narsawasta (12%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Retired (0%);<br>Others (0%)   Self-employed (56%);<br>Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Narsawasta (16%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Junior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Lementary School (0%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>S - 10 Million (24%);<br>S - 10 Million (2%)   <1 Million (12%);<br>S - 10 Million (2%);<br>S - 10 Million (0%);<br>S - 15 Million (0%);<br>S - 2,5 Mil   |                       | 40–60 Years Old (2%);     | 40 – 60 Years Old (42%);  |
| Occupation   Student (32%);<br>Civil Servant (8%);<br>Self-employed (44%);<br>Wiraswasta (12%);<br>Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Retired (0%);<br>Others (0%)   Suff-employed (56%);<br>Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (2%);<br>Retired (6%);<br>Others (0%)     Education   Elementary School (4%);<br>Junior High School (30%);<br>Senior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Elementary School (12%);<br>Junior High School (22%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (26%);<br>7 - 15 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (6%);<br>7 - 15 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (6%);<br>7 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (6%);<br>7 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 1,5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>7 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 1,5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>7 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 1,5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>7 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>7 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1,5 - 1   |                       | > 60 Years Old (0%)       | > 60 Years Old (0%)       |
| Civil Servant (8%);   Civil Servant (2%);     Self-employed (44%);   Self-employed (56%);     Wiraswasta (12%);   Wiraswasta (16%);     Housewife (4%);   Housewife (2%);     Retired (0%);   Retired (6%);     Others (0%)   Others (0%)     Education   Elementary School (4%);     Bachelor (48%);   Bachelor (62%);     Bachelor (48%);   Bachelor (62%);     Bachelor (48%);   Magister (2%);     Doctor (2%)   Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);   | Occupation            | Student (32%):            | Student (18%):            |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | Civil Servant (8%):       | Civil Servant (2%):       |
| Wiraswasta (12%);<br>Housewife (4%);<br>Retired (0%);<br>Others (0%)   Wiraswasta (16%);<br>Housewife (2%);<br>Retired (6%);<br>Others (0%)     Education   Elementary School (4%);<br>Junior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Junior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Elementary School (0%);<br>Junior High School (30%);<br>Senior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (62%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>2 - 2,5 Million (0%)<br>5 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>2 - 2,5 Million (0%)<br>5 - 2,5 Million (0%);<br>2 (46%);<br>3 (2%)<br>Car Ownership   O(26%);<br>0 (34%);<br>1 (28%);<br>3 (2%)<br>3 (0%)     Desired time to<br>delayed   cl Minutes (70%);<br>4 - 1 Minutes (28%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (2%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);   cl Minutes (2%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);  |                       | Self-employed (44%):      | Self-employed (56%):      |
