

# SEGO SEGAWA POLICY (A POLICY ON BICYCLING TO WORKPLACE AND SCHOOL) IN YOGYAKARTA MUNICIPALITY: STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF PERSUASIVE POLICY INSTRUMENT

La Ode Nazaruddin<sup>1</sup>  
Korean Development Institute

## ABSTRACT

Sebagian besar ahli di ranah kebijakan public setuju bahwa instrumen yang persuasif lebih efektif, lebih murah, lebih toleran, untuk diterapkan di dalam kebijakan yang bertujuan untuk mengubah perilaku publik. Berdasar pada tesis beberapa ahli ini maka instrumen persuasif yang diinisiasi oleh pemerintah tentu akan lebih mudah diikuti oleh masyarakat. Argumen ini membawa penulis untuk meneliti apakah kebijakan sego segawe (penggunaan sepeda untuk ke kantor dan sekolah) yang diinisiasi oleh pemerintah kabupaten DI Yogyakarta memang efektif untuk mencapai tujuan-tujuan kebijakan. Metode penelitian yang digunakan di dalam penelitian ini adalah gabungan antara metode penelitian kualitatif dan kuantitatif. Metode kualitatif digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data implementasi instrumen kebijakan persuasif, sedangkan metode kuantitatif (melalui penggunaan kuesioner dengan nonprobability sampling di dalam metode survey) digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data persepsi publik mengenai kebijakan yang diimplementasikan. Secara garis besar, penelitian ini menemukan fakta bahwa instrumen kebijakan yang persuasif tidak efektif untuk mempengaruhi perilaku publik. Tentunya tesis ini juga disebabkan oleh rendahnya frekuensi tindakan persuasif yang dilakukan oleh pemerintah serta dukungan kapasitas situasional yang tidak menyeluruh.

**Keywords :** *instrument kebijakan yang persuasive, kelompok sasaran, dan sepeda*

## BACKGROUND

The discussion about how governments carry out their roles and obligations to citizen will direct to public policy term. On the public policy field, the policy instruments play an important role because of the fact that an achievement in policy goals is determined by a good choice amongst the policy instruments. According to “choice vs resource approach” and “maximalist vs minimalist approach” to the policy tool determination, Vedung (as cited in Purwanto, 2010) classifies the tool into three types: regulation, economic, and information instruments (in sequence, each type is also called stick, carrot, and sermon). Policy-makers can choose between single instrument or combination—the latter, it is also called metapolicy instrument—for instrument determination (Vedung & Doelen, in Videc, Rist & Vedung, 2003).

To solve government's problems, many of them use the instruments according to their perspectives, for example, some of the policies on transportation sector to use zero-emission vehicles. First, The National Government of China has been implementing some of these instruments—both regulation and economic instruments—to promote the use of two-wheel electric vehicles as the daily transportation. Consequently, industries, sales, and vehicle usage increase in number. Yet, the national policy is opposed by several local and municipal governments (Weinert, Ma, & Cherry, 2007). Second, at state level, California Government

---

1. Sedang menempuh studi S2 di Korean Development Institute  
laodenaz@gmail.com  
laodenaz@yahoo.com  
Contributors: Ely Susanto # Erwan Agus Purwanto # Agus Pramusinto



also carried out the same policy to promote zero-emission vehicles by coercive method, as a result, the target groups—such as car and oil industries— fought a battle (Calef & Goble, 2007).

Effectiveness of the transportation policies in some countries shows that there is contribution of regulation instrument which is implemented either independently or dependently. In contrast, the other findings indicate that use of the regulation instrument cause the human-rights violation and arouse opposition (Sen [1996]; Weinert et al., [2007]; Calef & Goble [2007]). Some of these experts agree that persuasive instrument is the best of the other instruments. Their arguments that persuasive instrument is more lenient (Vedung & Doelen in Videc et al., 2003), cheaper (Salamon [as cited in Weiss & Tschirhart, 1994]; Stanbury & Fulton [as cited in Howlett & Ramesh, 1995), and more effective (Weiss & Tschirhart, 1994; Howlett & Ramesh, 1995; Schneider & Ingram, 1990) to influence the public behavior.

The prior discussion describes utilization of policy instruments in overseas. In Indonesia context, especially in Municipality of Yogyakarta, the use of policy instruments is able to be viewed on *Sego Segawe Policy*.<sup>2</sup> It has been implemented since 2008. Actually, this policy consists of three types of instruments - regulative, economical, and persuasive instrument— but persuasive instrument is priority instrument (source: the directly interview with Mayor of Yogyakarta, Herry Zudianto in December 2009).

Based on the experts' arguments that persuasive instrument is so effective to influence the public behavior (Schneider & Ingram, 1990; Andrews et al., 1990; Weiss & Tschirhart, 1994; Howlett & Ramesh, 1995; Meadow et al., 2005), for this reason, it is important to investigate the fact about: Is persuasive instrument effective to achieve the policy goals? To derive the right data, the main question will be elaborated into some questions: (1) How is the persuasive instrument implemented? (2) How is persuasive instrument able to influence the public behavior to use bicycle for their shorten-distance activities?

