

Constructing Women's Safety in Indonesian KRL Crisis Discourse: A Critical Analysis of a Ministerial Doorstop Statement and Clarification

¹*Lusy Mukhlisiana, ²Sri Dewi Setiawati, ²Martha Tri Lestari

¹ Master of Communication Sciences, School of Communication and Social Sciences, Telkom University, Jln. Telekomunikasi No. 1, Terusan Buahbatu, Bandung District, West Java, Indonesia

² Digital Public Relations, School of Communication and Social Sciences, Telkom University, Jln. Telekomunikasi No. 1, Terusan Buahbatu, Bandung District, West Java, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author e-mail: lusymj@telkomuniversity.ac.id

Received: May 2026; Revised: July 2026; Accepted: August 2026; Published: September 2026

Abstract

Gender-responsive transportation policy is increasingly recognised as an important instrument for women's safety in public space, yet the discourse through which such policies are communicated by state actors in moments of crisis remains underexplored. This study examines how women's safety is discursively constructed in two short, publicly available statements by Indonesia's Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (PPPA) following the fatal Kereta Rel Listrik (KRL) Commuter Line accident at Bekasi Timur Station in April 2026: an unscripted doorstep media statement (Corpus 1; five turns; approximately 100 words) and a subsequent formal clarification (Corpus 2; six turns; approximately 110 words). Using Fairclough's (1995, 2003) three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework, supported by Halliday's (1994) transitivity system for clause-level coding, the two verbatim transcripts were analysed descriptively, interpretively, and explanatorily, with a complete clause inventory constructed for both corpora. The analysis suggests four patterns. First, in Corpus 1 women occupy the roles of Senser and Carrier in every finite clause and appear as Actor in only one embedded, non-finite construction, indicating a discourse that positions women predominantly as recipients rather than agents of safety. Second, the entity from whom protection is required is not lexicalised; this omission is interpreted, as one plausible contextual reading among several, as activating a cultural assumption of male threat, while spatial relocation of the carriage is proposed as the primary response. Third, the doorstep genre, produced without institutional preparation, is associated with hedged, tentative language that this study interprets as a mismatch with the response prescribed for an accidental-crisis cluster. Fourth, the clarification statement follows a four-move rhetorical structure resembling institutional impression management that moderates surface-level framing, while women's earlier representational pattern largely, though not entirely, persists: women are subsumed under society and are named as equal subjects of safety alongside men only once, in Corpus 2. These findings are offered as an exploratory, corpus-specific contribution to research on gendered crisis communication in Indonesian public institutions, with implications for gender-responsive public-speaking training.

Keywords: Communicative competence; Crisis communication management; Critical discourse analysis; Gender representation; Women's safety

How to Cite: Mukhlisiana, L., Setiawati, S.D., & Lestari, M.T. (2026). Constructing Women's Safety in Indonesian KRL Crisis Discourse: A Critical Analysis of a Ministerial Doorstop Statement and Clarification. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 6(3), 1248-1262. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v6i3.5185>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v6i3.5185>

Copyright© 2026, Mukhlisiana et al.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) License.



INTRODUCTION

Transportation infrastructure serves not only as a means of physical mobility but also as a contested social space where gender relations, safety, and public policy intersect (Useche et al., 2024). In Indonesia, the Kereta Rel Listrik (KRL) Commuter Line constitutes one of the most heavily utilized mass transportation systems, serving millions

of daily passengers across the Greater Jakarta metropolitan area (Jabodetabek). As a high-density public space, KRL has become a microcosm of broader social inequalities pertaining to gender-based safety and comfort. Women's vulnerability to harassment in public transportation has been empirically documented as a persistent global and regional phenomenon: in Jakarta alone, studies estimate that approximately 92% of female commuters have experienced some form of harassment during their daily transit (Sil et al., 2023).

Studies consistently demonstrate that women engage in extensive behavioral adjustments and strategic planning what scholars term 'safety work', simply to navigate public transit spaces (Ison et al., 2025). In recognition of this structural vulnerability, the Indonesian government officially introduced women-only carriages in KRL Commuter Line services in August 2010 as an affirmative action measure (Salsabilla et al., 2025). This policy placed Indonesia within a broader regional pattern of gender-segregated transit solutions across South and Southeast Asia, a pattern that has attracted both empirical support and sustained scholarly critique (Joshi et al., 2022; Sil et al., 2023). Women-only carriages, while pragmatically effective in providing short-term comfort, have been identified as limited in their capacity to address the structural causes of harassment and have been critiqued for reinforcing rather than challenging gendered spatial norms (Joshi et al., 2022; Loukaitou-Sideris et al., 2020). The fatal collision at Bekasi Timur Station on April 27, 2026, in which all fatalities occurred in the women-only carriage at the rear of the train, reignited this debate with acute urgency.

The public statement delivered by Minister Arifah Fauzi in a doorstep media interaction, an unplanned, impromptu exchange with journalists conducted without prior preparation, represents a particularly significant site of discursive analysis. In her remarks, the Minister proposed relocating the women-only carriage from the extremities of the train to the middle section, reasoning that such positioning would make it 'not too easily accessed from the outside.' While framed explicitly as a protective measure, this proposition constructs a specific and consequential gender discourse: women are positioned as inherently vulnerable subjects requiring spatial insulation, while the unspecified threat remains unnamed yet structurally embedded in the logic of the solution (Ison et al., 2023). This reflects a deeper ideological orientation that addresses women's safety through segregation rather than through systemic, inclusive safety measures (Joshi et al., 2022; Salsabilla et al., 2025). Critically, this statement was produced in a communicative context inherently challenging for any public official: the doorstep media briefing, in which responses must be formulated rapidly, without institutional consultation, and under immediate media scrutiny (Kondolele et al., 2025). Unscripted statements by officials carry significant risks of producing socially unvetted messages with unintended ideological implications (Macnamara, 2025) and expose deficits in officials' affective communication competence that more prepared communicative contexts would conceal (Wang & Li, 2025). The combination of a gendered policy framing and an improvised communicative context renders this case a rich and urgent subject for critical academic inquiry.

