



INSECURITY AND THE FEELING OF INSECURITY IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**The implementation of the European Social Partners' Joint
Recommendations signed by ETF, UITP, IRU and supported by CER and
CEEP on November 13th 2003**

Tessa Nova



With the support of the European Union

Aggressive behavior and harassments in the public sphere seem to have increased over the last years. Processes of secularism, individualism, and the widening gap between rich and poor could very well be attributed to the stronger sense of tensions and hardening within society. Furthermore, compared to twenty years ago, media coverage about aggressions in society has become more varied and above all increasingly common.

The same impression seems to apply for the public transport sector. Figures on incidents of aggressions and vandalism in public transport seem to have increased over the last few years. Press reports about incidents of harassments in public transport make many people feel insecure using public transport, especially apart from traffic peak hours. At the same time as aggressions have seemed to increase, the number of staff members in public transport has decreased because of predominantly economic factors. The financial crisis presented considerable challenges to the public transport sector. Measures are introduced by companies which have been obliged to implement cost-effective policies. Part of the economic-management policies in the transport sector has been the development and expansion of technological devices and facilities.

The increase of both the risk of aggressions and vandalism, and the feeling of insecurity among its users and employees on the route can not be explained only by the curtailment of the total number of staff members. The changing character of society and its context seem to have led to an increasing number of passengers becoming more reluctant and insecure using public transport. In short, a combination of factors has contributed to a seemingly increase of aggressions in general, and more specifically in public transport. Understanding the problem of insecurity and the feeling of

insecurity in the public transport sector is therefore of great importance to all actors involved.

In other words, the quest for solutions to the problems of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport needs to be answered in a straightforward way in order to solve the problem. It has been eight years since the European social partners have come to an agreement and signed the Joint Recommendations, regarding the subject of insecurity in the public transport sector.¹ In 2010 the social partners agreed within the Social Dialogue Committee on a joint questionnaire, which has been sent to all ETF and CER affiliates. This was done as a first step to explore for the need of a bigger joint activity. The collective initiative resulted in a mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 in public transport, which can be read in this report. A continuous dialogue between the social partners is a vital part of tackling certain problems and searching for improvements of the security of both employees and users in and of public transport.

PARAGRAPH 1 OPERATIONALIZATION

This report addresses the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity more specifically in railway passenger transport.

1

[http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20EN\[1\].pdf](http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20EN[1].pdf)

http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20FR1.pdf

<http://www.itfglobal.org/etf/upt-sd.cfm>

It should be considered as a follow-up of the European Social Partners' in the railway passenger sector. An analysis of the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003, specifically in railway passenger transport in several European countries, is being outlined in this report.

1.1

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A total number of 28 participants, both trade unions and companies from several European countries, contributed to the research study. The data, deprived from the joint questionnaire, forms the basis of the analysis. The central question to this mid-term research is: *What has been agreed on, and what has been achieved in day-to-day practice in railway passenger transport, in view of the Joint Recommendations of 2003?* Reflecting on this question in both quantitative and qualitative ways makes it possible to have a better understanding of the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in the railway passenger sector.

The data-analysis is based on the results of the questionnaire of seventeen participating countries in total. These can be determined as twenty-eight individual participants (both trade unions and railway companies) in total. The figures represent data from both trade unions (twelve questionnaires in total) and companies (sixteen questionnaires in total) from the participating countries.

The following countries contributed to this research: Germany, Italy, France, Switzerland, Norway, Luxembourg, Belgium, Spain, Austria, Slovenia, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia and Turkey.

Finally, regarding the quantitative analysis some remarks have to be made. First of all, one should be aware of the relatively small degree of quantitative data

extracted from the questionnaire. Therefore, figures can not always be interpreted only in percentages. Only in some cases it is legitimate to provide conclusions on the basis of percentages. Although sometimes percentages are used to illustrate the implementation of the Joint Recommendations, it is even more interestingly to have a closer look at the individual outcomes. In sum, generalizations can be made, but the meaning of individual cases should not be overlooked in this research. There will always be an exception to the rule. Secondly, when numbers are asked, it is not possible to compare these because we do not know total numbers. For instance, when numbers are asked on how many incidents have happened on physical aggressions against staff members during 2009, figures from - for instance - Italy and Germany, could impossibly be compared simply because we do not have total numbers on staff members in both Italy and Germany. In that sense, there is no use in comparing numbers. The same applies to the question on the possible quantitative difference of attacks against male or female staff members. Since we do not know the ratio of male and female staff of an individual company, we are not able to conclude anything valuable. Thirdly, in line with the previous remark, the number of participating companies is not equal to the number of participating trade unions. In other words, in several cases both union and railway company from the same country responded to the questionnaire. But in others, only the union or the company responded. Therefore, comparing answers between unions and companies is possible in some but not all cases.