| Housewife ( $4\%$ );<br>Retired ( $0\%$ );<br>Others ( $0\%$ );<br>Elementary School ( $10\%$ );<br>Junior High School ( $10\%$ );<br>Junior High School ( $12\%$ );<br>Senior High School ( $30\%$ );<br>Bachelor ( $48\%$ );<br>Doctor ( $2\%$ );<br>$1 - 2,5$ Million ( $12\%$ );<br>$2,6 - 5$ Million ( $2\%$ );<br>$5 - 10$ Million ( $2\%$ );<br>$1 - 1,5$ Million ( $2\%$ );<br>$1.5 - 2$ Million ( $2\%$ );<br>$1.5 - 2$ Million ( $0\%$ );<br>$2,5$ Million ( $0\%$ );<br>$2,6$ Million ( $0\%$ );<br>  |                       | Wiraswasta (12%):         | Wiraswasta (16%):         |
| Retired (0%);<br>Others (0%)   Retired (6%);<br>Others (0%)     Education   Elementary School (4%);<br>Junior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (10%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Junior High School (12%);<br>Senior High School (22%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (0%);<br>1,5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>1,5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>1 (28%);<br>2 (4%);<br>2 (4%);<br>2 (4%);<br>3 (2%)   0 (34%);<br>3 (0%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>1 - 1.5 Milutes (70%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (28%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (2%);<br>5 - 10 Times (64%);<br>3 - 5 Times (18%);<br>3 - 5 Times (18%);<br>3 - 5 Times (10%);<br>5 - 10 Times (6%);   |                       | Housewife (4%):           | Housewife (2%):           |
| Others (0%)   Others (0%)     Education   Elementary School (10%);<br>Junior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Elementary School (12%);<br>Senior High School (22%);<br>Magister (2%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>10 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>3 (2%)     Motorcycle   0 (8%);<br>0 (2%);<br>2 (46%);<br>2 (46%);<br>2 (2%)   0 (2%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>2 (4%);<br>3 (2%)   1 (64%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 - 3 Minutes (28%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (0%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (2%);<br>3 - 5 Times (18%);<br>3 - 5 Times (10%);   |                       | Retired (0%):             | Retired (6%):             |
| Education   Elementary School (4%);<br>Junior High School (10%);<br>Senior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Elementary School (0%);<br>Junior High School (12%);<br>Senior High School (22%);<br>Bachelor (62%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (34%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (26%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>10 - 15 Million (2%);<br>2,2 - 5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,2,5 Million (0%);<br>2 (46%);<br>3 (2%)   > 15 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>2 (4%);<br>3 (2%)   0 (66%);<br>3 (0%)   0 (66%);<br>3 (0%)     Desired time to<br>delayed   c < 1 Minutes (70%);<br>1 - 3 Minutes (0%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (0%);<br>5 - 10 Times (16%);<br>5 - 10 Times (64%);<br>1 - 3 Times (64%);<br>5 - 10 Times (6%);  |                       | Others (0%)               | Others (0%)               |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | Education             | Elementary School (4%):   | Elementary School (0%):   |
| Senior High School (30%);<br>Bachelor (48%);<br>Magister (6%);<br>Doctor (2%)   Senior High School (22%);<br>Bachelor (62%);<br>Doctor (2%)     Income   <1 Million (18%);<br>1 - 2,5 Million (18%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (34%);<br>2,6 - 5 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (24%);<br>5 - 10 Million (2%);<br>5 - 10 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (2%);<br>5 - 2 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>1 - 1,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2,5 Million (0%);<br>2 (46%);<br>2 (46%);<br>3 (2%)   > 2,5 Million (0%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>2 (4%);<br>3 (2%)   0 (34%);<br>1 (64%);<br>2 (2%);<br>3 (2%)     Car Ownership   0 (66%);<br>1 -3 Minutes (28%);<br>1 -3 Minutes (32%);<br>3 -6 Minutes (0%);<br>3 -6 Minutes (0%);<br>3 -6 Minutes (0%);<br>3 -6 Minutes (0%);<br>3 -5 Times (10%);<br>5 -10 Times (64%);<br>1 -3 Times (64%);<br>3 -5 Times (10%);<br>5 -10 Times (6%);   |                       | Junior High School (10%)  | Junior High School (12%)  |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | Senior High School (30%): | Senior High School (22%): |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | Bachelor (48%)            | Bachelor (62%)            |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | Magister (6%)             | Magister (2%):            |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $   |                       | Doctor (2%)               | Doctor (2%)               |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | Income                | <1 Million (18%)          | <1 Million (14%):         |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  | income                | 1 - 2.5 Million (18%)     | 1 - 2.5 Million (12%)     |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccc} & 5 & -10 \ \text{Million} (24\%); & 5 & -10 \ \text{Million} (24\%); & 5 & -10 \ \text{Million} (24\%); & 10 & -15 \ \text{Million} (2\%); & >15 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 1 & -1,5 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 1 & -1,5 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 1,5 & -2 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 1,5 & -2 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 1,5 & -2 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 2,5 \ \text{Million} (0\%); & 3,2 \ \text{Minutes} (0\%); & 3,2 \ Min$   |                       | 2.6 - 5 Million (34%):    | 2.6 - 5 Million (26%):    |
| $\begin{array}{c cccc} & 10 - 15 \text{ Million (2%);} & 10 - 15 \text{ Million (2%);} \\ > 15 \text{ Million (4%)} & > 15 \text{ Million (2\%);} \\ > 15 \text{ Million (4\%)} & > 15 \text{ Million (2\%);} \\ \hline Transportation & <500.000 (92\%); & <500.000 (98\%); \\ Costs/Month & 500.000 - 1 \text{ Million (6\%);} & 500.000 - 1 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ 1 - 1,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} & 1 - 1,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ 1 - 1,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} & 1 - 1,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ 1,5 - 2 \text{ Million (0\%);} & 1,5 - 2 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ > 2,5 \text{ Million (0\%)} & > 2,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ 2 (46\%); & 2 (66\%); \\ 3 (2\%) & 3 (10\%); \\ \hline Car Ownership & 1 (44\%); & 1 (20\%); \\ 2 (46\%); & 2 (66\%); \\ 3 (2\%) & 3 (10\%); \\ \hline Car Ownership & 0 (66\%); & 0 (34\%); \\ 1 (28\%); & 1 (64\%); \\ 2 (4\%); & 2 (2\%); \\ 3 (2\%) & 3 (0\%) \\ \hline Desired time to <1 \text{ Minutes (70\%);} & 1 \text{ Minutes (66\%);} \\ delayed & 1 - 3 \text{ Minutes (70\%);} & 3 - 6 \text{ Menit (0\%);} \\ 6 - 9 \text{ Minutes (0\%);} & 3 - 6 \text{ Menit (0\%);} \\ 6 - 9 \text{ Minutes (0\%);} & 3 - 6 \text{ Menit (0\%);} \\ \hline Frequency of using public transportation & 3 -5 \text{ Times (16\%);} \\ 1 \text{ week} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (16\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (16\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (16\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (16\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (0\%)} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (16\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (6\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (10\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (10\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (10\%);} \\ \hline = 10 \text{ Times (10\%);} & 5 - 10 \text{ Times (10\%);} \\ \hline = 10  $ |                       | 5 - 10 Million (24%)      | 5-10 Million (44%).       |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | 10 - 15 Million (2%)      | 10-15 Million (2%)        |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | >15 Million (4%)          | > 15 Million (2%)         |