Accordingly, to answer the questions, this paper is going to be divided into eight parts. First part is going to discuss the background with respect to paradox between theoretical vs empirical argumentation of persuasive instrument and implementation of the lenient instrument in Municipality of Yogyakarta. Second part contains theoretical study and policy experiences towards bicycle use in other countries, so this explanation will be useful to find problem solving for policy effectiveness for the future. Third part contains research method to collect the data. Fourth part contains the context of Municipality of Yogyakarta. Fifth part contains essence and implementation of the policy. Sixth part contains effectiveness of persuasive policy instrument from survey and interview result. Seventh contains research conclusion. At the end of the part contains policy recommendation and further discussion.

---

2. An acronym for Javanese language, the meaning is policy to promote the use of bicycle to workplace and school.



## **THEORETICAL VIEW**

### **1. Public Policy and Its Instruments**

The concept of public policy can be understood as "...A process or a series or pattern of governmental activities or decisions that are designed to remedy some public problem, either real or imagined" (Lester & Stewart, 2000, p. 4). To interfere the public problems, there are primary factors which should be paid attention - the nature of problems, goals and outcomes, the nature of target population, rules, and tools or incentives (Schneider & Ingram as cited in Bosso, 1994). Schneider & Ingram state that policy instruments are one of the factors within public policy. The policy instruments are the methods which utilized by government to change citizen behavior and to achieve policy goals (Salamon, [1989], Doern & Wilson [1974], Dahl & Lindblom [1953] as cited in Schneider & Ingram, 1990).

According to perspectives "choice vs resource approach" and "maximalist vs minimalist approach" (Vedung as cited in Howlett, 1991 [as cited in Purwanto, 2010]), Vedung (as cited in Purwanto, 2010) divide policy instrument into three types i.e., regulative, economical, informative instruments - he made analogy such as stick (to force the public in order to comply), carrot (to provide material incentives so that public can behave like government's will, and sermon (to convince the public with moral jargons and the same kind to make people behave like government's will). The good choice of policy instruments will determine public compliance and effectiveness of achievement of policy goals, and vice versa. When government fixes the policy instruments, government can choose single or combination of policy instrument. The combination is called metapolicy instrument (Vedung & Doelen, in Videc et al., 2003).

Moreover, Vedung & Doelen (in Videc et al., 2003) explain that metapolicy instrument is able to be understood as effort merge informative instrument and other instruments into a program. In addition, both of them describe that the information can be used as a metapolicy instrument to disseminate knowledge, availability, and content other policy instruments. Then, they illustrate with a subsidy program. If expected target group do not know that they possibly get the subsidy when they apply, the program can not be utilized. For the reason, government should inform expected target group about the existence and essence of the subsidy program. In this case, position of information is as a metapolicy instrument.

Vedung & Doelen (in Videc et al., 2003) give explanation again that information as part of the policy instruments is all government effort to influence the public directly - through transfer of knowledge, communication with rational argument, exhortation, and moral suasion - in order to achieve performance of policy. And then, Schneider & Ingram (1990) argue that the instrument is used by government to make public behavior into adherence and use or support in appealing self-consciousness activities in public and private sector so the particular goals can be attained without government intervention such as incentives and



coercion. The informative instrument as one of the non-coercive instruments - an instrument which tend passive, simple, cheap - is expected to have capability to embody particular values and gain enthusiastic support from society (Howlett & Ramesh, 1995; Stanbury & Fulton [as cited in Howlett & Ramesh, 1995]). Popular support on policy will be able to reach on condition that every government pays attention some crucial factors in policy - the policy must capture the target group attention; implementor must deliver a credible, clear, understandable policy message; message must influence target group, and it can create social context (Weiss & Tschirhart, 1994). Thereby, the remarkable performance of information policy instrument to realize a policy goals will be ensured if implementor pay attention to a lot of the following factors (Goggin, Bowman, Lester, & O'Toole, 1990; Grindle [in Grindle, 1980]; Weiss & Tschirhart [1994]; Love & Sederberg (as cited in Goggin, et. al., 1990) :

- a. Inducement and constraints from the top: (1) Content of the policy message: provision resources or types of benefit, credibility of the message, and extent of change envisioned; (2) Form of the policy message: clarity, consistency, frequency of repetition or exposure duration, receipt of messages, and channel types of communication; (3) Reputations of the communicator: legitimacy and credibility of the federal actors.
- b. Inducement and constraints from the bottom: the elected and appointed government officials, organized interest groups, and state agency.
- c. The state decisional outcomes and capacity: (1) Organizations capacity: structure, personnel, financial resources; (2) State ecological capacity: economic, political, and situational capacities; (3) Physical environment and social structure.