1.2

STRUCTURE

First of all, this report starts answering the question whether aggressions,

incivilities and vandalism in railway passenger transport have increased since 2003. The first paragraph concludes with an analysis of the efficiency of reporting systems and costs calculation.

The third paragraph discusses the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003. Starting with refreshing one's memory by recalling the Joint Recommendations of 2003, it then turns into the analysis.

In order to outline the practical value of implementing the Joint Recommendations of 2003, some examples of good practice will be demonstrated in paragraph 4: *Guidebook to the Future: Campaigning for a Safer Railway Environment*. This could possibly be a source of inspiration for all of the actors involved in the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in the railway sector.

This report will be concluded with a straightforward answer to its research question: *what has been agreed on, and what has been achieved in day-to-day practice in railway passenger transport, in view of the Joint Recommendations of 2003?* Furthermore, a few methodological pitfalls will be discussed as well, which are important to future research activities.

PARAGRAPH 2 QUANTITATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF AGGRESSIONS IN RAILWAY PASSENGER TRANSPORT

Before starting to analyze the implementation of the Joint Recommendations, this paragraph begins by outlining the quantitative development of aggressions, incivilities and vandalism in railway passenger transport since 2003. Information has been gathered on numbers of respectively aggressions in general (2.1), verbal attacks (2.2), verbal attacks against staff members (2.2.1), verbal attacks against

passengers (2.2.2), verbal attacks in total (2.2.3), physical attacks (2.3), physical attacks against staff members (2.3.1), physical attacks against passengers (2.3.2), physical attacks in total (2.3.3), vandalism on rolling stock and in train stations (2.4) and finally attacks on male or female (2.5), divided into verbal and physical attacks against female staff members (2.5.1) and verbal and physical attacks against male staff members (2.5.2). A final summary on the quantitative development of aggressions in railway passenger transport is provided in 2.6. Finally, the efficiency of reporting systems and costs calculation is furthermore discussed in the final subparagraph (2.7).

2.1 AGGRESSIONS IN GENERAL

Analyzing the outcomes on the question whether aggressions, incivilities and vandalism have risen during the past eight years, the majority of the participating countries indicate an increase of aggressions in railway passenger transport.

Luxembourg, Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey state there are no signs of an increase. Furthermore, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Latvia do not provide statistics on numbers of aggressions in railway transport. The same applies to the union of Bulgaria (contrary to the Bulgarian railway company BDZ EAD which states aggressions did rise). The countries which do not report on, or do not know about a possible increase of the number of aggressions, are remarkably East-European countries. In other words, reporting statistics of aggressions is done primarily by West-European countries (except Luxembourg).

This conclusion – the majority of countries reporting an increase of aggressions – relates to the usage of reporting systems. In the next subparagraphs we will find out that all

countries except Bulgaria practice reporting systems in order to have a better understanding of the quantitative development of aggressions in railway transport. The importance of collecting and sharing data on the issue of insecurity in public transport is furthermore part of the agreement on the Joint Recommendations of 2003. Interestingly, as we will see further on, this outcome on reporting systems stands in sharp contrast to the defective reporting on numbers following the questionnaire. The next sections demonstrate this pitfall in collecting and sharing data on the issue of insecurity in railway passenger transport more in detail.

2.2

VERBAL ATTACKS

Figures on verbal attacks are divided into verbal attacks against staff members (2.2.1), verbal attacks against passengers (2.2.2) and verbal attacks in total (2.2.3).

2.2.1

VERBAL ATTACKS AGAINST STAFF MEMBERS

Comparing the available statistics on physical and verbal attacks, the latter loses out on the former. Although only few, both trade unions and companies, report numbers of verbal attacks against staff members.

First of all, figures on verbal attacks against staff members are remarkably high. In Germany the number of verbal aggressions against staff members has risen from 242 in 2003 to 496 in 2009. This means a multiplication by more than two during the past eight years. The same applies to Romania, where verbal attacks against staff have risen from 64 to 160 according to the trade union (Free Trade Union of Metro Workers). Furthermore, the union from Luxembourg shows a relatively

small increase of 18% (from 60 in 2003 to 71 in 2009).

The same applies to the companies, reporting extremely high figures. Especially numbers on verbal attacks against staff members in France and Germany stand out, compared to others. Deutsche Bahn from Germany reports 242 cases of verbal attacks in 2003; and 496 in 2009.² Although the French Railways SNCF report a small decrease, figures are extremely high. In 2003 a number of 3200 cases of aggressions have been reported. In 2009 it decreased slightly to a number of 3000. Germany, a country which is best comparable to France in this respect, reports numbers of 242 in 2003 to 496 in 2009. Comparing the figures of both countries the difference is strikingly large.