Before proceeding, four related but analytically distinct issues addressed in this study should be distinguished: (1) the railway accident itself, a structural safety failure attributable to infrastructure and operational conditions; (2) sexual harassment risk, a separate and well-documented concern in Indonesian public transport (Sil et al., 2023; Ison et al., 2025); (3) the pre-existing policy of gender-segregated carriages, introduced in 2010 primarily as a harassment-prevention measure; and (4) the crisis-response communication produced after the accident, which is the primary object of this study's analysis. The Minister's statements link these four issues by proposing carriage repositioning, a harassment-prevention measure as a response to a structural accident,

without making the connecting logic explicit in the broadcast segment retained for analysis. This study does not assume that this linkage, or the identity of any implied risk, is self-evident; rather, it treats the connection itself, and its discursive construction, as an object of analysis (see the research questions below).

Scholarly work applying CDA to gender representation has grown substantially, particularly in analysis of media texts, political speeches, and written policy documents (Mowri & Bailey, 2023; Tang et al., 2026). Within the Indonesian context, researchers have examined how gender is discursively constructed in online news media (Sakhiyya et al., 2023) and in public policy framing (Salsabilla et al., 2025; Syukri, 2023).). Based on a review of this literature, however, three gaps appear to remain unaddressed. First, to the authors' knowledge, no published study has specifically analysed discourse produced by Indonesian public officials in doorstep or impromptu media interactions, a genre susceptible to unmediated ideological expression (Slemon, 2025). Second, while scholars have critiqued gender-segregation policies in public transportation (Joshi et al., 2022; Useche et al., 2024), and while CDA has been applied extensively to prepared political and media texts, no study identified in this review has applied Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework (1995; 2003) to the language through which such policies are verbally justified by state actors in real time. Third, existing research has not examined the relationship between public speaking competence, specifically the affective dimension of gender-sensitive awareness (Wang & Li, 2025) and the discursive quality of gender-policy statements as an interrelated analytical object. This study addresses these three gaps as an exploratory, single-case contribution rather than as a comprehensive survey of the genre.

This study aims to critically analyse the gender-protection discourse embedded in the public statements of Indonesia's Minister of PPPA regarding the repositioning of women-only carriages in KRL following the Bekasi Timur accident. Fairclough's (1995, 2003) three-dimensional model provides the primary analytical architecture; Halliday's (1994) transitivity system, Van Dijk's (2001) concept of mental models, Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, Goffman's (1959) impression management, Coombs' (2007) SCCT, and Wang and Li's (2025) communicative-competence model are each applied in a delimited, supporting capacity at specific analytical junctures identified in Table 1 and the Results and Discussion section, rather than as independent, competing frameworks. Three objectives are pursued. First, at the textual dimension, the study identifies lexical choices, modality markers, and actor representation strategies constructing women's protection discourse. Second, at the discursive practice dimension, the study examines the doorstep communicative context and evaluates the public speaking competence it reveals, with reference to crisis communication theory (Coombs, 2007; Wang & Li, 2025). Third, at the social practice dimension, the study interrogates how the statements reproduce prevailing ideological assumptions about gender, vulnerability, and the state's protective role (Siscawati et al., 2020; Tang et al., 2026). The scope is delimited to the verbatim transcripts of the Minister's doorstep statement and subsequent clarification, as verifiable through media documentation reported in Table 2.

This study is guided by four research questions. RQ1: How are women represented as social actors, in terms of process type and participant role in the Minister's doorstep statement and subsequent clarification? RQ2: How is the entity posing a risk to women's safety construed or grammatically elided in the doorstep statement, and what alternative readings does the available corpus support? RQ3: How do the production conditions of the doorstep genre relate to the hedging, modality, and crisis-response patterns observed in Corpus 1? RQ4: What discursive shifts and continuities appear between Corpus 1 and

Corpus 2, and what do they suggest about the relationship between rhetorical repair and ideological change?

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research design anchored in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as both theoretical framework and methodological approach (Fairclough, 1995; Slemon, 2025). CDA critically appraises how language contributes to producing and reinforcing social inequalities, attending to both what is said and what is absent or elided (Slemon, 2025). Fairclough (2003) proceeds from the premise that language is not a neutral medium but a social practice that actively constructs social reality, identities, and power relations. The specific framework applied is Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model, organizing analysis across text, discursive practice, and social practice (Fairclough, 1995, p. 58). As stated above, this model supplies the primary analytical architecture throughout; the additional theoretical resources listed in Table 1 are each invoked only at the specific analytical step to which they are best suited, and none is treated as an independent framework applied to the whole dataset. Table 1 presents this framework as operationalized in the study, and Figure 1 illustrates the nested relationship between the three dimensions.