## **2. Policy and Urban Transportation Mangement**

In order to be effective, implementor of transportation policy should concentrate on urban design/form, as well (Yunus, 2005 & Tsai, 2005). With regard to Herbert & Thomas' urban classification (as cited in Pacione, 2009, p. 264), the compact city is better for non-motorized vehicles. Even though the bicycles is not stressed explicitly by the experts in urbanism, but according to Beatley's findings and argument (Beatley, 2000) some cities in Europe have significant increase in bicycle rider due to its compactness. Nonmotorized vehicle—for instance, bicycle - is very advantageous for physical environment and human life (Elmore, 2004). In spite of very beneficial, the policies which make great progress in using bicycle become the controversial policies in some countries. Some governments become proponent and other governments become opponent (Beatley, 2000; Soemarwoto, 2004; Weinert et al., 2007). We can conclude that public policy plays key role in using of nonemission vehicles (Pucher [1997] as cited in Beatley, 2000) with either single or metapolicy instrument (Pucher, [1997] as cited in Beatley, 2000; Beatley [2000]; Vedung & Doelen [in Videc et al., 2003]).



## RESEARCH METHOD

This investigation had been conducted in Municipality of Yogyakarta with *mixed methods research* - combination of qualitative and quantitative method (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Creswell & Clark, 2007; Singarimbun in Singarimbun & Effendi, 1989; Babbie, 2007; Justice in Yang & Miller, 2008; Rist in Denzin & Lincoln, 2009; Strauss & Corbin, 2009). The qualitative method is used to collect the data about implementation of persuasive policy instrument from implementor, whereas the quantitative method is used to collect the data about public perception of policy implementation.

Research Population is rider and owner of bicycle as resident of Yogyakarta city and nonresident of Yogyakarta city - the latter is the one who commit to act such as students and working people. As a result, they are classified into five groups i.e., students in primary to senior high schools, university students, Yogyakarta Municipality's civil servants, provincial and national government's civil servants, the nongovernmental-working people. Nonprobability sampling specifically quota sampling method is chosen for this purpose (Babbie: 2007; Northrop & Arsneault [in Yang & Miller : 2008]). Because the bicyclists can not be indentified exactly - there is not a sampling frame. Therefore, number of sample is 150 @30. After all, processing data is done through some stages i.e., preparation, exploration, analyses, presentation, and validation (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

## CONTEXT OF YOGYAKARTA MUNICIPALITY

On Province of Yogyakarta Special Teritory's map, Municipality of Yogyakarta located in central which is surrounded by other regencies in Yogyakarta Province. Many people who come from other areas especially inner areas of DIY Province perform an act in Yogyakarta City because of the following underlying causes. First, there are 548 schools; second, there are 49 higher-education institutions; third, there are a few public agencies; fourth, there are a lot of small to big businesses with 53.372 companies.<sup>3</sup> According to the facts, some schools, higer education bodies, and labour market field enable nonresident of Yogyakarta Municipality to engage in the activities.

## SEGO SEGAWA POLICY

### 1. Policy Esence

A deep-rooted cause of establishment of Sego Segawe Policy makes air quality of Yogyakarta Municipality much better.<sup>4</sup> Background of the policy adoption is a considerable

---

3. Read: data of The Coordinator Body of Private Higher Eduacation, Regional V Yogyakarta; The Education Agency of DIY Province; The Education Agency, The Religion Affairs Agency, The Employment Agency of Yogyakarta Municipality all of them as cited in Annual Statistic Data of Yogyakarta Municipality in 2009; Annual Statistic Data of Yogyakarta Municipality in 2009

4. The change in the air quality occurs due to the dramatic increase in vehicles. The secondary data shows that only Yogyakarta Municipality, vehicles progress from 260.496 vehicles in 2004 to 327.378 vehicles in 2008 with the substantial contribution to motorcycles i.e., from 213.690 vehicles in 2004 to 273.538 vehicles in 2008 or progress >82% every year (sources: Data Base in 2007 and Annual Statistic Data in 2009 of Yogyakarta Municipality).



increase in use of motorized vehicles and the crises in energy of Indonesia; inferior quality of health due to the poor air quality, global warming and air pollution due to vehicle emission; and traffic congestion. One of the ways to solving the problems which was chosen by The Municipal Government of Yogyakarta is bicycle ride to the daily activity—especially on Friday and the short-distance activities—through the bicycle-supporting spirit which is called ride of bicycle into workplace and school (in the Javanese language, *sepeda kanggo sekolah lan nyambut gawe* or *Sego Segawe*).

As to theory of public policy instrument in chapter two, this policy adopts all kind of policy instruments—three kinds i.e., regulative, economical and persuasive instruments. And yet, the primary instrument which is used is persuasive method and its implementers are not only government agencies but also people in general. The persuasive method which is applied is a broad appeal, lead by concrete personal example (imposing well-known, religious, community, and public figures become the prime example for riding bicycle), public campaign (by launching program, public outcry and pamphlet, coaching clinic program, merchandises, professional jargons for debunking the negative myths on riding bicycle e.g., bicyclist as the poor), election of the bicyclist idol for students and working people, creation of website of *Sego Segawe* campaign, gathering program of *Sego Segawe*, organized effort of movement pattern, the privilege award for bicycle community (sources: profile of *Sego Segawe* persuasion or visit to <http://segosegawe.jogjakota.go.id/profil.php> & the interview results with the Mayor of Yogyakarta Municipality in December 2009).