Comparing figures on verbal attacks against staff in both Switzerland and Belgium, figures on 2003 show quite similar results with respectively 448 cases in Switzerland and 497 cases of verbal attacks against staff in Belgium in 2003. Turning to figures on 2009 the difference becomes apparent. Numbers on verbal attacks against staff in Belgium have multiplied by more than 1.5 (497 in 2003; 819 in 2009) over the past eight years. Switzerland demonstrates an increase from 448 in 2003 to 1335 in 2009. This means a multiplication by three.

Secondly, the variance in numbers is remarkable large. Whereas France reports numbers of 3200 in 2003 and 3000 in 2009, Turkey reports numbers of 11 in 2003 and 5 in 2009. The same applies to Romania. Its railway company reports a stagnation of

² Interestingly, both the union (EVG) and the railway company (Deutsche Bahn) from Germany report identical numbers (with one exception). The origin of data is Deutsche Bahn. It has a special unit *DB Sicherheit*, which is responsible for the reporting (among other things).

verbal attacks against staff members, with interestingly only 1 case in 2003 and 1 in 2009). The union from Romania reports 64 in 2003 and 160 in 2009. Although its figures are slightly higher, these are still small compared to others, like France or even Belgium, Luxembourg or Switzerland.

Concluding, both the size and the variance of numbers reported on verbal attacks against staff members are extremely large. This apparent difference in measuring numbers of verbal aggressions raises serious questions about the performance, the quality and the variety of reporting systems in different European countries.

2.2.2

VERBAL ATTACKS AGAINST PASSENGERS

Since it is a hard task to monitor numbers on verbal aggressions against passengers, simply because of practical reasons, not much data is available on this subject.

Only the railway company from Switzerland reports on this aspect, with an increase of 23% from 252 to 310 between 2003 and 2009. Furthermore, the railway companies from Germany (DB) and Turkey (TCDD) report numbers of respectively 902 and 3 casualties of verbal attacks against passengers in 2009. Since both do not report on 2003, it is not possible to make valuable conclusions on its quantitative development. Nevertheless, the same applies to verbal attacks against passengers: the difference in numbers is large.

2.2.3

VERBAL ATTACKS IN TOTAL

Again few countries report their numbers. Again, Switzerland points out a multiplication by more than two (700 in 2003; 1645 in 2009). Deutsche Bahn from Germany reports a total number of verbal attacks of 1398 in 2009. Analyzing the

figures we can see that Germany progressed in monitoring figures, since it has numbers of verbal attacks against staff both in 2003 and 2009, and numbers on verbal attacks against passengers in 2009. This means a reporting system on monitoring verbal attacks against passengers has been developed. Studying this case more in detail could be very interesting, especially in view of sharing information on data collection.

Furthermore, Italy, Turkey and Luxembourg report total numbers on verbal attacks. Since these are inconsistent with previous numbers, or indistinct regarding its calculation, it is better to leave it for the moment. Finally, the railway company of Romania reports a stagnation. during the past eight years, with numbers of only 1 verbal attacks against staff in both 2003 and 2009, and 0 verbal attacks against passengers in both 2003 and 2009.

In sum: first of all, verbal attacks against both staff and passengers have risen drastically since 2003. Secondly, although only few countries report numbers on verbal aggressions, it confirms the existence of a system on reporting not only verbal attacks against staff members, but also against passengers. It would be very interesting sharing this kind of information.

2.3

PHYSICAL ATTACKS

Let's turn our point of focus to physical attacks. Figures on physical attacks are divided into physical attacks against staff members (2.3.1), physical attacks against passengers (2.3.2) and physical attacks in total (2.3.3).

2.3.1

PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST STAFF MEMBERS

First of all, much more countries report numbers on physical attacks against

staff in 2009, compared to 2003. This means a serious progression in the field of reporting figures.

Secondly, the figures demonstrate an overall increase of physical attacks against staff members. According to Germany, Belgium, Czech Republic and Romania, physical attacks against staff members increased enormously. In Germany numbers multiplied by more than two since 2003, with 356 cases of physical attacks against staff in 2003; this has increased to a number of 836 by 2009. The same applies to Czech Republic, which points out a multiplication by 2.5 from 14 in 2003 to 36 in 2009. Romania reports a multiplication by 6 according to its statistics from 1 in 2003 to 6 in 2009. In sum, the difference in numbers is extremely large.