| NamportationCosts/MonthCostor (01/0)Costor (00/0) $1 - 1,5$ Million (0%); $1 - 1,5$ Million (0%); $1 - 1,5$ Million (0%); $1,5 - 2$ Million (0%); $1,5 - 2$ Million (0%); $1,5 - 2$ Million (0%); $2,5$ Million (0%) $2,5$ Million (0%); $2,5$ Million (0%); $2,5$ Million (0%) $2,5$ Million (0%); $2,5$ Million (0%);Ownership $1$ (44%); $1$ (20%); $2$ (46%); $2$ (66%); $3$ (10%); $3$ (2%) $3$ (10%); $-3$ (2%)Car Ownership $0$ (66%); $0$ (34%); $1$ (28%); $1$ (64%); $2$ (2%); $3$ (2%) $3$ (0%)Desired time to< 1 Minutes (70%);   | Transportation        | < 500,000 (92%)           | <500,000 (98%):           |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | Costs/Month           | 500,000 - 1 Million (6%)  | 500,000 - 1 Million (0%)  |
| $\begin{array}{c cccc} & 1,5 - 2 \text{ Million (0\%);} & 1,5 - 2 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ & 2,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} & > 2,5 \text{ Million (0\%);} \\ & >2,5 \text{ Million (0\%)} & > 2,5 \text{ Million (2\%)} \\ \hline \text{Motorcycle} & 0 (8\%); & 0(2\%); \\ \hline \text{Ownership} & 1 (44\%); & 1 (20\%); \\ & 2 (46\%); & 2 (66\%); \\ & 3 (2\%) & 3 (10\%); \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $  |                       | 1 - 1.5 Million (0%).     | 1 - 1.5 Million (0%).     |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | 1.5 - 2 Million (0%)      | 1.5 - 2 Million (0%).     |
| $\begin{array}{c cccc} \mbox{Motorcycle} & 0 & (8\%); & 0(2\%); & 0(2\%); & 0(2\%); & 0(2\%); & 0(2\%); & 0(2\%); & 1 & (44\%); & 1 & (20\%); & 2 & (46\%); & 2 & (66\%); & 3 & (2\%) & 3 & (10\%); & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$  |                       | >2.5 Million (0%)         | > 2.5 Million (2%)        |
| Ownership 1 (44%); 1 (20%);   2 (46%); 2 (66%);   3 (2%) 3 (10%);   >3 (2%) 3 (10%);   Car Ownership 0 (66%); 0 (34%);   1 (28%); 1 (64%); 2 (2%);   2 (4%); 2 (2%); 3 (0%)   Desired time to < 1 Minutes (70%);  | Motorcycle            | 0 (8%).                   | 0(2%)                     |
| $\begin{array}{cccc} 11100011p & 2 (46\%); & 2 (66\%); \\ 3 (2\%) & 3 (10\%); \\ & & & >3 (2\%) \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Car Ownership & 0 (66\%); & 0 (34\%); \\ 1 (28\%); & 1 (64\%); \\ 2 (4\%); & 2 (2\%); \\ 3 (2\%) & 3 (0\%) \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Desired time to < 1 Minutes (70\%); & <1 Minutes (66\%); \\ delayed & 1-3 Minutes (28\%); & 1-3 Minutes (32\%); \\ 3-6 Minutes (0\%); & 3-6 Menit (0\%); \\ 6-9 Minutes (0\%); & 3-6 Menit (0\%); \\ 6-9 Minutes (0\%) & >9 Minutes (2\%); \\ >9 Minutes (0\%) & >9 Minutes 0\% \\ \hline \\ \\ Frequency of using public transportation & 1-3 Times (18\%); & 3-5 Times (10\%); \\ in 1 week & 5-10 Times (16\%); & 5-10 Times (6\%); \\ \hline \\ \end{array}$   | Ownership             | 1 (44%)                   | 1(20%)                    |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | emerenp               | 2 (46%):                  | 2 (66%):                  |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $  |                       | 3 (2%)                    | 3 (10%)                   |
