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Alex Iskandar Munaf 1, Wiwik Rachmarwi 2, Amanda Setiorini 3, Dety Nurfadilah 4)*

1, 4 Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen IPMI. Jalan Rawajatitumir I/1, Kalibata, Jakarta Selatan, DKI Jakarta, 12750, Indonesia.
2, 3 Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Krisnadwipayana. Kampus Unkris Jatiwaringin, Pondok Gede, Kota Bekasi, Jawa Barat, 13077, Indonesia.
E-mail: dety.nurfadilah@ipmi.ac.id

Abstract

The traffic congestion in Indonesia is considered worse compare to other neighbours country, such as Malaysia and Singapore. In response to that, Government is currently building LRT and MRT with the intention to reduce the private transportation. However, the study related to the internal motivation of people to use private transportation in Indonesia is very limited and need further examination in order to provide good insights for policy maker and practitioners. Thus, this study is aims to investigate factors that influence people motivation to use private transportation. The study employed quantitative approach through survey, 151 data were collected through online tools and analysed used multiple regression in which the model should fulfilled the required validity, reliability, and classical assumption test. The result showed that perceived usefulness and perceived value have positive correlation with people’s motivation to use private transportation. This study is intent to expand the literature by only exploring internal factors towards private transportation. The finding also is expected to give references for policy maker and practitioners to make a prioritize strategy in order to reduce traffic in Indonesia.
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INTRODUCTION

Traffic congestion is a situation of stagnation caused by obstruction of vehicle mobility. Many traffic congestion occurs in big cities, such as DKI Jakarta, Semarang, Bandung, Surabaya, Makassar, Medan, especially those that do not have good or inadequate public transportation. There could also be an imbalance between road needs and population density. To reduce the traffic congestion problem in DKI Jakarta, the Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta is handling traffic by creating new and convenient mode of transportation with the purpose to increase the high number of people to use public transportation in the future. The government is currently starting to build Mass Rapid Transit (MRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), and the Jakarta-Bandung fast train. These projects are Indonesia's future means of transportation. In fact, not only in DKI Jakarta, it is hoped that this project will target other big cities. In order for this project to be effective in breaking down congestion, the government will integrate the transportation, so that it can reduce the level of traffic and reduce the use of private cars in Jabodetabek.

However, changing the mindset and habits of the people of DKI Jakarta, shifting from private to public transportation is complicated. Based on the data provided by Badan Pusat Statistik (2019), the number of motorbike increased significantly from 7,773,511 in 2017 to 8,194,590 in 2019. It showed that many people in DKI Jakarta are still depend on motorbikes because it is faster and more time efficient to get through traffic jams. Another issue is some people also have more than one private cars with different car number plat. So, they still can use their own private transportation every day.

The external factors that affect people to use private transportation has been discussed by many scholars. Kurniawan (2017) stated that one of the main factors that caused people to use private transportation is poor quality of available public transportation. Tamaela (2015) agreed that available public facilities have not met the criteria, especially comfortless. The high usage of private transportation is also supported by the industry that offer new vehicle with a low down-payment (DP).

There are extensive research about factors that influence people to use public transportation (Burian et al., 2018; Sánchez-Atondo., 2020; Borhan et al., 2014); electric transportation (Liao et al., 2017). However, the previous study that discuss about internal factors of people to use private transportation is very limited. Therefore, this study aims to fill the gap between the practice related to increasing demand to buy private transportation, government support in promoting more sustainable infrastructure and the academic study. The objective of this study is to analyse the factors that influence people attitude and motivation to use private transportation.

The finding of this research is expected to deepen the understanding about internal factors that cause the increasing number of private transportation and provide an insight for practitioners on how to develop the strategy to tackle this issue. The government also play an important role to make sure that all parties
are in the same path to reduce the traffic congestion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Relationship between Perceived Usefulness (PU) and the People’s Motivation to Use Private Transportation

Perceived usefulness (PU) is described as how people perceive the improvement in new technology will improve their work performance (Mathwick et al., 2001). By connecting this definition to the context of this study, Sumaedi et al., (2016) stated that people are likely to use private transportation when they feel that it is useful to support their activities. Based on the discussion, the hypothesis is as follows: H1: perceived usefulness will be positively related to motivation to use private transportation.