On the contrary, figures from France, Luxembourg and Switzerland demonstrate a decreasing trend of physical attacks against staff members. During 2003 until 2009 numbers have diminished from 385 to 251 in Switzerland; and from 1200 in 2003 to 1050 in 2009 in France according to the SNCF. The French union, CFDT, even demonstrates a sharper decline (2003: 1220; 2009: 880). Turkey is the exception to the rule where figures demonstrate stability in the quantitative development of physical attacks against staff members.

The variety in figures from both small countries (such as Belgium and Switzerland) and large countries (such as Germany and France) again raises questions about the application of evidently different types of reporting systems in the participating European countries. For instance, whereas Romania reports only 6 casualties of physical attacks against staff members in 2009, Belgium (which is a smaller country) reports numbers of 471 in 2009. These extreme differences could be explained by for instance a missing completion of reporting systems by improved follow-ups, failing communicative

structures between the management and its employees on the route et cetera.

A final conclusion on physical attacks against staff members refers to the large number of countries providing data since 2009. In other words, a growing number of companies and trade unions are communicating the number of aggressions in a more active way. It is a positive sign view of sharing statistics on aggressions in railway passenger transport.

2.3.2

PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST PASSENGERS

In comparison to verbal attacks against passengers, more numbers on physical attacks against passengers are reported. Again, these are strikingly high. It would be interesting comparing numbers on verbal attacks to numbers on physical attacks. Nevertheless, since we do not know the total number of both employees and passengers of each individual railway company, valuable conclusions can hardly be made.

Even without comparing figures, it is demonstrated that the majority of both trade unions and companies indicate a sharp increase of casualties. In Germany numbers have almost been doubled from 6405 in 2003 to 10069 in 2009. This would mean 839 casualties of physical attacks against passengers in 2009 on a monthly basis! The same applies to France with numbers starting with 3650 in 2003 and ending with 3950 in 2009. Nevertheless, some uncertainty remains in this case, because the French union CFDT demonstrates a relatively small decrease (2003: 3600 to 2009: 3290). Exceptions to the rule are made by Switzerland (SBB) and Turkey. Statistics demonstrate a decrease in the number of physical attacks against passengers.

As we have seen in the previous subparagraphs, the same question arises

looking at the figures on physical attacks against passengers: how could the variance in numbers of different, even comparable countries be explained?

2.3.3

PHYSICAL ATTACKS IN TOTAL

Analyzing total numbers of physical attacks leads to some interesting conclusions. First of all, figures on physical attacks demonstrate a sharp and alarming increase of casualties. Secondly, compared to monitoring verbal attacks, more countries report on physical attacks against both passengers and staff, and both on 2003 and 2009. In this sense, total numbers could be valuable when analyzing individual cases. Since we do not have total numbers on staff and passengers there is no value in comparing figures between countries. The following countries are actively involved in monitoring numbers on physical attacks against both staff and passengers, during a period of eight years since 2003: Germany, France (varying numbers from both its union and railway company), Switzerland, Luxembourg, Czech Republic, Turkey and Romania. Furthermore, Italy is progressing in providing statistics on both physical attacks against staff and passengers since it does not report on 2003, but does on 2009. Hungary restricts its reporting system on physical attacks to staff members, since it does not report numbers on physical attacks against passengers.

In sum, figures on physical attacks against both staff and passengers show a sharp increase. Moreover, compared to verbal attacks, more countries report figures on physical attacks.

2.4

VANDALISM ON ROLLING STOCK AND IN TRAIN STATIONS

The counterpart of aggressions against staff members and passengers of railway transport is determined by vandalism on infrastructural elements of railway transport, such as rolling stock and railway stations. The figures on vandalism are extremely high and furthermore demonstrate a mixed outcome. Germany reports highest numbers with 22369 casualties in 2003, and 21059 cases of vandalism in 2009. Although its numbers are much smaller, and an increase is demonstrated, figures on vandalism in France are also extremely high as well. The French union CFDT reports numbers which even transcend the numbers from Germany. Smaller countries, such as Belgium and Switzerland, both report a decrease, although figures are high as well.

In sum, the following countries indicate an increase of vandalism: France, Slovenia and Czech Republic. Countries which indicate a decrease are Germany (although a relatively small decrease and extremely high numbers!), Switzerland, Belgium (as well a relatively small decrease), Luxembourg, Turkey and Romania. Finally, Hungary and Italy only report numbers of vandalism of 2009, comparable to those of Belgium.

In sum, figures on vandalism demonstrate a rather mixed outcome with extremely high numbers. Contrary to physical and physical attacks, there are no clear signs of an increasing trend regarding vandalism. Instead, the majority of countries report a small decrease.