| Car Ownership 0 (66%);<br>1 (28%);<br>2 (4%);<br>3 (2%) 0 (34%);<br>1 (64%);<br>2 (2%);<br>3 (0%)   Desired time to <1 Minutes (70%);<br>3 (2%) <1 Minutes (66%);<br>3 (0%)   Desired time to <1 Minutes (70%);<br>3 (2%) <1 Minutes (66%);<br>1 -3 Minutes (28%);<br>3 - 6 Minutes (0%);<br>6 - 9 Minutes (0%);<br>6 - 9 Minutes (2%);<br>9 Minutes (0%) >9 Minutes (32%);<br>3 - 6 Menit (0%);<br>6 - 9 Minutes (2%);<br>9 Minutes (0%)   Frequency of using<br>public transportation<br>in 1 week 1-3 Times (64%);<br>3 -5 Times (18%);<br>5 -10 Times (16%);<br>5 -10 Times (0%) 1-3 Times (6%);<br>5 -10 Times (0%)  |                       | 0 (= /0)                  | >3 (2%)                   |
| Construction 1 (28%); 1 (64%);   1 (28%); 2 (2%);   2 (4%); 2 (2%);   3 (2%) 3 (0%)   Desired time to < 1 Minutes (70%);  | Car Ownership         | 0 (66%) <sup>.</sup>      | 0 (34%)                   |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                       | 1 (28%):                  | 1 (64%)                   |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |                       | 2(4%)                     | 2 (2%)                    |
| Desired   time   to   < 1 Minutes (70%);   < 1 Minutes (66%);     delayed   1-3 Minutes (28%);   1-3 Minutes (32%);   3- 6 Menit (0%);   3- 6 Menit (0%);   6 - 9 Minutes (28%);   1-3 Minutes (32%);   3- 6 Menit (0%);   6 - 9 Minutes (2%);   5- 9 Minutes (0%);   3- 6 Menit (0%);   6 - 9 Minutes (2%);   >9 Minutes (0%);   5- 9 Minutes (0%);   3- 6 Menit (0%);   5- 9 Minutes (0%);   >9 Minutes (0%);   >9 Minutes (0%);   >9 Minutes (0%);   3- 5 Times (0%);   3- 5 Times (18%);   3- 5 Times (10%);   5-10 Times (16%);   5-10 Times (10%);   5-10 Times (0%);   5-10 Times (   |                       | 3 (2%)                    | 3(0%)                     |
| delayed 1-3 Minutes (28%); 1-3 Minutes (32%);   3- 6 Minutes (0%); 3- 6 Menit (0%);   6 - 9 Minutes (2%); 6 - 9 Minutes (2%);   9 Minutes (0%) 9 Minutes (2%);   9 Minutes (0%) 9 Minutes (2%);   9 Minutes (0%) 9 Minutes (0%)   9 Minutes (0%) 9 Minutes (0%)   1-3 Times (0%) 9 Minutes (0%)   5-10 Times (18%); 3-5 Times (10%);   5-10 Times (16%); 5-10 Times (6%);   410 Times (0%) 410 Times (2%);  | Desired time to       | < 1 Minutes (70%).        | <1 Minutes (66%):         |
| 3-6 Minutes (0%); $3-6$ Menit (0%); $6-9$ Minutes (2%); $6-9$ Minutes (2%); $9$ Minutes (0%) $9$ Minutes (2%); $9$ Minutes (0%) $9$ Minutes 0%)   Frequency of using public transportation in 1 week $1-3$ Times (18%); $1-3$ Times (2%); $5-10$ Times (16%); $5-10$ Times (2%); $5-10$ Times (2%);   | delaved               | 1-3 Minutes (28%):        | 1-3 Minutes (32%)         |
| 6 - 9 Minutes (2%); $6 - 9$ Minutes (2%); $9$ Minutes (0%) $9$ Minutes (2%); $9$ Minutes (0%) $9$ Minutes 0%)   Frequency of using public transportation in 1 week $1-3$ Times (18%); $3-5$ Times (10%); $5-10$ Times (0%) $5-10$ Times (6%); $5-10$ Times (2%);  |                       | 3- 6 Minutes (0%)         | 3- 6 Menit (0%)           |
| >9 Minutes (0%)   >9 Minutes 0%)     Frequency of using public transportation in 1 week   1–3 Times (64%);   1–3 Times (82%);     5–10 Times (18%);   3–5 Times (10%);   5–10 Times (6%);   |                       | 6 - 9 Minutes (2%).       | 6 - 9 Minutes (2%).       |
| Frequency of using public transportation in 1 week   1–3 Times (64%);   1–3 Times (82%);     5–10 Times (18%);   3–5 Times (10%);   5–10 Times (6%);     5–10 Times (0%);   5–10 Times (2%);  |                       | >9 Minutes (0%)           | >9 Minutes 0%)            |
| public transportation $3-5$ Times (18%); $3-5$ Times (10%);in 1 week $5-10$ Times (16%); $5-10$ Times (6%); $< 10$ Times (0%) $< 10$ Times (2%)   | Frequency of using    | 1–3 Times (64%)           | 1-3 Times (82%).          |
| in 1 week $5-10$ Times (16%); $5-10$ Times (6%); $-10$ Times (0%)   | public transportation | 3-5 Times (18%).          | 3-5 Times (10%).          |
| $\sim 10 \text{ Times } (0\%)$ $\sim 10 \text{ Times } (2\%)$   | in 1 week             | 5-10 Times (16%).         | 5-10 Times (6%).          |
|   |                       | < 10 Times (0%)           | < 10 Times (2%)           |