## **2. The Policy Implementation**

### **Establishment of the driver team of *Sego Segawe* persuasion implementation**

The team is nonformal, established to smooth the implementation at municipal level, directly managed by the mayor of Yogyakarta Municipality, as a patron of all bicycle clubs and associations in Yogyakarta Municipality.

### **Media support**

All bicycle events or activities - spectacular or not - is extensively published via mass media such as electronic and news media; new media such as formal website, personal web-blog, facebook and other online social networks. The media is classified into two kinds i.e., internal media, for example, formal website, weblog, facebook, Yogyakarta Municipality's tabloid and magazine; and external media, for instance, newspapers, radios, local and national TV stations, online media.

### **Interest group support**

In this chapter, Interest group is classified into two groups i.e., bicyclists and nonbicyclists. The first, bicycle clubs and associations, we can classify according to ownership of bicycle clubs/associations, and other communities; the residential area



I.e., inner of Yogyakarta and outer of Yogyakarta. The second, nonbicyclists, who include in bicycle traders, other public officials, repair shop workers, and etc.

### **Political-actor support**

By the year 2008, The Municipal Government also establishes communication with political actors as successful maker. Then, in this research is conducted interview with two parliament members of Yogyakarta Municipality. They originate from the The Faction Welfare Justice Party and The Fraction of Struggle Indonesia Democracy Party. As for the interview result with them, the politicians state that they give full support personally and officially for the policy.

### **Financial support**

Government also provides financial support regularly from an annual municipal budget, but the budget is for publicity in news and electronic medias, erect of transport infrastructures, accident and health insurance for bicyclist, budget for support program. Some implementers in Municipal Government of Yogyakarta judge that in implementation process, there is budgetary limitations especially in street level bureaucrat such as school and other local services. In contrast to bicycle clubs and associations and other people, they clearly state that riding bicycle do not always need for much money because they can ride on the bicycles anywhere without money. If their programs or activities need for money, they will raise funds (sources: the interview results with two bicycle club and association personils in May 2010).

## **PERSUASIVE ACTS**

### **1. Persuasion Towards Public Servants Of Yogyakarta Municipality**

Specifically, persuasion for this community is begun with an appeal for all civil servants then the government issue the orders for public agencies under municipality, and every institution leader persuades his staff continuously to ride the bicycle but the method is applied by some little leaders. The policy goals and benefits of bicycle ride are always conveyed by implementers to them in the beginning of implementation. During implementation process, every public institution employs policy messages with diferent methods to evade blasé about it but there are public institutions which rarely even never notify the goals and benefits, the implementers focus their attention on minimum standard –i.e., bicycle ride on Friday (sources: the interview results with one of the implementation personils and some of the bicycle clubs in municipal government in May 2010).

### **2. Persuasion in the schools**

Before Sego Segawe policy implementation, there is The Mayor Decree with Number 24/2008 which regulates An Ethical Code of School that all students is banned from riding motorized vehicles —the ordinance implicitly intends the students to use bicycle as the short-



distance transportation. When Sego Segawe policy is established, the policy is distinctly understood and implemented by officials in the schools such as essence of policy; the moment for persuasion and frequency of repetition. For understanding side, there are schools understand that the bicycling ride is Friday only and for everyday activities with minimum standard on Friday. There are schools which undertake the events independently and behave passively - both of them are the other varieties of implementation in schools (sources: the interview results with the four school principals in May 2010).

### 3. Persuasion for all target groups

The informative methods for all people are the direct appeal; utilization of news, electronic, and new media; dissemination and sales of merchandise and; formal events

## EFFECTIVENESS OF PERSUASIVE POLICY INSTRUMENT

### 1. Policy messages transmission

Policy message which is conveyed by the civil servants of Municipal Government of Yogyakarta and bicycle clubs and associations, is expected to be received, known, and understood by target groups. On the other hand, bad transmission process will bring on contribute to inefficiency in resources during implementation process, the message will be understood partially or will not be received by target groups. For this reason, the following table will present briefly this survey results.

**Table 1.**  
**The Transmission of Bicycle Use Appeal from Implementers to Target Group**

Respondent Groups	Knowing the Appeal		Sum	Percentage (%)		
	Yes	No		Yes	No	Sum
School Students	19	11	30	63,3	36,6	100
College Students	22	8	30	73,3	26,6	100
Public Servants of The Municipal Govt	30	-	30	100	-	100
Public Servants of The Natl & Prov Govt	24	6	30	80	20	100
Noncivil-Servant-Working People	20	11	30	66,6	33,3	100
<b>Total (N : 150)</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>76,7</b>	<b>23,3</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The result shows that the message is transmitted badly to the people especially to students and private-sector-working people. The figures in the list above shows that there are 23,3% respondents who do not know about bicycle campaign existence —the major contributor is school students (36,6%). There are the underlying causes for this problem. First, fifth-four respondent groups may not know that bicycle convoy —or fun bike— include in bicycle campaign. Second, respondents might be forget that bicycle campaign exists. Third, there is low frequency of repetition at sermon or campaign. Officials Officials in the school state that they seldom persuade people in the schools, a government public-relation officer



also issues a statement that his institution is very seldom deliver the policy message to public, and a team personil of Sego Segawe implementation also realizes that low frequency of performance of bicycling events also influence directly mass media to publish the events.