Furthermore, more countries report on numbers of vandalism, compared to countries reporting on physical and physical attacks against staff and/or passengers.

2.5

ATTACKS ON MALE OR FEMALE

A final element in analyzing numbers of aggressions is to distinguish

between male and female staff members working on the route. First of all, the number of countries who do not indicate, or do not know, a possible quantitative difference is strikingly large. Railway companies from Germany, Italy, France, the union from Czech Republic and both the union and the company from Romania do point out a quantitative difference in attacks on male or female staff members. In sum, the majority of countries do not register possible differences between attacks against men or women. The large countries (Germany, Italy and France) confirm the quantitative difference of attacks between men and women, contrary to mainly small and East-European countries.

It has to be stressed that total numbers on male and female staff members are unknown. In this sense, we have to look at the individual figures on attacks against male and female exclusively, without being able to make comparisons.

2.5.1

VERBAL AND PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST FEMALE STAFF MEMBERS

Since only few countries report a possible quantitative difference between attacks against male and female staff members, only seven countries report on verbal attacks against female staff. The same number reports on physical attacks against female staff members. Interestingly, the figures show that numbers on verbal attacks against female staff have risen, whereas numbers on physical attacks against female staff have decreased.

2.5.2

PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST MALE STAFF MEMBERS

Figures on verbal and physical attacks against male staff members both demonstrate an increase. Only according to

German railways (Deutsche Bahn AG) numbers on physical attacks against male staff have decreased, although slightly with 10%. Regarding verbal attacks, the same applies to French railways SNCF. Its numbers demonstrate a small decrease of 10%, contrary to others which demonstrate an increase of verbal attacks against male staff members.

Furthermore, numbers on both physical and verbal attacks against male staff, provided by the German Deutsche Bahn, are extremely high. In 2003 Deutsche Bahn reported 1000 physical attacks against male staff; in 2009 it decreased to a number of 900. The same applies to France. Verbal attacks against male staff rated 2750 in 2003, and 2450 in 2009. Interestingly, French Railways SNCF does report on verbal attacks, but does not report on physical attacks against male staff. This is probably due to a temporal mistake, since numbers on both verbal and physical attacks against female staff are provided. (Moreover, according to the German trade union physical attacks against male staff members have increased with 11% (258 in 2003; 288 in 2009). This is contrary to numbers provided by its railway company, which states numbers have decreased with 10% (1000 in 2003; 900 in 2009). This difference is remarkable, since the German union has been using identical figures, which are deprived from the railway company Deutsche Bahn, except for this question on possible quantitative differences between attacks on male and female staff members).

In sum, since we do not have data on total numbers of both female and male employees for the railway companies participating on this research, we are not able to draw conclusions regarding the quantitative difference and development with respect to verbal and/or physical attacks on either men or women. In this sense, future monitoring and research on this aspect is necessary in order to

understand the possible quantitative difference in attacks against either men or women.

A final remark refers to the quiet turnout of countries which have contributed to this part of the research. The provision of statistics on except 2009 should again be considered as a positive development. In this way comparisons over time could possibly become of decisive importance. In other words, countries like Austria, which have reported only on 2009, have been actively working on improving their reporting system (since they did not report numbers on 2003). First of all, this contributes to a larger engagement of management staff members to the (consequential) damages due to aggressions. This in turn could bring positive outcomes for the economic interests of the company. Secondly, a larger number of countries reporting on cases of aggressions means an important contribution to future research.

2.6

SUMMARIZING ON THE QUANTITATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF AGGRESSIONS IN RAILWAY PASSENGER TRANSPORT

Although few data on the issue of insecurity in railway transport are available, the majority of countries observe an increase in the total number of aggressions, incivilities and vandalism. Nevertheless, less is known on how much precisely. Only four of sixteen companies; and three of twelve unions reported figures on aggressions since 2003. Besides, both the individual percentages and numbers differ greatly. This in return puts a severe restriction on comparing variations of aggressions between both men and women, companies and countries.

In short, although statistical numbers confirm the legitimate concern about insecurity in railway passenger

transport, much effort still have to be made in unifying the reporting system on monitoring numbers of aggressions.

2.7

THE EFFICIENCY OF REPORTING SYSTEMS

The outcomes on the subject of reporting systems and its efficiency are very interestingly in relation to the previous subparagraphs. The figures demonstrate, with the exception of Bulgaria, that all countries indicate having a reporting system in order to monitor cases of aggressions. Since not all countries report on their statistics (as we have seen in the previous subparagraphs) these contrary findings raise questions about, for instance, whether reporting systems do not function properly, countries having problems regarding data security or lacking resources to practice a reporting system. For instance, although the MAV-START from Hungary did not report any numbers on aggressions, it does address the importance of having a reporting system operating on a daily basis in its additional informative documents. Furthermore it did not report any numbers on aggressions.