The Relationship between Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) and the People’s Motivation to Use Private Transportation

Perceived ease-of-use (PEOU) has been described by Alshibly (2014) as how much people think that using a product or service do not cause any problem or will make them free from high effort. With the advantages of technology in this era, especially transportation, everything seems more effortless. In the past, some people need to walk to the open street to reached a taxi, or using the crowded train with no air conditioner, etc. Although it still needs to have an effort to drive in our own (but, with a driver it will be a zero-effort), but it will be more comfortable and flexible.

In related to private transportation, it show how people feel easily to use transportation. Based on the discussion, the hypothesis is as follows: H2: perceived ease of use will be positively related to motivation to use private transportation.

The Relationship between Perceived Risk (PR) and the People’s Motivation to Use Private Transportation

The term of perceived risk (PR) has been discussed by (Dowling & Staelin, 1994) as how people perceive that using a product or service will make them suffer from a loss in order to gain an outcome. In the context of transportation, risk is more related to fear of crime and personal security where the passengers do not familiar with the surrounding places (Cordner, 2010). His study also mentioned that the level of perceived of risk is related to the characteristic of respondents which include age, ethnicity, education, and gender. Based on the discussion, the hypothesis is as follows: H3: perceived risk will be positively related to motivation to use private transportation.

The Relationship between Perceived Value (PV) and the People’s Motivation to Use Private Transportation

Sumaedi et al., (2016) considered perceived value (PV) as how people perceive a product or service will give benefit rather than the sacrifice made to obtain the product or services. According to Lai and Chen (2011), the perceived of value in the context of private transportation is how people compare the benefit they can get from using private car and the sacrifice they have done. Based on the previous study conducted by Wen et al. (2005), people tend to choose product/services with full benefit. Based on the discussion, the hypothesis is as follows: H4: perceived value will be
positively related to motivation to use private transportation.

METHODS
Research Design

This study analyses the internal factors (perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, perceived risk and perceived value) on people motivation to use private transportation. In order to maximize our research with the respondents, we are going to implement a quantitative approach. We choose the quantitative approach because we are going to use questionnaires that involves numerical analysis as our measurement.

Population and Sample

The sampling technique used in this study is probability sampling where the sample in this study is the users of private transportation in Jabodetabek. They are considered appropriate as a sampling frame for this research because those areas are considered as big city and portray for approximately 17% of the total population in Indonesia. The sample size should follow the 10-times rule (Hair et al., 2014). As this study use fifteen (15) question with five variables, then the minimum sample size is 150.

Data Collection Method

A survey was conducted in order to determine people attitude and motivation to use private transportation. Data collection was conducted from mid of May until Mid of July, 2020. The questionnaires were distributed to 250 respondents, but unfortunately there were only 151 data valid.

Data Analysis Method

This research will use SPSS to run the data. The multiple regression model in this study is as follow:

\[ Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 \]

Where:
\[ Y = Motivation \]
\[ B_0 = Constant \]
\[ B_1 = Regression coefficient \]
\[ X_1 = Perceived ease of use \]
\[ B_2 = Regression coefficient \]
\[ X_2 = Perceived usefulness \]
\[ B_3 = Regression coefficient \]
\[ X_3 = Perceived risk \]
\[ B_4 = Regression coefficient \]
\[ X_4 = Perceived value \]

In analysing the factors that influence people motivation to use private transportation, we began the analysis by gathering the data, then we used frequency distribution to check the respondent’s profile, testing for valid and reliability test, classical assumption, coefficient correlation, multiple regression, and anova.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Information

Based on Table 1, majority of respondents were female with 66.2%, while men were 33.8%. In terms of age range, majority of respondents were in the 40 – 46 age range (43.0%), followed by 33 – 39 age range (40.4%), while the least respondents were in the age range 18 – 25 (2.6%). In terms of education, majority of respondents were undergraduate (47%), followed by master (32.5%), while the least respondents were doctoral (10.6%) and SMA/SMK (9.9%).

Then, in terms of income, majority of respondents have received
Rp10.000.001 - Rp15.000.000 per month (53%), followed by Rp5.000.001 - Rp10.000.000 (34,4%) and Above Rp15.000.001 (12,6%). In terms of occupation, majority of them were private employee (44,4%), followed by government/public employee (43%), while the least respondents were teacher/lecturer/instructor (4,6%) and students (7,9%). In terms of frequency in using private transportation, majority of them answered everyday (60,3%), while others answered 1 – 2 times per week (25,2%) and 3 – 6 times per week (14,6%).