IPAThe results of the IPA questionnaire are shown in

### **IPA Analysis**

Data obtained from questionnaires related to perceptions of city transportation services were analyzed using

Tabel 4 Results of performance adjustment for the perspectives of Passanger of public transportation

| No | Satisfaction Variable   | Angkot<br>Passanger (%) | Those who<br>reside near<br>routes used<br>by Angkot (%) |
|----|---|-------------------------|--|
| 1  | There is not an overabundance of music playing on public transit                      | 26.07                   | 40.52  |
| 2  | Car windows are transparent in Angkot.  | 39.22                   | 42.24  |
| 3  | Passengers in Angkot are protected from pickpocketing                                 | 36.05                   | 41.91  |
| 4  | There are health protocols in Angkot  | 36.25                   | 40.00  |
| 5  | Avoid sexual harassment   | 37.39                   | 41.35  |
| 6  | There is distance between seats   | 30.57                   | 40.26  |
| 7  | Vehicles are not allowed to pass other cars in front of them                          | 37.44                   | 42.22  |
| 8  | Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly  | 36.32                   | 40.68  |
| 9  | The speed of public transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow        | 39.17                   | 45.65  |
| 10 | Modernization of the fleet for public transit   | 36.89                   | 42.60  |
| 11 | The state of cleanliness in transit   | 43.89                   | 46.86  |
| 12 | Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke  | 31.17                   | 37.39  |
| 13 | The driver is well-groomed  | 39.62                   | 40.91  |
| 14 | Passenger capacity does not exceed the available seats                                | 28.76                   | 36.48  |
| 15 | Angkot implements the health protocols that have been established during the pandemic | 32.44                   | 40.77  |
| 16 | There are no buskers  | 34.76                   | 42.61  |
| 17 | Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient   | 40.79                   | 44.10  |
| 18 | The walking distance to get Angkot is less than 200 m                                 | 40.85                   | 46.12  |
| 19 | Timely departure of Angkot  | 35.90                   | 42.19  |
| 20 | Angkot runs according to the route (Angkot Route)                                     | 53.53                   | 79.42  |

Table 4.

It can be seen in Table 4 that the average suitability of Angkot performance to the perception of Angkot passanger is below 50%. Only 1 performance has a conformity above 50%, namely performance 20 (Transport runs according to its route and path). The average performance of public transportation according

to community perception is below 50%, but only 1 performance has a conformity above 50%, namely performance 20 (transportation runs according to its route and lane). So it can be concluded that managers must pay more attention to the performance desired by Angkot passanger.





Table 5. Comparison of Variable Positions for Each Quadrant Based on Perceptions of Angkot passanger and Communities Around Angkot Routes.

|    | Angkot Passanger Those who reside near routes used by Angko          |     | Those who reside near routes used by Angkot           |
|----|--|-----|---|
|    | Quadrant 1   |     |   |
| 1  | There is not an overabundance of music<br>playing on public transit. | 3   | Passengers in Angkot are protected from pickpocketing |
| 6  | There is distance between seats                                      | 4   | There are health protocols in Angkot                  |
| 12 | Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke                       | 5   | Avoid sexual harassment                               |
| 16 | There are no buskers   | 8   | Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly                |
|    |  | 12  | Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke        |
|    |  | 19  | Timely departure of Angkot                            |
|    |  |     |   |
|    |  | Qua | adrant 2  |
| 2  | Car windows are transparent in Angkot                                | 11  | The state of cleanliness in transit                   |
| 3  | Passengers in Angkot are protected from<br>pickpocketing             | 20  | Angkot runs according to the route (Angkot Route)     |
| 4  | There are health protocols in Angkot                                 |     |   |
| 5  | Avoid sexual harassment  |     |   |
| 8  | Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly                               |     |   |
| 19 | Timely departure of Angkot   |     |   |
| 20 | Angkot runs according to the route (Angkot Route)                    |     |   |
|    |  | -   |   |