In order to support prior argument, the following data will give strong evidence. The concrete data shows that in regard to 76,7% respondents who know about existence of persuasion in Yogyakarta, about 64,7% respondents state that persuasion is performed <10 times in one month—partially, public servants of Municipal Government hold a great majority i.e., 86,6%. Then, there are 8% respondents who do not understand about sermon or campaign with school students as a high majority (26,3%). Thereby, we can conclude that bicycle using appeal is transmitted poorly from implementers to target groups.

## **2. Implementation actors and their reputation**

The policy is performed by some of the actor not only public servants of municipal government but also other people. The result of statistical multiple response analysis shows that the primary actors—in sequence—who appeal the bicycle ride are their friends themselves, Mayor of Yogyakarta, and bicycle clubs and associations. The other actor is the members of their families. Some of the respondents give statements that their families in outer DIY are also appeal to them to ride the bicycles consequently their families' sermon can not be included in the policy influence (sources: the interview results with some respondents in May 2010 and the statistical analysis result of survey result in May 2010). Even though, other actors intervene in public's behavior, it is important to know that bicycling appeal is transmitted from not only the team of Sego Segawe implementation but also other people to target groups—before and after policy implementation. In addition, the policy only makes bicycle ride massive and is a bicycling spirit (sources: the interview results with some personils of the Sego Segawe team personils).

When actors persuade them to ride bicycles, generally, there are 3,3% respondents who do not comply with the sermon—partially, school students are the great majority. They state that they sometimes even do not adhere to the persuasive act because of several reasons 1) impossibility to ride bicycle due to danger and wheather; 2) pressed for time and highly mobile activities; 3) impossibility to carry the heavy load, and other illogical reasons due to the bad mood (sources: the interview results with some key informans in May 2010). The other result of statistical multiple response analysis shows that there are the underlying reasons to obey the persuasion 1) in particularly the intimate relationship; 2) logic in their persuasion; 3) physical exercise. Partially, public servants of municipal government are great majority and their prime reason is rationality (sources: the interview results with some respondents and the statistical analysis result of survey result in May 2010).



### 3. Clarity of policy and persuasion message

For this purpose, the clear message is message which is delivered clearly to target groups about what is the policy goal? What should they do? The result of statistical cross-tabulation analysis shows that there are 6% respondents who do not know of the policy goals. Next, the result of statistical cross-tabulation analysis shows that all respondents generally state that all actors who conduct persuasion campaign advise public to ride the bicycle.

### 4. Channel communication types

In respect to all communication channels, some respondents know that bicycle campaign via new media, news media, and electronic media are from actors in outer Yogyakarta (sources: the interview results with some respondents in May 2010) such as Kompas. Next, the result of statistical multiple response analysis shows that channel communication type which that is frequently seen are via face to face (60 respondents), news media (51 respondents), and appeal and order (46 respondents). Partially, public servants of municipal government are the great majority because of their agencies as implementers and the direct persuasion from the Yogyakarta Mayor (source: statistical analysis result of survey result in May 2010).

### 5. Target Group Adherence

The municipal government intends public to ride the bicycle to all the short-distance activities. Public is expected to use the bicycle as their transportation when they will go to school, workplace, all short-distance activities, and physical exercise area. The following table outlines to us about the school student obedience in persuasion.

**Table 2.**  
**School Students by Bicycle Utilization**

Activities	Bicycle Utilization			Percentage (%)		
	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never
Physical Exercise	15	14	1	50	46,6	3,3
To School	14	8	8	46,6	26,6	26,6
The Short-Distance of the Daily Activities	13	16	1	43,3	53,3	3,3

N: 30

Source : The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The bicycle ride to the school and all the short-distance activities are under 50% hence persuasion is not effective. During the interview, a student who rides the bicycle from her house to three activities admits that she always rides the bicycle from her house to all her activities since in the elementary school and she sees the tangible benefit. In daily activities, the woman some time rides her bicycle due to long-distance destination. The other respondent argues that he rides bicycle regardless of the fact that his school is not the bus route, he stays



out of sentence because of The Mayor Decree Number 24/2008 towards An Ethical Code Of School (sources: the interview results with two of the school students in May 2010).

In contrast to some respondents, they seldom or even never use bicycle for a few some activites because of some factors. Mostly because of mood situation, traffic jam and its danger, and a lift, but the other respondent says that she does not use bicycle for her activities since policy adoption in view of the fact that she seldom go out of the house (sources: the interview results with some respondents in May 2010).