Classical Assumption Test

Classical assumption test is a compulsory robust test before testing the hypothesis. It consist of validity, reliability, normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity test as follows:

Validity and Reliability Test

Validity and reliability test is a compulsory robust test. According to (Sugiyono, 2013), validity test should compare the calculated r numbers and r table. If the calculated r number is > r table, it is considered as valid and vice versa. In addition, if Cronbach alpha value > 0.6, it is considered as reliable. Based on table 2, the study were valid and reliable.

Normality Test

According to Santoso (2010), normality test is used to check whether or not the data distribution normal. Based on the test of Kolmogorov-Smirnov, if the value of p greater than 0.05 (5%), then the data is normally distributed, while if the value of p less than 0.05 (5%), then the data is not normally distributed. According to Table 3, p-value is 0.200 greater than 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the study has a normally distributed data.

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test is used to determine the correlation between variables in the same model. A good model should have no correlation between independent variables (Gani & Amalia, 2015). If VIF is higher than 10, it showed that the study has not passed collinearity test, while VIF lower than 10 showed that the study passed the collinearity test. Based on table 5, VIF value of Perceived ease of use is 3,216; VIF value of perceived usefulness is 3,338; VIF value of perceived risk is 3,770; VIF value of perceived value is 3,109. Thus, we can conclude that the study does not have problem in collinearity test.

Heteroscedasticity Test

According to Ghozali (2007), heteroscedasticity test is used to check the regression model residual variance inequality from one observation to another observation (Ghozali, 2007). Using the Spearman test method which is carried out by correlating the absolute value of the residuals with each of the independent variables (X₁, X₂, X₃, and X₄). Based on Table 5, the study has passed heteroscedasticity test.

Multiple Regression Test

According to Table 6, here is the multiple regression equation in this study:

\[ Y = 12,301 - 0,017 + 0,006 - 0,093 + 0,123 \]

Hypothesis Testing

Based on Table 6, the results of the partial test (T-test) were obtained than
perceived usefulness ($T = 0.079; 0.037 < 0.05$); and perceived value ($T = 1.884; 0.041 < 0.05$) were found to have significant effect on people's motivation to use private transportation.

Perceived usefulness refers to how people believe that using private transportation would improve their performance. In this context, people's motivation to use private transportation is merely because they want to have a convenience mode of transportation where they could go from one place to another place. The result also showed that by using public transportation, they usually need to take more than one transportation where it is not suitable for those who prefer more convenience mode of transportation.

In related to perceived value, people believe that private transportation has an ability to meet their needs and expectations compared to public transportation. This is also having relationship with the convenience way in using private transportation.

Simultaneous test results (F-test) with SPSS processing obtained a sig value ($0.045 < 0.05$), or F count (2.586) $> F$ table (2.47) so there is an effect of variables X1, X2, X3, and X4 simultaneously on variable Y.
### Table 1. Demographic Respondents

| Category         | Frequency | Percentage | Category                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender           |           |            |                           |           |            |
| Male             | 51        | 33.8       | Students                  | 12        | 7.9        |
| Female           | 100       | 66.2       | Private employee          | 67        | 44.4       |
| Age              |           |            | Government/Public employee| 65        | 43.0       |
| 18 - 25          | 4         | 2.6        | Teacher/lecturer/instructor| 7         | 4.6        |
| 26 - 32          | 10        | 6.6        |                           |           |            |
| 33 - 39          | 61        | 40.4       | Rp5.000.001               | 52        | 34.4       |
| 40 - 46          | 65        | 43.0       | Rp10.000.000              | 80        | 53.0       |
| Above 47         | 11        | 7.3        | Above Rp15.000.001        | 19        | 12.6       |
| Education        |           |            |                           |           |            |
| SMA/SMK          | 15        | 9.9        | 1 – 2 times per week      | 38        | 25.2       |
| Undergraduate    | 71        | 47.0       | 3 – 6 times per week      | 22        | 14.6       |
| Master           | 49        | 32.5       | Everyday                  | 91        | 60.3       |
| Doctoral         | 16        | 10.6       |                           |           |            |