Table 1. Three-Dimensional CDA Framework

Dimension (Fairclough)	Level of Analysis	Analytical Focus	Key Questions
Text	Micro (linguistic)	Lexis, modality, transitivity, actor representation	What words and structures are used? Who acts? Who is acted upon?
Discursive Practice	Meso (contextual)	Text production conditions, genre, intertextuality	How was the text produced? In what communicative context?
Social Practice	Macro (ideological)	Ideology, power relations, gender constructs	What social ideologies and power relations does the text reproduce or challenge?

Data Corpus

This study analyses two short, publicly available media texts; no human participants were recruited, interviewed, or observed, and the study therefore did not require research-participant ethical clearance. Corpus 1 is the verbatim transcript of an unscripted doorstep media statement delivered by the Minister of PPPA in the immediate aftermath of the Bekasi Timur accident (27 April 2026); Corpus 2 is the verbatim transcript of a subsequent formal video clarification released by the Minister's office. Both recordings are publicly accessible television and social-media broadcasts of a public office-holder speaking in an official capacity (see Table 2 for full source details); analysing such broadcasts is treated in media and political-discourse research as falling outside the scope of the human-subjects protocols that govern primary data collection from private individuals (cf. Slemon, 2025). The two-corpus, comparative design enables intertextual analysis of discursive shift following public criticism, consistent with CDA's epistemological preference for interpretive depth over sample breadth (Slemon, 2025).

Research Subject and Data Corpus

The primary data corpus consists of two verbatim transcripts of public statements delivered by Indonesia's Minister of PPPA. Corpus 1 is a doorstep media statement delivered in the immediate aftermath of the Bekasi Timur accident; an unplanned, unscripted, time-pressured exchange with journalists (Macnamara, 2025). Corpus 2 is the subsequent formal clarification. The two-corpus design enables comparative intertextual analysis of discursive shift. The corpus was prepared through repeated listening and cross-verification to ensure verbatim accuracy, including retention of discourse markers and hesitation sounds which carry analytical significance (Fairclough, 1995; Mowri & Bailey, 2023). CDA's epistemological orientation prioritizes analytical depth over breadth of data (Slemon, 2025). Table 2 summarises the data corpus attributes.

Table 2. Data Corpus Attributes

Attribute	Corpus 1 (Doorstop Statement)	Corpus 2 (Clarification)
Speaker	Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (PPPA), Republic of Indonesia – Arifah Fauzi	Same
Context	Post-accident media briefing following the Bekasi Timur Station accident, 27 April 2026	Formal follow-up clarification issued after public criticism of the doorstep statement
Source / platform	https://youtu.be/hP4p2F7mP0w	https://www.youtube.com/shorts/AqqwYXALZ9s
Access / archive date	May 3rd, 2026 11.22 WIB	May 3rd, 2026 12.14 WIB
Duration	±2 minutes (00:18–02:20)	±1 minute 15 seconds (01:05–02:20)
Turns / segments	5 (segments 00:18–00:42 to 01:56–02:20)	6 (segments 01:05–01:16 to 02:04–02:20)
Word count (Indonesian, verbatim)	224 words	111 words
Finite + embedded clauses coded	14 clauses	12 clauses

Transcription followed a verbatim orthographic convention retaining discourse markers (e.g., ee...), hesitation pauses, and false starts, which the analysis treats as analytically significant rather than as noise (Fairclough, 1995). Only verbal content was analysed; the available recordings' audio and video quality did not support reliable coding of prosodic stress, and gesture and other paralinguistic features, while potentially relevant, fall outside this study's clause-level transitivity scope and are flagged as a direction for future multimodal analysis. Each transcript was produced through a minimum of three independent listening passes against the source recordings identified in Table 2, and Corpus 1 was additionally cross-checked against the second, independently uploaded recording of the same broadcast. English translations (reported in the Appendix) were produced by the researcher and checked by an independent bilingual reader for semantic and pragmatic equivalence; idiomatic or culturally loaded expressions (e.g., diakses dari luar, 'accessed from outside') are glossed rather than translated literally, with the Indonesian original retained throughout the Results and Discussion section and in full in the Appendix so that readers may evaluate translation

choices directly. Because the corpus consists of broadcast and social-media material that platform holders may edit, remove, or make unavailable after publication, both source videos were archived by the researcher (screen recording and full transcript file); readers seeking to verify quoted material directly may request the archived files from the corresponding author.

The primary analytical instrument is the systematic application of Fairclough's (1995; 2003) three-dimensional CDA framework. At the textual level, the analysis draws explicitly on Halliday's (1994) transitivity system. The clause-level coding instrument (Table 3a) operationalises these categories as follows: a clause was coded material if its main verb denoted a physical or abstract 'doing' with a distinguishable Actor and, optionally, a Goal (e.g., *menggunakan*, 'to use'); mental if the verb denoted sensing, feeling, or cognition, with a Senser and Phenomenon (e.g., *merasa*, 'to feel'; *menyadari*, 'to realise'); relational if the verb construed an attribute, identity, or circumstance, with a Carrier/Identified and Attribute/Value (e.g., *adalah*, 'to be'; *menjadi*, 'to become'); and verbal if the verb denoted saying (e.g., *memohon maaf*, 'to apologise'), with a Sayer and Target. Passive and agentless constructions (e.g., *diakses*, 'is accessed') were additionally coded for voice and for the presence or absence of an overt Agent. Two clauses admitted more than one plausible coding (marked 'ambiguous' in Table 3a); both readings are reported, and the discussion foregrounds the reading most consistent with the surrounding co-text rather than treating either as definitive. Figure 1 and Figure 2 summarise the analytical procedure schematically; each stage they depict is instantiated in Table 3a's clause-by-clause coding and in the worked examples quoted in the Results and Discussion section, so that the diagrams function as a map of, rather than a substitute for, the coding trail. At the discursive practice level, analysis attends to genre conditions and public communication competence (Wang & Li, 2025; Coombs, 2007). This instrument has been validated in qualitative discourse studies examining gender representation (Tang et al., 2026; Mowri & Bailey, 2023). The research procedure followed four stages: verbatim transcript preparation; close textual coding; discursive practice analysis (Kondolele et al., 2025); and macro-level ideological analysis (Syukri, 2023; Salsabilla et al., 2025).