Although few trade unions and companies do monitor the number of aggressions, all of the countries (with the exception of Bulgaria) indicate they do practice any kind of a reporting system. As we have seen before, this contradictory result puts one to wonder about the quality and effectiveness of reporting systems that have been developed. On the basis of the missing statistics, it seems like a few reporting systems overshoot the mark. In other words: what causes the missing statistics, regarding countries which answer YES to the question whether they operate a reporting system? What does it mean to have a reporting system but any figures? And what kind of reporting systems do the

countries both practicing a reporting system and providing figures work with?

Furthermore, the contrary findings raise questions which go beyond the system of reporting. Transparency, responsibility, communication and policies on reporting should be considered in reviewing this aspect of reporting on aggressions in European railway passenger transport.

2.8 COSTS CALCULATION

Economic interests are being served by a broad understanding of these costs due to vandalism. Costs calculation is very well represented among the participating railway companies. Costs calculation rates 92.8%. Furthermore, some disagreement exists between the trade unions and companies from France, Switzerland and Bulgaria. Whereas both trade unions answer NO to the question about costs calculation due to damages, the companies from both countries answer YES to the question.

The very positive outcome on costs calculation due to damages becomes even more interesting when trade unions and companies is asked whether consequential damages due to aggressions against staff members (such as times absent due to health problems) are being calculated. The results are very much different to those of the previous question. Only 57.5% of the countries calculate consequential damages. These countries are Italy, Spain, Belgium, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania and Hungary (MAV-START). In the case of Switzerland its trade union and the railway company disagree on whether consequential damages are being calculated by the company.

The remarkable smaller percentage of countries which calculate consequential costs, compared to the costs calculation due to vandalism, could be attributed to problems considering confidentiality of

personal data. For instance, Germany does calculate costs due to damages and vandalism, but does not calculate consequential damages due to aggressions against personnel. The issue of data security explains the difference in outcomes. It obliges Deutsche Bahn to stick to only calculating costs due to damages and vandalism, to protect personal data of passengers and/or staff members. This could very well explain the different outcome for the rest of the countries as well. Again, we will need to do a more comprehensive research, to find out whether this is right.

PARAGRAPH 3 THE RESULTS IN VIEW OF THE JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2003

JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS, 2003 Insecurity and the Feeling of Insecurity in Public Transport

- I. **The social partners must seek the most indicated resources in the following fields: human resources, organization, technology and recovery.**
- II. **The social dialogue at company level must be established to ensure the balance between technological devices and human resources. The first must be at the service of the latter, so the quality of and at work will be improved.**
- III. **The social agreements in the companies are an essential key to the development of the civil dialogue: first of all with the legitimate authorities, particularly in the matter of funding (when the own resources of the company are insufficient) and repression (police and justice institutions); secondly, with the associates, the users of public transport, NGOs and all other representatives of civil society.**

IV. The European social partners' complementarities and success of social- and civil dialogue can only be guaranteed by the strength of communication and dialogue between the various social partners and the representative bodies of trade unions and companies in the public transport sector. As mentioned before, social dialogue is necessary for the pursuit of convergence, procedures and measures, credibility and pragmatism.³

Now we have come to a broad understanding of the number of aggressions and its various types in several countries, it is time for assessing the implementation of the Joint Recommendations. As we have seen, the first and second Joint Recommendations deal with measurements in the field of prevention and the balance between technological devices and human resources. The third and fourth Joint Recommendations refer to external cooperation with respectively the legitimate authorities and associations, the users of railway transport, NGOs etc. First of all, preventive measures are defined by measures in the field of human resources, organization, technology and recovery. Secondly, examples of concerted action to combat insecurity in railway transport could possibly be found in alignments with police departments, municipalities and finally academic research groups.

3

[http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20EN\[1\].pdf](http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20EN[1].pdf)

http://www.cer.be/media/2022_Recommendations%20on%20Insecurity%20in%20Urban%20Public%20Transport%20FR1.pdf

<http://www.itfglobal.org/etf/upt-sd.cfm>

3.1 MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF PREVENTION: HUMAN RESOURCES, ORGANIZATION, TECHNOLOGY AND RECOVERY

1. The social partners must seek the most indicated resources in the following fields: human resources, organization, technology and recovery.