**Table 3.**  
**College Students by Bicycle Use**

Activities	Bicycle Use.			Percentage (%)		
	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never
Physical Exercise	23	6	1	76,6	20	3,3
To School	23	5	2	76,6	16,6	6,6
The Short-Distance of the Daily Activ ities	17	13	-	56,6	43,3	-

N: 30

Source : The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

This table shows that the university students ride bicycle from their house to all their daily activities - about >50% - accordingly the sermon is effective. But, there are some students who sometimes, seldom, or never use bicycle for all their daily activites due to some reasons such as long-distance, traffic jam and its danger, bad weather. On the other hand, a woman student tells that she always uses her bicycle for all her daily activities because of her necessity and as physical exercise (sources: the interview results with some of the university-student respondents in May 2010).

**Table 4.**  
**Bicycle Use of Students for the School and College by Distance from House to the School and College**

The Distance Between House and School and College	Often (%)	Sometimes (%)	Never (%)	Sum (%)
< 5 km	50	13,3	6,6	69,9
>5 km	11,6	8,3	10	29,9
<b>Sum Total (N : 60)</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>

Source :The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The table shows that there are 69,9% respondents who cover the distance between their houses and the schools and the colleges about <5 kilometre and the others cover the distance between their houses and the schools and the colleges about >5 kilometre. There are 17% respondents who do not ride bicycle with the great majority are from respondets who cover the distance from their houses and school and college about >5 kilometre. The result of statistical correlation analysis indicates that figures of correlation coefficient



value are 0,236 with probability 0,031 ( $<0,05$ ) therefore we can conclude that there are statistical correlation between bicycle ride and the distance from house to school and college (source: statistical analysis result of survey result in May 2010).

**Table 5.**  
**Public Servants of The Municipal Government of Yogyakarta by Bicycle Utilization**

Activities	Bicycle Utilization			Percentage (%)		
	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never
Phisycal Exercise	17	11	2	56,6	36,6	6,6
To Workplace on Friday	15	8	7	50	26,6	23,3
To Workplace on the Other Working Days	3	5	22	10	16,6	73,3
The Short-Distance of the Daily Activities	9	13	8	30	43,3	26,6

N: 30

Source :The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The table indicates that bicycle use - for physical activity and the workplace on Friday - of public servants of municipal government is about 50%. The bicycle ride on Friday is very interesting because they are always under the control and sermon of their institutions. Whereas, bicycle ride from their houses to the other activities is at least 50% thereby bicycle use for these activities is not effective. Unsafety, preoccupation and pressed for time, the long and short distance, a bad mood, conditional and situational impossible are some underlying reasons for not bicycling (sources: the interview results with some of the public servants of municipal government in May 2010).

**Table 6.**  
**Public Servants of The National and Provincial Government by Bicycle Use**

Activities	Bicycle Utilization			Percentage (%)		
	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never
Phisycal Exercise	25	4	1	83,3	13,3	3,3
To Workplace on Friday	10	7	13	33,3	23,3	43,3
To Workplace on the Other Working Days	3	4	23	10	13,3	76,6
The Short-Distance of the Daily Activities	12	12	6	40	40	20

N: 30

Source : The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The table above indicates that bicycle ride from respondents'houses to the workplace on Friday and the other days and daily activities is at least 50% as a result bicycle ride is not effective. The public servants of national and provincial government sometimes use bicycle for those activities because of preoccupation and in hurry, the long distance activities,



situational and conditional impossible, and the bad mood. On the other hand, the respondents who always use bicycle for those activites because of the fact that they do not have other vehicles, feel unsafe to ride the bicycle, their leaders in their offices tolerate their performance (sources: the interview results with some of the public servants of national and provincial government in May 2010).

The table 7 shows that bicycle ride from house to four activities —the workplace on Friday and the other days, the daily short-distance activities, and physical exercise— of the noncivil servant working people, is about >50% hence we can conclude that there are effectiveness of bicycle use for this target group. But, this conclusion can not be generalized on account of the fact that the great majority of respondents are the informal-sector-working people.

**Table 7.**  
**The Private-Sector-Working People By Bicycle Utilization**

Activities	Bicycle Utilization			Percentage (%)		
	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never
Phisycal Exercise	23	4	3	76,6	13,3	10
To Workplace on Friday	20	6	4	66,6	20	13,3
To Workplace on the Other Working Days	22	3	5	73,3	10	16,6
The Short-Distance of the Daily Activities	21	6	3	70	20	10

N : 30

Source : The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

Non-public servants-working people sometimes ride bicycle from their houses to their destinations due to the fact that they have preoccupation, bicycle do not carry the heavy load, weather is unsettled. Whereas the respondents who always ride bicycle from their houses to their destinations because they only have bicycles as their transportation (sources: the interview results with some of the private-sector-working people in May 2010). Then, bicycle use for all kind of the daily activities as the prior explanation is analyzed statistically. The annova result indicates that probability value of bicycle use is about 0,000 (<0,05) consequently there is a difference in bicycle use among five groups of respondents. Because some working people's arguments that some respondents —especially, civil servants— do not pedal the bicycle on Friday and the other working days because of the long distance, so the following tabel indicates the statistical tabulation result which maps the house distance to the workplace and its effect on bicycle ride.