Data analysis proceeds through Fairclough's (1995, pp. 56–62) three stages: description, interpretation, and explanation. In description, micro-level analysis identifies lexical patterns, semantic clusters, transitivity structure (Halliday, 1994), and modal expressions. In interpretation, the doorstep and clarification genres are analysed as communicative frames, including evaluation against crisis communication standards (Coombs, 2007; Macnamara, 2025). In explanation, findings are connected to macro-level ideological formations, with attention to what Slemon (2025) terms the analytical significance of absences and silences (Fairclough, 2003). Table 3 and Figure 2 summarise the procedure.

Table 3. Data Analysis Procedure

Stage	Analytical Procedure	CDA Dimension	Output
1. Description	Linguistic analysis of vocabulary, grammar, and text structure	Text	Inventory of lexical and grammatical patterns
2. Interpretation	Analysis of production context: genre, setting, communicative constraints	Discursive Practice	Mapping of discourse genre and contextual conditions
3. Explanation	Ideological analysis: power relations, gender ideology, social	Social Practice	Critical account of ideological reproduction and

implications	policy implications
--------------	---------------------

Given the small, fully public corpus, credibility was pursued through procedures adapted to CDA rather than through inter-rater statistics computed on a two-text dataset. These included: (a) an audit trail linking every interpretive claim in the Results and Discussion section to a specific, quoted clause in Table 3a or the Appendix; (b) peer debriefing, in which the clause-level codes and the two central interpretive claims – the agentless-passive reading and the non-apology-apology structure – were reviewed and discussed with colleagues trained in discourse analysis, whose disagreements are noted in the relevant sections where they occurred; (c) negative-case analysis, in which the one instance of women appearing in an Actor role (Segment C1-1) and the one instance of women being named alongside men (Segment C2-5) were deliberately sought out and reported rather than omitted, precisely because they qualify the study's central claims; and (d) a brief reflexive note on the researcher's own positioning: the researcher approaches this material as an Indonesian communication scholar working in gender and public-communication studies, a positioning that motivates attention to gender representation but that also means alternative, non-gendered readings of ambiguous passages (e.g., of the elided agent in Segment C1-3) were actively solicited from debriefing colleagues to guard against confirmation bias.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

The analysis is organized across four thematic findings derived from systematic application of Fairclough's (1995; 2003) three-dimensional CDA framework to the two-corpus dataset. Each finding follows a consistent analytical structure: textual evidence is first identified at the micro-linguistic level, then interpreted through the mediating theoretical lens, and explained in relation to the broader social and ideological context of Indonesian public policy communication.

Women as Objects of Protection: A Transitivity Analysis

Halliday's (1994, p. 106) transitivity system identifies three primary process types structuring how participants are represented in discourse: material processes (doing, acting), in which the principal participant role is the Actor; mental processes (sensing, feeling), in which the principal role is the Senser; and relational processes (being, having), in which the principal role is the Carrier. The ideological significance of transitivity lies in the systematic assignment of process types to social actors: material processes and the Actor role they carry, confer social agency and the capacity to act upon the world, while mental and relational processes position their subjects as experiencers of states or bearers of attributes rather than as initiators of action. Fairclough (1995, p. 108) establishes this as a core instrument for ideological analysis in CDA. Applying this framework to the complete clause inventory reveals a clear pattern, with one qualification: across the twelve coded clauses of Corpus 1, women are assigned to mental or relational processes (as Senser, Carrier, or possessor within a nominal group) in every finite clause in which they appear, and to an Actor role in only one clause, and that clause is embedded and non-finite (C1-1d, '...perempuan itu ... menggunakan transportasi publik', 'women ... use public transportation').

The two most representative instances illustrate this clearly. In "*perempuan itu merasa aman dan nyaman*" (*women feel safe and comfortable*), women are assigned to a mental process as Sensers, those who experience a psychological state without any grammatical role in bringing that state about. In "*diharapkan lebih terlindungi*" (*expected to be better protected*), women appear as Carriers in a passive relational process, those to whom a protective attribute is ascribed, while the agent of protection is grammatically

suppressed. This systematic relegation to Senser and Carrier roles, qualified by the single embedded Actor instance noted above constitutes as a representational choice that naturalises women's social position as recipients rather than initiators of protection. This systematic relegation, Senser and Carrier, never Actor constitutes what Fairclough (2003, p. 145) describes as a representational choice that naturalizes women's social position as recipients rather than participants. This convergently identifies the 'vulnerability frame' wherein women's identity is constituted primarily through susceptibility to harm. Ison et al. (2024, p. 2835) demonstrate that women in public transit actively engage in sophisticated 'safety work' constituting genuine social agency entirely absent from the institutional discourse examined here.

The contrast with Indonesian civil society discourse is instructive. Study find that women's movement discourse in Indonesia systematically constructs women as material agents, actors who march, campaign, demand, and organize. The lexical field of the doorstep corpus, by contrast, is anchored in *perlindungan* (protection), *aman* (safe), *nyaman* (comfortable), and *terlindungi* (protected), positioning safety as something women receive rather than exercise.