|    | Quadrant 3                             |   |  |  |
|----|--|---|--|--|
|    | Modernization of the fleet for public  |   | There is not an overabundance of music playing on public |  |
| 10 | transit                                | 1 | transit.   |  |
|    | Passenger capacity does not exceed the |   |  |  |
| 14 | available seats                        | 2 | Car windows are transparent in Angkot.                   |  |
|    | Angkot implements the health protocols |   |  |  |
| 15 | that have been established during the  | 6 | There is distance between seats                          |  |

|     | Angkot Passanger   |     | Those who reside near routes used by Angkot   |
|-----|--|-----|---|
|     | pandemic   |     |   |
|     |  | 7   | Vehicles are not allowed to pass other cars in front of them                          |
|     |  | 10  | Modernization of the fleet for public transit   |
|     |  | 13  | The driver is well-groomed  |
|     |  | 14  | Passenger capacity does not exceed the available seats                                |
|     |  | 15  | Angkot implements the health protocols that have been established during the pandemic |
|     |  | 16  | There are no buskers  |
|     |  |     |   |
|     |  | Qua | adrant 4  |
| 7   | Vehicles are not allowed to pass other<br>cars in front of them                | 9   | The speed of public transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow        |
| 9   | The speed of public transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow | 17  | Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient   |
| 11  | The state of cleanliness in transit  | 18  | The walking distance to get Angkot is less than 200 m                                 |
| 13  | The driver is well-groomed   |     |   |
| 17  | Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient  |     |   |
| 4.0 | The walking distance to get Angkot is  |     |   |

18 less than 200 m

Figure 2 shows the criteria that passengers on angkot believe need to be addressed: 1 (There is not an overabundance of music playing on public transit), 6 (There is distance between seats), 12 (Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke), and 16 (There are no buskers). For those who reside near urban transportation routes, there are a few variables that need to be improved: variable 3 (Passengers in Angkot are protected from pickpocketing); variable 4 (There are health protocols in Angkot); variable 5 (Avoid sexual harassment); variable 8 (Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly); variable 12 (Drivers are courteous, kind, and doesn't smoke); and variable 19 (Timely departure of Angkot). It can be seen that for angkot users the variables that need to be improved are something they feel during the trip. Meanwhile, for local people who rarely use angkot on average, the variables that need to be improved are based on the information they have obtained and based on the respondents' experience.

For the perception of angkot passengers who are Keep up the good work or quadrant B are 2 (Car windows are transparent in Angkot), 3 (Passengers in Angkot are protected from pickpocketing), 4 (There are health protocols in Angkot), 8 (Drivers do not drive angkot recklessly), 19 (Timely departure of Angkot), and 20 (Angkot runs according to the route (Angkot Route). In variables 3,4,5,8 and 19 which are considered good by angkot passanger, these variables are actually variables that must be improved according to people who live around angkot. From this gap, it can be seen that there are different perceptions between variables that need to be improved and those that are good according to urban transit passanger and the surrounding community. Variables that have been good by urban transit passanger can actually reduce the desire of the

surrounding community because they are considered to need improvement.