**Table 8.**  
**Bicycle Use for the Workplace on Friday according to the Distance**  
**between House and Workplace**

The Distance from house to workplace	Often (%)	Sometimes (%)	Never (%)	Sum (%)
< 5 km	31,1	10	15,5	56,6
>5 km	18,8	11,1	13,3	43,2
<b>Sum Total (N : 60)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>

Source :The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

**Table 9.**  
**Bicycle Use for the Workplace on the Other Working Days according to the Distance**  
**between House and Workplace**

The Distance from house to workplace	Often (%)	Sometimes (%)	Never (%)	Sum (%)
< 5 km	17,7	5,5	33,3	56,6
>5 km	13,3	7,7	33,3	43,2
<b>Sum Total (N : 60)</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

Source :The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

The two table above show that there are 56,% respondents with the distance from house to the workplace about <5 kilometre and the other are >5 kilometre. The respondents with the distance from house to the workplace about <5 kilometre do not ride the bicycle from their houses to the workplace on Friday (15,3%) and the other working days (33,3%). After the statistical correlation test is conducted, the result indicates that there is no correlation between the distance from house to the workplace and bicycle use - the fact that the contingency coefficient value is about 0,163 with probability 0,252 (>0,05). Whereas the distance from house to the workplace and bicycle use do not correlate one another –the fact that the contingency coefficient value is about 0,163 with probability 0,252 (>0,05). Generally, the effect of bicycle using appeal on the all respondents is indicated by the following table (Table 10).

Generally, there are about 66,7% respondents give statement that the sermon does not produce an effect on their behavior with university students hold a large majority (83,3% respondents). Last, F test is done for five groups of respondents about campaign influence. The annova result indicates that the value is  $F = 2,725$  with probability about 0,032 (<0,05) so we can conclude that there is difference among the groups which is influenced and not influenced by the persuasion.



**Table 10.**  
**Appeal influence for all target groups**

Appeal Influence	Agree	Disagree	Excpt*	Sum	Percentage (%)			
					Agree	Disagree	Excpt*	Sum
School Students	7	23	-	30	23,3	76,3	-	100
College Students	5	25	-	30	16,6	83,3	-	100
Pegawai/karyawan Pemkot	12	18	-	30	40	60	-	100
Pegawai/karyawan non-Pemkot	14	15	1	30	46,6	50	3,33	100
Noncivil-servant-working people	11	19	-	30	36,6	63,3	-	100
<b>Sum Total (N : 150)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>32,7</b>	<b>66,7</b>	<b>0,7</b>	<b>100</b>

Except\*: Exception for the people who never ride the bicycle

Source :The primary data from survey result in May 2010, processed

Even if many respondents pedal bicycle across their destinations, some respondents agree about something uncomfortable when they use bicycles for their activities and feel fear for their safety when they are on the road because other rider and driver have not respected to bicyclists (sources: the interview results with some the respondents in May 2010). In addition to their compliance, respondents' families are also discussed how respondents' families adhere to the persuasion. The result of cross-tabulation analysis shows that bicycle use of respondents' families from their houses to their destinations is at least 50% thereby we can conclude that bicycle ride for the families is not effective (source: the statistical analysis result of survey result in May 2010)

## CONCLUSION

The research finding shows that the instrument do not be effefitive to reach the policy goals - especially, for students, Yogyakarta Municipality's civil servants, provincial and national governments'civil servants. And the explanation of this situation are (1) the long distance between home and destination due to non-compactness of Yogyakarta city; (2) impossible situational and condition to ride the bicycle - because of preucupation, short time, and the crowded street; (3) subordination to bicyclist of other drivers and riders, and some people in the absence of bicycle. The research finding about causes of ineffectiveness of persuasive instrument are compatible with some contributing factors in public policy implementation according to Goggin et al., (1990) i.e., frequency of repetition of policy message and situational capacities in public policy implementation.

Accordingly, we can not generalize about the finding and arguments of the other researchers - Schneider & Ingram (1990); Andrews et al., (1990);Weiss & Tschirhart (1994); Howlett & Ramesh (1995); Meadow et al. (2005) - who state that persuasive instrument is so effective to affect public behavior.



## RECOMMENDATION AND FURTHER DISCUSSION

The experience has proven that altering of life style needs incentive, regulation, and basic investment that is required (Beatley, 2000). The metapolicy instrument is classified into three groups. First, enforcement of the regulative instrument with restrictions of use motorized vehicles on all occupations not only public servants of Yogyakarta Municipality but also other occupations, implementation of bicycle use not only on Friday and public servants of Yogyakarta Municipal but also on all working days and other people, the reduction in speed level of traffic in Yogyakarta Municipality territory for bicyclist safety. Second, it is essential for government to submit over budget to optimize implementation of economical instrument —e.g., transportation infrastructure erecting of bicycle, providing public bicycle in appropriate places, offering the incentive for bicycle service stations to service bicycles and the traders in bicycle to hold down bicycle prices, submitting over budget for insurance against the road accident, and other incentives and disincentives. Third, intensification of persuasive method and socialization of other benefits of the gift for bicycle owners as part of persuasive method.