Ideological Naturalization and the Logic of Spatial Segregation

A second analytically distinct pattern in Corpus 1 concerns the construction of threat. Fairclough (2003, p. 17) defines ideological naturalization as the process through which culturally specific assumptions are rendered as common sense. In Corpus 1, this operates through the agentless passive. The key proposition is that the repositioned carriage would be "*tidak terlalu mudah diakses dari luar*" (*not too easily accessed from outside*). The verb *diakses* is passive in form, and its Agent – who would do the accessing, and why this constitutes a risk is structurally absent from every clause in the corpus.

This reading that the elided agent activates a cultural assumption of male threat is offered as the most contextually probable interpretation, given the extensive prior documentation of harassment as the original rationale for women-only carriages in Indonesia (Sil et al., 2023; Salsabilla et al., 2025) and the broader regional literature on gendered transit segregation (Joshi et al., 2022). It is not presented as a grammatically determined fact. The passive construction *diakses* is compatible with several referents: unauthorised or non-ticketed passengers of any gender; general crowding and physical over-access relevant to the accident's rescue and evacuation conditions; or opportunistic harassers specifically, the reading favoured by the surrounding policy context. The corpus available to this study consists only of the Minister's recorded remarks; the journalist's original question, which might have disambiguated the intended referent, was not part of the broadcast segment retained for analysis and could not be independently verified at the time of writing. This is treated as a limitation of the present study (see Conclusion) rather than resolved by inference.

The Doorstop Genre, Public Speaking Competence, and the Conditions of Unmediated Ideological Expression

The third finding concerns the conditions of discourse production and their relationship to the ideological character of what is produced. Fairclough (1995, p. 58) insists that the analysis of discursive practice is constitutively related to textual analysis: how a text is produced shapes what ideological content it can contain. Corpus 1 exhibits clear and convergent linguistic markers of unscripted, improvised speech: the discourse particle "*ee...*" appears at the opening of four of five segments, functioning as a real-time utterance-planning device that signals the speaker is formulating her response as she speaks rather than retrieving a prepared position. The hedging expression "*misalnya*" (*for example*) reduces propositional commitment to the spatial relocation proposal, while the

paired constructions "*masih menjadi bahan kajian*" (still under study) and "*bukan keputusan final*" (not a final decision) together construct what may be termed an accountability vacuum: a substantive policy proposal is publicly advanced while the speaker simultaneously disclaims institutional responsibility for it. Slemon (2025) argues that CDA's analytical contribution lies precisely in attending to such structural features not only what is explicitly said but what is withheld, hedged, or displaced and both forms of discursive absence are systematically present in Corpus 1.

Alternative, non-ideological explanations for this hedging and for the spatial-relocation proposal itself should also be considered. The doorstep format structurally produces hedged and provisional language regardless of the substantive content of the response, because officials answer without a prepared text; the specific wording of the journalist's question, unavailable in the retained corpus, may have directly prompted a proposal framed in spatial terms; media editing in the broadcast excerpt may have removed qualifying context; and the Minister's institutional position – without direct operational authority over railway infrastructure – may have constrained her to propose a measure within PPPA's own policy remit (carriage allocation, which railway operators have previously acted on at the Ministry's recommendation) rather than a structural safety response outside her mandate. These alternative explanations are not mutually exclusive with the ideological reading developed in this study; they indicate that the discursive pattern identified admits multiple, non-contradictory levels of explanation, of which the ideological is one.

Non-Apology Apology: Rhetorical Shift Without Ideological Transformation

The fourth finding emerges from comparative intertextual analysis of Corpus 1 and Corpus 2. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory distinguishes between positive face, the desire to be approved of—and negative face—the desire for autonomy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). A sincere apology constitutes a face-threatening act (FTA) against the speaker's own positive face. Institutional actors under public pressure have strong incentives to perform the social function of apology while limiting institutional face damage—producing what is termed the non-apology apology.

Findings deploy lexical attenuation: the statement is characterised as "*kurang tepat*" (not quite right) foreclosing the more substantive interpretations of error that had driven public criticism. Move 2 renders the apology conditional, addressed to *those "yang merasa tersakiti atau tidak nyaman"* (who felt hurt or uncomfortable): apology validity is made contingent on the subjective affective response of the recipient. Move 3 explicitly denies intent—"*tidak ada maksud dari saya untuk mengabaikan keselamatan penumpang lainnya*"—strategically separating intention from effect (Fairclough, 2003, p. 160). Move 4 shifts from first-person accountability to collective agency through "*Mari kita bersama-sama memusatkan perhatian...*"—dissolving the individual institutional responsibility momentarily constructed by the apology. Each move is grounded in the complete clarification transcript reproduced in the Appendix and corresponds to recognised categories in the apology-classification literature: lexical attenuation and conditional apology parallel what apology scholarship identifies as minimisation and hedged responsibility acceptance, while intent denial and collective diffusion parallel externalising and diffusion strategies documented in institutional crisis apologies more broadly.