Based on the perceptions of angkot passengers who are low priority or quadrant C are items 10 (Modernization of the fleet for public transit), 14 (Passenger capacity does not exceed the available seats), and 15 (Angkot implements the health protocols that have been established during the pandemic). According to the opinions of those who live close to Angkot's low priority routes, or quadrant C, the following items are perceived as such: (1) There is not an overabundance of music playing on public transit; (2) Car windows are transparent in Angkot; (6) There is distance between seats; (7) Vehicles are not allowed to pass other cars in front of them; (10) Modernization of the fleet for public transit; (13) The driver is well-groomed; (14) Passenger capacity does not exceed the available seats; (15) Angkot implements the health protocols that have been established during the pandemic; and (16) There are no buskers. The variables numbered 10, 14, and 15 are considered low priority by both types of responders. Community attitudes indicate that variables 1, 6, and 16 are not urgently needed to be addressed. However, city transportation passanger believe that these factors need to be improved right away.

Additionally, items 7 (Vehicles are not allowed to pass other cars in front of them), 9 (The speed of public transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow), 11 (The state of cleanliness in transit), 13 (the driver wears neat clothes), 17 (Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient), and 18 (The walking distance to get Angkot is less than 200 m) relate to the perception of angkot passengers who become Excessive (Possible overkill) or quadrant D. As for the perception of those who live along the Angkot route, item 9 (The speed of public

transportation is felt to be neither too fast nor too slow), item 17 (Air circulation in Angkot is sufficient), and item 18 (The walking distance to get Angkot is less than 200 m) are considered to be in the quadrant D (possible overkill). Based on the analytical results, it is evident that three variables—variables 9, 17, and 18—are viewed by angkota users and the local population as not being particularly significant.

### CONCLUSION

The level of conformity between performance and expectations for respondents of Angkot user group and the community around the city transit line shows a value below 50%. This indicates that the manager must improve the performance variables that have been provided. There are the same variables that need to be improved between the perceptions of Angkot passengers and the surrounding community, namely variable 12 (Drivers are courteous, kind, and don't smoke). Based on the results of the analysis, it can be seen that for angkot users, the variables that need to be improved are something they feel during the trip. As for the surrounding community, which on average rarely uses angkot, variables that need to be improved based on the information they have obtained and based on the experience of respondents.

### REFERECES

- Aminah S. (2007). Transportasi Publik dan Aksesibilitas Masyarakat Perkotaan. Jurusan Ilmu Politik FISIP. Universitas Airlangga. Surabaya.
- Hartono R, Arthaya BM, Alfian. (2016). Usulan Perbaikan Angkutan Kota Bogor untuk Mengurangi Kemacetan. Simposium Nasional RAPI XV. Pp: 118 - 125
- Iman MN, Sitorus SRP, Machfud, Poerwo IFP, Widiatmaka. Keberlanjutan (2019). Analisis

Angkutan Umum Penumpang Berbasis Jalan (Studi Kasus di Kota Bogor). Jurnal Penelitian Transportasi Darat Vol 2 No 1.pp: 75 - 90.

- Meutia W dan Yuliana E. (2019). Performance Analysis of Manggarai Station Service Facilities on Passenger Satisfaction. Jurnal Infrastruktur Volume Nomor 2, pp: 99 – 104. Cited 5 in: https://journal.univpancasila.ac.id/index.php/infrastru ktur/article/view/1131.
- Peraturan Menteri Perhubungan Republik Indonesia Nomor PM 98 Tahun 2013 tentang Standar Pelayanan Minimal Angkutan Orang dengan Kendaraan Bermotor Umum dalam Trayek. (2013)
- Sartono D M dan Sartono W. (2011). Tingkat Kepuasan Penerbang terhadap Kinerja Air Traffic Controller Bandar Udara Adisutiipto Yogyakarta. The 14th **FSTPT** International Syposium.
- Solichin I. (2010). Analisa Kepuasan Penumpang Angkutan Kota terhadap Sistem Pelayanan Angkutan Kota di Kota Sidoarjo. Jurnal Aplikasi Vol 8 No 1. Pp: 1 - 8