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*

### Table 2. Validity and Reliability

| Variables          | Reliability Statistics |
|--------------------|------------------------|
|                    | Cronbach’s Alpha | N of Items |
| Perceived ease of use | 0.929          | 3          |
| Perceived usefulness | 0.852          | 3          |
| Perceived risk      | 0.829           | 3          |
| Perceived value     | 0.812           | 3          |

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*

### Table 3. Normality

| Unstandardized Residual |
|-------------------------|
| N                      | 160                   |
| Normal Parametersa,b    | Mean                  | 0.00000000  |
|                         | Std. Deviation        | 1.60547717  |
| Most Extreme Differences| Absolute              | 0.060       |
|                         | Positive              | 0.043       |
|                         | Negative              | -0.060      |
| Test Statistic          | 0.060                 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)  | .200a,d               |

- a. Test distribution is Normal.
- b. Calculated from data.
- c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
- d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*
Table 4. multicollinearity

| Model | Coefficients* | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |
|-------|--------------|----------------------------|---|------|-------------------------|
|       | Beta | t |  | | Tolerance | VIF |
| I (Constant) | 12,301 | 0,656 | 18,754 | 0,000 | 0,311 | 3,216 |
| Perceived ease of use | -0,017 | 0,060 | -0,040 | -0,280 | 0,780 | 0,300 | 3,338 |
| Perceived usefulness | 0,006 | 0,074 | 0,011 | 0,079 | 0,937 | 0,322 | 3,109 |
| Perceived risk | -0,093 | 0,079 | -0,182 | -1,182 | 0,239 | 0,265 | 3,770 |
| Perceived Value | 0,123 | 0,065 | 0,264 | 1,884 | 0,061 | 0,194 | 1,930 |

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity

| Correlations | Perceived ease of use | Perceived usefulness | Perceived risk | Perceived Value | ABS_RES |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|---------|
| Spearman's rho Correlation Coefficient | 1,000 | .802** | .603** | .570** | 0.002 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,977 |
| N | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| Perceived usefulness Correlation Coefficient | .802** | 1,000 | .609** | .516** | 0,056 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,482 |
| N | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| Perceived risk Correlation Coefficient | .603** | .609** | 1,000 | .780** | -0,068 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,395 |
| N | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| Perceived Value Correlation Coefficient | .570** | .516** | .780** | 1,000 | -0,025 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,756 |
| N | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| ABS_RES Correlation Coefficient | 0,002 | 0,056 | -0,068 | -0,025 | 1,000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0,977 | 0,482 | 0,395 | 0,756 | |
| N | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 |

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

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*
### Table 6. Multiple Regression Analysis

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .153\(^a\) | .023     | -.002             | 1.626                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived Value, Perceived ease of use, Perceived usefulness, Perceived risk

b. Dependent Variable: Motivation

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t  | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----|------|
|       | B                             | Std. Error                | Beta|      |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 12.301                    | 0.656| 18.754 | 0.000 |
|       | Perceived ease of use       | -0.017                    | 0.060| -0.040 | -0.280 | 0.780 |
|       | Perceived usefulness        | 0.006                     | 0.074| 0.011  | 0.079  | 0.037 |
|       | Perceived risk              | -0.093                    | 0.079| -0.182 | -1.182 | 0.239 |
|       | Perceived Value             | 0.123                     | 0.065| 0.264  | 1.884  | 0.041 |

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

*Source: the data is processed by author (2020)*
CONCLUSION

The objective of this study is to investigate internal factors that influence people to use private transportation. This research shows that perceived usefulness and perceived value have significant effect on people’s motivation to use private transportation. Perceived usefulness related to performance and perceived value related to needs and expectations.

Meanwhile, perceived ease of use and perceived risk don’t have significant effect on people’s motivation to use private transportation. Perceived ease of use related to efforts and/or problems and perceived risk related to personal security.

This shows that the use of private transportation is still considered to provide benefits and greater value than public transportation. For example, they do not have to change modes of transportation, do not waste time waiting, not being in the crowd, lowering the risk of losing goods (lost or left behind). Thus, they can focus more on the work or activity to be carried out, and not run out of resources (time and effort) for the hassles that can be avoided.

Regarding this COVID-19 pandemic, in which people need to stay away from one another, private transportation helps to enhance perceived usefulness—support activities without being too close to others, perceived value—they got benefit from staying healthy even in the crowd (of people who wants to get work), perceived ease-of-us—free of being in the crowd, and lowering perceived risk—minimize the possibility if being infected or spreading the virus.