Situating the clarification statement within Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical framework of impression management provides a complementary analytical lens. Goffman distinguishes between front-stage behaviour the performance presented to a visible audience and back-stage behaviour the reality that performance is designed to manage or conceal. Corpus 2 is unambiguously a front-stage performance: a formally

prepared, institutionally framed communicative event whose primary function is the restoration of the Minister's and the ministry's public identity following the reputational damage inflicted by Corpus 1. In Goffman's (1959, p. 208) terms, it is an act of impression management directed not at substantive policy correction but at the control of the institutional image projected to a critical public audience. This reading is consistent with SCCT's observation that institutional actors under reputational threat frequently deploy diminish strategies which seek to reduce perceived severity or organizational responsibility when the crisis type would warrant a full rebuild strategy involving unequivocal apology and corrective commitment (Coombs, 2007). Corpus 2 enacts precisely this strategic downgrade, performing institutional repair without accepting the substantive costs that genuine repair would require.

Crucially, the deep ideological structure of Corpus 1 remains intact in Corpus 2. Women continue to be absent as agents: in Corpus 1 they are objects of protection; in Corpus 2 they are subsumed within the undifferentiated category of masyarakat (society). The paternalistic logic of the state as guardian persists across both texts. This finding is consistent with Mowri and Bailey's (2023, p. 6) observation that institutional responses to gender-based safety incidents address surface manifestations of gender bias without engaging with the structural conditions that generated them. Tang et al. (2026, p. 15) offer a measured counterpoint, suggesting that discursive corrections can create openings for more substantive normative change by repositioning the publicly acknowledged boundaries of acceptable institutional speech. This study acknowledges that possibility while maintaining that the analytical distinction between surface rhetorical correction and deep ideological transformation remains essential for evaluating whether institutional gender discourse is changing in substance or only in style.

Table 4. Cross-Corpus Comparative Analysis: Discourse Shifts and Ideological Continuities

Analytical Dimension	Corpus 1: Doorstop Statement	Corpus 2: Clarification Statement
Representation of women	Senser and Carrier in mental/relational processes only; never Actor in material processes	Absent as agent; subsumed under universal 'society' (masyarakat)
Representation of men	Implicit threat; entirely elided via agentless passive construction	Acknowledged rhetorically as equal safety subject for first time
Proposed solution	Spatial segregation: relocate women's carriage to centre of train	Abstract systemic reform invoked; no concrete proposal offered
Accountability structure	Absent; hedged through epistemic distancing and conditional modality	4-move non-apology: attenuation → conditionality → intent denial → collective diffusion
Public communication strategy	Inadvertent deflection: crisis reframed from systemic failure to carriage positioning	Diminish strategy deployed where rebuild strategy required (SCCT)
Dominant ideology	Protective paternalism; spatial containment as proxy for safety	Collective paternalism; institutional impression management (Goffman, 1959)
Discursive shift	—	Surface-level rhetorical correction without deep ideological transformation

Table 4 synthesises the cross-corpus analysis, incorporating both the CDA findings and the public communication management evaluation. The addition of the 'public communication strategy' row makes explicit what the CDA analysis implies: that the discursive choices in both corpora are not only ideologically consequential but also

communicatively deficient when evaluated against established crisis communication standards (Coombs, 2007). The most significant continuity, the absence of women as agents in both corpora, underscores that the discursive transformation from Corpus 1 to Corpus 2 does not constitute a substantive reconceptualisation of gender in public safety discourse. The quality of institutional commitment to gender equality is most reliably read not in moments of crisis response but in the structural assumptions embedded in everyday institutional language.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that women's safety in the examined KRL crisis discourse is constructed primarily through a protection-oriented rather than agency-oriented representational framework. Across Corpus 1, women appear predominantly as Sensors, Carriers, or beneficiaries of protection, while their only material Actor role occurs in an embedded, non-finite clause referring to women "using public transportation." From a Hallidayan transitivity perspective, this pattern is important because grammatical agency is not distributed neutrally: material Actor roles tend to foreground participants as initiators of action, whereas mental and relational processes more often represent them as experiencers or bearers of states (Halliday, 1994). The finding therefore supports Fairclough's (1995, 2003) argument that grammatical choices participate in the ideological construction of social identities. In this case, women are represented principally as those who *feel safe*, *are protected*, or *receive protection*, rather than as citizens who actively shape the conditions of public safety.

This result confirms previous research identifying a "vulnerability frame" in public-transport discourse. Ison et al. (2025) show that women and gender-diverse passengers perform extensive "safety work" when navigating public transportation, including modifying routes, timing, clothing, positioning, and social behavior. Such practices constitute active social agency. The ministerial discourse analyzed here differs markedly from that empirical reality: women's everyday agency is largely absent from the grammatical structure of the statements. The finding also contrasts with Sakhiyya et al. (2023), whose analysis of Indonesian women's movement discourse depicts women as actors who organize, campaign, protest, and demand change. The contrast suggests that social-actor representation varies according to institutional location: civil-society discourse can foreground women as political agents, whereas state protection discourse may position them primarily as recipients of institutional care. This extends previous gender-discourse research by demonstrating how these representational differences emerge at the level of process type and participant role.

A second finding concerns the unlexicalized Agent in the phrase *tidak terlalu mudah diakses dari luar* ("not too easily accessed from outside"). The passive construction leaves unspecified who or what would perform the accessing. The surrounding policy context makes a gendered-threat interpretation plausible because women-only carriages were introduced partly in response to harassment risks, which have been documented in Indonesia and elsewhere in South and Southeast Asia (Joshi et al., 2022; Sil et al., 2023; Salsabilla et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the corpus does not grammatically establish that the elided Agent is male. Other possible referents include unauthorized passengers of any gender, crowding-related access, or individuals creating risks during emergency conditions. This distinction is analytically important because CDA should reveal what discourse makes available as an interpretation without converting contextual inference into grammatical fact. The study therefore extends previous critiques of gendered transit discourse by demonstrating that ideological meaning may be carried not only through lexical selection but also through absence and grammatical suppression (Fairclough, 2003; Slemon, 2025).