## REFERENCE

- Anderson, J.P, 2003, *Public Policymaking*. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed, Houghton Mifflin Company, USA.
- Babbie, E, 2007, *The Practice of Social Research* 11<sup>th</sup> Ed, Thomson Wadsworth Publishing Company, USA
- Beatley, T, 2000, *Green Urbanism : Learning from European Cities*, Island Press, USA.
- Bosso, C.J, 1994, The practice and study of policy formation, in Nagel, S.S. (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies* 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed, revised and expanded (pp.95-115), Public Administration and Public Policy/53, Marcel Dekker Inc, New York.
- Creswell, J.W. & Clark, V.L.P, (2007), *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, Sage Publications Inc., USA.
- Goggin, M.L., Bowman, A.O.M., Lester, J.P., & O'Toole Jr, L.J, (1990), *Implementattion Theory and Practise : Toward A Third Generation*. Scott-Foresman/Little- Brown Higher Education, A Division of Scott-Foresman and Company, USA.
- Grindle, M.S, 1980, Policy content and context in implementation, in Grindle, M.S. (Ed), *Politics and Policy Implementation in The Third World*, Princeton Univeresity Press, pp3-34. New Jersey.
- Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M, 1995, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Justice, J.B, 2008, Purpose and significance of research design, in Kaifeng Yang & Gerald J. Miller (Eds), *Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration*. CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group, p. 75-92. USA.
- Lester, J.P. & Stewart JR. J, 2000, *Public Policy: An Evolutionary Approach*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed, Wadsworth, A Division of Thomson Learning.



- Northrop, A. & Arsneault, S, 2008, Sampling and data collection, in Kaifeng Yang & Gerald Miller (Eds), *Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration* (pp. 213-239). Press, Taylor and Francis Group. USA.
- Pacione, M, 2009, *Urban Geography : A Global Perspective*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, Rotledge Is An Imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group USA : New York, Googlebooks version, Retrieved from [http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=M3rAuvRogC&oi=fnd&pg=PA2&dq=Urban+Geography++A+Global+Perspective&ots=T\\_2fp8ahq8&sig=dxRI79b476xAFY2zOKmpD-7qOM#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=M3rAuvRogC&oi=fnd&pg=PA2&dq=Urban+Geography++A+Global+Perspective&ots=T_2fp8ahq8&sig=dxRI79b476xAFY2zOKmpD-7qOM#v=onepage&q&f=false), accessed: 27/08/2010 17:44.
- Purwanto, E.A, 2010, Subsidy as a public policy instrument: The dilemma between economic rationality and political pressure, in Wahyudi Kumorotomo & Ambar Widaningrum (Eds), *Think Administrative Reform Over*. 1<sup>st</sup> Ed (pp. 258-275), Gava Media Publisher, Public Management and Policy Department, and Graduate School of Public Administration Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta.
- Rist, R.C, 2009, Influencing the policy process with qualitative research methods, in Norman K. Denzim & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds), *Hanbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 714-731) Pustaka Pelajar Publisher, Yogyakarta.
- Singarimbun, M, 1989, Metode Penelitian Survei, in Masri Singarimbun & Sofian Effendy (Eds), *Metode Penelitian Survei*, revised Version (pp. 3-15), LP3ES. Jakarta.
- Soemarwoto, O, 2004, Atur Diri Sendiri, Paradigma Baru Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup Pustaka Pelajar Publisher, Yogyakarta.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, A, 2009, *Qualitative Research Principles : Procedures and Methods Teorize about Data*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, Pustaka Pelajar Publisher, Yogyakarta.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C., 1998, *Mixed Methodology : Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Sage Publications Inc., USA
- Vedung, E. & Doeloen, F.C.J.vd., 2003, The sermon: Information programs in the public policy process, choice, effects, and evaluation, in Marie-Loise Bemelmans-Videc, Ray C. Rist, & Evert Vedung (Eds), *Carrots, Sticks & Sermons: Policy Instruments and Their Evaluation* (pp. 103-128), Transaction Publishers, Googlebooks version, New Jersey, retrieved from: [http://books.google.com/books?id=qeajs\\_EVxYEC&pg=PA10&lpq=PA10&dq=stick+carrot+sermon&source=bl&ots=ek6BQeCpVF&sig=KPctCudnPLMk7YLvMVGsimB5vk&hl](http://books.google.com/books?id=qeajs_EVxYEC&pg=PA10&lpq=PA10&dq=stick+carrot+sermon&source=bl&ots=ek6BQeCpVF&sig=KPctCudnPLMk7YLvMVGsimB5vk&hl), accessed : 27/08/2010, 17:55.
- Yunus, H.S., 2005, *Struktur Spasial Perkotaan*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.