Joint Recommendations, 2003

As has been said, preventive measures are defined by measures in the field of human resources, organization, technology and recovery. The aspect of recovery refers to a situation of post-aggression, in contrast to human resources, organization and technology.

First of all, 57.2% of the companies introduced human resources policy. According to the trade unions the percentage is a bit smaller, more precisely 50%. The cases of Switzerland and Slovakia are remarkable in this respect. Disagreement exists between the trade unions and the companies. Preventive measures in human resources policy have not been taken, according to the unions, whereas the Swiss railway company SBB and Slovakian ZSSK indicate the opposite. Reverse positions refer to Czech Republic. In contrast to the railway company, its union says measures have been introduced.

Secondly, organizational measures have been taken by 85.6% of the companies. The percentage given by the unions is more or less equal (83.4).

Finally, 78.5% of the countries have introduced technological measures. Again, the trade unions report a smaller rate of 75%.

More specifically, the figures demonstrate that the outcome of technological and organizational measures are more or less similar. With respect to "Organization", only Slovenia and Romania state they did not introduce organizational

measures. France does not know whether these have been introduced or not. Regarding "Technology" only France states it does not know, and Luxembourg, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria respond by answering NO to the question whether measures in the field of technology have been introduced. Remarkable, these are mostly East-European countries. This in turn could be explained by the difference in resources between west- and east-European countries. Figures on "Human Resources Policy" are much more varied, compared to figures on "Technology" and "Organization".

In sum, the outcome on preventive measures should be considered as very positive: measures in the field of prevention have been implemented by the majority of countries. Nevertheless, measures in the field of human resources loses out on measures in the field of Technology and Organization. In the next section, we will take a look more into detail.

3.1.1

HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATION

As we have seen, only a small majority of countries introduced a policy on human resources. More specifically, 78.6% of the countries introduced training of staff in de-escalating strategies according to the railway companies. Secondly, different organization of work shifts has been introduced by 78.6%. Possible to think on: more personnel on certain lines, during certain hours. Except Czech Republic and Latvia did not. Disagreement between union and company exists regarding Romania, Slovakia and Italy. Thirdly, according to the companies 71.4% of the countries carried out the implementation of more personnel in train stations. Czech Republic, Romania and Latvia are the exceptions to the rule in all three components.

The percentages provided by the unions are a bit smaller, though more or less

equal regarding the first two dimensions with respectively 66.7% (training in de-escalating strategies) and 72.7% (different organization of work shifts). Conflicting with the figures given by the railway companies especially refer to more personnel in train stations. Whereas the companies report 62.5%, the unions interestingly demonstrate a percentage of 33.4%.

The final components of measures in the field of human resources and organization refers to internal communication in the company in order to inform staff and external cooperation with organizations such as police, municipalities and academics. Except Romania, all countries implemented policies on processes of internal awareness raising. This according to the companies. Regarding the union, much fewer countries work on awareness raising (58.3%). A positive signal in combating aggressions in railway passenger transport is the rating on *Coöperation with External Organizations*, of which mainly with departments of national and/or regional police. Rates on cooperation with external organizations are extremely high. All countries (except Bulgaria according to its union) cooperate with external organizations. Later on we will find out in what way countries communicate with external organizations.

3.1.2

TECHNOLOGY

As we have seen, preventive measures in the field of technology have been introduced in thirteen of seventeen countries (78.5%). More specifically, only ten of seventeen countries (64.3%) introduced video surveillance in trains. First of all, remarkably, video surveillance has not been introduced in both Germany and Belgium. Especially in view of its extreme high figures on aggressions in railway

passenger transport it could be very interesting to find out which underlying reasons can be found. Secondly, figures on video surveillance in train stations are much higher. Almost in every country this type of preventive measures have been introduced. Exceptions to the rule are Bulgaria, and Slovakia and Romania (of which railway companies and union disagree). Thirdly, no cash policy on board of trains has been introduced in only few countries. Possibly because of practical reasons the majority of countries has not implemented policies on cash or no cash on board of trains. Regarding Germany, Slovakia and Czech Republic it is not sure whether it has been introduced or not because of thriving answers coming from companies and unions. Finally, more than half of the participating countries implemented technological measures for safety. More specifically, twelve of seventeen countries introduced emergency communication lines to the railway guard and/ or the train station. Exceptions are Spain, Luxembourg, Turkey, Romania and possibly Bulgaria. In sum, technological measures have been introduced by especially west-European countries. The deficiency of these kind of measures in some east-European countries is possibly due to lack of resources, compared to many west-European countries.