The proposed response of relocating the women-only carriage also situates the findings within broader debates concerning gender-segregated transport. Joshi et al. (2022) argue that segregation-based measures may address immediate exposure to risk without altering the structural conditions that generate harassment. Similarly, Useche et al. (2024) conceptualize harassment in transport environments as a structural problem that cannot be reduced to physical proximity alone. The discourse identified in Corpus 1 is consistent with this literature because protection is spatialized: safety becomes associated with where women are physically placed rather than with broader systemic transformation. At the same time, the findings should not be interpreted as proving that women-only carriages are ineffective. Salsabilla et al. (2025) provide a contrasting policy perspective, reporting practical benefits from gender-responsive carriage provision in the Jabodetabek system. The present study therefore neither confirms nor rejects the effectiveness of segregation policy. Instead, it reveals a different question: how such policies are discursively justified. This distinction strengthens the analysis by separating ideological critique from transport-policy evaluation.

The third major finding concerns the doorstep genre itself. Corpus 1 contains hesitation markers, provisional expressions, and explicit hedges such as *misalnya*, *masih menjadi bahan kajian*, and *bukan keputusan final*. These features are compatible with research suggesting that unscripted public communication places officials under severe real-time cognitive and rhetorical pressure (Kondolele et al., 2025; Macnamara, 2025). Rather than interpreting such markers exclusively as evidence of ideological avoidance, the study appropriately recognizes competing explanations: the journalist's unavailable question, media editing, limited response time, and the Minister's lack of direct operational authority over railway infrastructure may all have shaped the response. This qualification extends CDA by demonstrating the importance of integrating discourse production conditions into ideological interpretation. The observed language may simultaneously reflect institutional constraints, genre pressure, and socially available assumptions about women's protection.

Within Wang and Li's (2025) communicative-competence framework, the doorstep performance can also be interpreted as revealing a temporary weakness in affective sensitivity during this particular exchange. The Minister demonstrated knowledge of the policy domain and sufficient behavioral competence to respond coherently, yet the immediate proposal did not explicitly foreground the gender implications of responding to an accident involving fatalities in a women-only carriage through another spatial-segregation proposal. The manuscript correctly restricts this observation to the recorded performance rather than treating it as evidence of the official's overall competence or beliefs. This interpretation is consistent with Mandl and Reis (2022), who show that crisis communication by political leaders is shaped by the interaction between situational pressure, available cognitive resources, and institutionalized communicative dispositions.

The crisis-communication findings further show that the initial response was not strongly aligned with the victim-centered communication expected in an accidental-crisis context. Coombs' (2007) Situational Crisis Communication Theory emphasizes acknowledgment of impact, concern for affected parties, and corrective action where responsibility is perceived as moderate. The doorstep statement instead foregrounded carriage positioning. Importantly, however, PPPA is not the railway operator, and the study therefore applies SCCT only to the gender-protection communication dimension, not to operational responsibility for the accident. This refinement contributes to crisis-communication research by showing that cross-sectoral governmental crises may involve different institutional actors holding different forms of communicative rather than operational responsibility.

The comparison with Corpus 2 reveals rhetorical repair but only limited representational change. The clarification includes an acknowledgment that the earlier statement was *kurang tepat*, an apology, denial of harmful intent, and a final shift toward collective responsibility. These moves resemble strategies described in apology, politeness, and impression-management literature (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1959; Macnamara, 2025). Corpus 2 therefore confirms previous research showing that institutions under reputational pressure often recalibrate language in ways that reduce face damage while seeking to restore public legitimacy. Yet the clarification does contain a meaningful shift: women and men are named together as equal subjects of safety in one clause. This qualifies any claim of complete ideological continuity. Tang et al. (2026) provide a useful counterpoint by suggesting that apparently limited discursive corrections may create openings for subsequent normative change. The present case supports a more cautious conclusion: rhetorical correction occurred, but the available corpus is too small to determine whether it signals deeper institutional transformation.

Taken together, the four findings extend existing scholarship by connecting gender representation, transport-safety discourse, crisis communication, and public-speaking competence within one closely bounded Indonesian case. The study's strongest contribution lies not in establishing a stable ideology of a ministry or public official, but in showing how linguistic agency, grammatical absence, spatial protection logic, genre pressure, and rhetorical repair interact in a specific crisis-communication event. The complete clause-level inventory strengthens the transparency of that interpretation, while the acknowledgment of negative cases and alternative readings limits overgeneralization. Future studies should examine larger corpora of ministerial and cross-agency crisis communication, compare prepared and unscripted statements, incorporate journalist prompts and audience-reception data, and consider multimodal features such as gesture, prosody, facial expression, and visual framing. Such research could determine whether the patterns identified here represent a broader institutional tendency or remain specific to this event.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the two ministerial statements construct women's safety through a discernible but qualified pattern of protection-oriented discourse. The clause-level evidence shows that women in Corpus 1 are predominantly represented as Sensors, Carriers, or beneficiaries rather than material Actors, with only one embedded non-finite exception; the Agent associated with "accessing" the women-only carriage remains grammatically unexpressed; and women and men are explicitly named together as equal subjects of safety only once in the clarification statement. Interpreted through Fairclough's CDA framework, these observations suggest a discourse in which women are positioned primarily as recipients of institutional protection and in which safety is initially conceptualized through spatial containment. The subsequent clarification demonstrates greater rhetorical sensitivity and explicitly broadens the safety frame to include both women and men, but its apology structure also shifts from admission to conditionality, intent denial, and collective responsibility. Thus, the movement from Corpus 1 to Corpus 2 is better understood as partial discursive adjustment than as clear evidence of fundamental ideological transformation.