This study has some limitations as follows: 1) sample size is only for people domicile in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi. The sample size is small compared to the population in Indonesia. Therefore, future study need to add more sample size in order to get more generalized result. 2) this study employed questionnaire. In other to get in-depth analysis, the future study might need to expand it using interviews.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATION

Understanding this result will help local government to design affordable public transportation arrangement. So far the government has only provided very basic public transportation services and has not considered supporting factors, such as comfort. Especially in the midst of the current COVID-19 pandemic, health factors need important attention without neglecting other factors, including comfort. In addition to that, the practitioners in transportation industry might get benefit from this finding where they could develop their business strategy to attract more people to use public transportation.

REFERENCES

Alshibly, H. H. (2014). The Effects of Characteristics of Electronic Document Management Systems on Their Acceptance: An Empirical Study In Jordan. International Journal of Information, Business and Management, 6(4), 126-145

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2019). Jumlah kendaraan bermotor menurut jenis kendaraan (unit) di Provinsi DKI Jakarta 2017-2019. Retrieved December 13, 2020, from https://jakarta.bps.go.id/indicator/17/786/1/jumlah-kendaraan-bermotor-menurut-jenis-kendaraan-unit-di-provinsi-dki-jakarta.html
Beirão, G., & Cabral, J. S. (2007). Understanding attitudes towards public transport and private car: A qualitative study. Transport policy, 14(6), 478-489.

Borhan, M. N., Syamsunur, D., Mohd Akhir, N., Mat Yazid, M. R., Ismail, A., & Rahmat, R. A. (2014). Predicting the use of public transportation: a case study from Putrajaya, Malaysia. The Scientific World Journal, 2014.

Burian, J., Zajičková, L., Ivan, I., & Macků, K. (2018). Attitudes and motivation to use public or individual transport: a case study of two middle-sized cities. Social sciences, 7(6), 83.

Cordner, G. (2010). Reducing Fear of Crime Strategies for Police. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Dowling, G. R., & Staelin, R. (1994). A Model of Perceived Risk and Intended Risk-handling Activity. Journal of Consumer Research, 21(1), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1086/209386

Gani, I., & Amalia, S. (2015). Alat Analisis Data: Aplikasi Statistik untuk Penelitian Bidang Ekonomi dan Sosial. Penerbit Andi.

Ghozali, I. (2007). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS. Semarang: Penerbit Undip.

Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., & Sartedt, M. (2014). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kurniawan, D. (2017). Mengapa kendaraan pribadi terus bertumbuh?. Retrieved December 13, 2020, from https://pustral.ugm.ac.id/2017/10/05/

Lai, W.-T., Chen, C.-F. (2011). Behavioral intention of public transit passenger - the role of service quality, perceived value, satisfaction and involvement. Transport Policy, 18(2), 318 - 325.

Liao, F., Molin, E., & Van Wee, B. (2017). Consumer preferences for electric vehicles: a literature review. Transport Reviews, 37(3), 252-275.

Madan, C. R., & Kensinger, E. A. (2017). Test–Retest Reliability of Brain Morphology Estimates. Brain Informatics, 4, 107–121.

Mathwick, C., Malhotra, N., & Rigdon, E. (2001). Experiential value: Conceptualization, measurement and application in the catalog and Internet shopping environment. Journal of Retailing, 77(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00045-2

Santoso, S. (2010). Statistik Multivariat. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Komputindo.

Sánchez-Atondo, A., García, L., Calderón-Ramírez, J., Gutiérrez-Moreno, J. M., & Mungaray-Moctezuma, A. (2020). Understanding Public Transport Ridership in Developing Countries to Promote Sustainable Urban Mobility: A Case Study of Mexicali, Mexico. Sustainability, 12(8), 3266.

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Sumaedi, S., Bakti, I. G. M., Rakhmawati, T., Astrini, N. J., Widianti, T. (2016). Factors influencing public transport passengers' satisfaction: a new model. Management of
Tamaela, T. M. (2015). Alasan warga yang tetap memilih naik kendaraan pribadi di Jakarta. Retrieved December 13, 2020, from https://megapolitan.kompas.com/read/2015/01/09/14180471/Alasan.Warga.

Wen, C.H., Lan, L.W., Cheng, H.L. (2005). Structural equation modelling to determine passenger loyalty toward intercity bus services. Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1927, 249 - 255.