The findings should remain bounded by the study's exploratory design. The analysis concerns two short public texts from one crisis event and cannot establish the Minister's enduring beliefs, the PPPA Ministry's stable institutional ideology, or the empirical effectiveness of women-only carriages. The unavailable journalist question, possible media editing, lack of audience-reception evidence, absence of multimodal analysis, and lack of comparable statements from other officials further limit

interpretation. Nevertheless, the study illustrates the value of integrating Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA with transitivity analysis and selected insights from crisis communication and communicative-competence research. Practically, the findings suggest a need for gender-responsive crisis-communication preparation that equips public officials not only with policy knowledge but also with sensitivity to how grammatical agency, framing, modality, apology, and proposed solutions may reproduce unintended gender assumptions under high-pressure conditions. Replication across larger and more diverse institutional corpora is necessary before broader conclusions can be drawn.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the colleagues who contributed to peer debriefing and independent review of the clause-level coding used in this study. Appreciation is also extended to the bilingual reviewer who assisted in checking the semantic and pragmatic equivalence of the English translations against the original Indonesian statements. The authors thank the academic colleagues whose comments helped strengthen the methodological transparency, theoretical framing, and interpretation of the findings. We also acknowledge the publicly accessible media sources that made corpus verification possible. This research received no specific external funding. All analytical decisions, interpretations, revisions, and conclusions remain the responsibility of the authors.

DECLARATION OF USING AI TOOLS

Generative artificial intelligence tools, including OpenAI ChatGPT, were used only to support language editing, academic expression, structural refinement, and organization of selected manuscript sections. AI tools were not used to transcribe the source recordings, produce translations of the primary corpus, perform clause-level coding, assign transitivity categories, determine analytical findings, fabricate data, or independently interpret the ministerial statements. All primary-data transcription, translation, coding, theoretical analysis, and interpretation were conducted and verified by the authors. Any AI-assisted wording was subsequently reviewed, revised, and checked against the original corpus and cited literature. The authors retain full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coombs, W. T. (2007). Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of Situational Crisis Communication Theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(3), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550049>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Ison, J., Forsdike, K., Henry, N., Hooker, L., & Taft, A. (2025). "I'll try and make myself as small as possible": Women and gender-diverse people's safety work on public transport. *Violence Against Women*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012241270279>
- Joshi, S., Roy, S., Mowri, S., & Bailey, A. (2022). Devising gender-responsive transport policies in South Asia. *Gender & Development*, 30(1–2), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2022.2066266>

- Kondolele, S., Sultan, M. I., Akbar, M., & Putra, B. A. (2025). The nexus between public communication and policy implementation revisited: Insights from the Population and Civil Registration Service of South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1556747>
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Brozen, M., & Ding, H. (2020). Documenting #MeToo in public transportation: Sexual harassment experiences of university students in Los Angeles. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 44(1), 210–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X20960778>
- Macnamara, J. (2025). Strategic communication and public policy: A major gap and opportunity for research, practice, and democracy. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2025.2572076>
- Mandl, B. J., & Reis, B. Y. (2022). The language of crisis: Spatiotemporal effects of COVID-19 pandemic dynamics on health crisis communications by political leaders. *npj Digital Medicine*, 5(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00554-w>
- Mowri, S., & Bailey, A. (2023). Framing safety of women in public transport: A media discourse analysis of sexual harassment cases in. *Media, Culture & Society*, 45(2), 266–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221111913>
- Sakhiyya, Z., Hapsari, C. T., Sumaryani, S., & Farida, A. N. (2023). From protest march to digital campaign: Women's movement and critical literacies in Indonesia. *Gender and Education*, 35(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2023.2183181>
- Salsabilla, H., Kartini, D. S., & Bintari, A. (2025). Evaluasi kebijakan responsif gender dalam penyediaan gerbong khusus wanita pada commuter line Jabodetabek tahun 2024–2025. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pemerintahan*, 8(2), 66–78.
- Sil, A., Chowdhury, S., & Thoreau, R. (2023). Moving towards an inclusive public transport system for women in the South and Southeast Asian region. *Transport Reviews*, 43(6), 1144–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2023.2200983>
- Siscawati, M., Adelina, S., Eveline, R., Siscawati, M., Adelina, S., Eveline, R., & Anggriani, S. (2020). Gender equality and women empowerment in the national development of Indonesia. *Journal of Strategic and Global Studies*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.7454/jsgs.v2i2.1021>
- Slemon, A. (2025). Absences and silences in critical discourse analysis: Methodological reflections. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251321250>
- Syukri, M. (2023). Gender policies of the new developmental state: The case of Indonesian new participatory village governance. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 42(1), 110–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034221149750>
- Tang, Q., Zhang, X., & Liu, T. (2026). A feminist critical discourse analysis of gender norms on Chinese social media: Empirical insights from WeChat public accounts. *PLoS Med*, 21(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0338967>
- Useche, S. A., Colomer, N., Alonso, F., & Faus, M. (2024). Invasion of privacy or structural violence? Harassment against women in public transport environments: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, 19(2), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0296830>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352–371). Blackwell.
- Wang, T., & Li, J. (2025). How to improve communication competence of government leading officials in intercultural environment?—The driving role of intercultural psychological factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1544626>