3.1.3 RECOVERY

As has been said, measures in the field of recovery are different from measures in the field of human resources, organization and technology. Measures in the field of recovery are defined by its post-aggression typology. Only looking at the percentages, we can see that results are varied. Psychological support has been implemented by 75% according to the companies (and by 41.7% according to the

unions). Extra free days for recovery rates 43.8% and financial compensation is guaranteed by more or less 50% of the countries. As has been said, analyzing quantitatively only on the basis of percentages can not be sufficient. We will have to have a more detailed look on the figures.

Figures on specific aspects of measures in the field of recovery indicate the following. First of all, ten of seventeen countries (of which both union and company agree) indicate they do have introduced measures in the field of psychological support. Disagreement between union and companies exists regarding France, Switzerland, Spain, Norway, Czech Republic and Bulgaria. Secondly, thirteen of seventeen countries indicate employees are entitled having extra free days for recovery from physical and/or psychological damage. Although this seems very positive, many results are conflicting with those coming from unions, and vice versa. Furthermore, the different number of both unions and companies from different countries (in some cases both union and company from the same country answered to the questionnaire; in other cases only the company or the union answered) makes it hard to compare. In sum, because of conflicting figures it is hard to say whether and how many companies offer extra free days for recovery. The same applies to the third component of measures in the field of recovery: financial compensation. This is provided by fourteen of seventeen countries. Again results differ between unions and companies. According to the figures, a few more than half of the total number of countries do offer financial compensation. In sum, still much effort can to be made in implementations in the field of recovery.

Finally, some practical examples demonstrate the relevance and importance of measures in the field of recovery in view

of the issue of insecurity. For example, Deutsche Bahn developed a guideline to cope with traumatic events regarding serious physical and mental violence. Furthermore Deutsche Bahn provides assistance regarding medical or psychological support. In 2007 the SNCB from Belgium has introduced a master plan "anti-aggression", including forty actions with proactive, preventive and curative measures. Finally, the SEV from Switzerland provides legal assistance and support for victims of aggressions.

In short, although figures demonstrate the need for more improvements in view of measures in the field of recovery, several countries implemented some interesting and constructive measures, which possibly could be a source of inspiration for others.

3.2

THE BALANCE BETWEEN HUMAN RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVICES

II. The social dialogue at company level must be established to ensure the balance between technological devices and human resources. The first must be at the service of the latter, so the quality of and at work will be improved.

Joint Recommendations, 2003

The analysis of the introduction of both preventive measures and measures in the field of technology brings us to the second Joint Recommendation. Before heading into this aspect, one should take notice of the stage of research. We have just reached the first stage of researching the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport, and more specifically railway passenger transport, by analyzing the questionnaire on the Joint Recommendations of 2003. In view of this research, it is therefore too early to conclude whether technology and human

resources have found the right balance. It does not make any sense comparing percentages on the different aspects. In other words, more in-depth research is needed in order to make valuable conclusions on the balance between technological devices and human resources in public transport relations.

We do could make some small statements in general. The overall image seems to be that measures in the field of human resources lose out on measures in the field of technology. A quick look at the figures demonstrates this imbalance. Again, before agreeing on one-dimensional statements on the balance between human resources and technology, future in-depth research is needed.

3.3

CIVIL- AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE

III. The social agreements in the companies are an essential key to the development of the civil dialogue: first of all with the legitimate authorities, particularly in the matter of funding (when the own resources of the company are insufficient) and repression (police and justice institutions); secondly, with the associates, the users of public transport, NGOs and all other representatives of civil society.

Joint Recommendations, 2003

3.3.1

COMPANY COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS

Sicher Unterwegs in Germany

The Social Partner Agreement *Sicher Unterwegs* is based on a common understanding of the objectives. The social partners agreed on eight specific items, including (1) understanding of security and insecurity in railway passenger transport, (2) documentation and recording, (3) regulation of partnerships, (4) qualification, (5) after-care and recovery, (6) security management and technical measures, (7) intercorporate agreements and (8) information exchange and continuous improvement. The agreement was signed on 1st June 2010.

"Sicher Unterwegs" brings us to the third and fourth Joint Recommendations: the development of social agreements in order to stimulate civil- and social dialogue. Collective agreements are of essential value in strengthening the objectives of prevention and compensation. In Germany, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Turkey and Latvia companies developed this kind of company collective agreements. Germany offers qualification in deescalating strategies, guarantees welfare insurance and legal protection and strives for more personnel. Luxembourg guarantees continuous payment of employers. Latvia guarantees health insurance for its employees. Although both the Bulgarian company and the union do not give any indication of the existence of a company collective agreement, additional informative documents provide some very interesting information on their activities.

International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women – FTTUB Bulgaria

The activities of FTTUB in 2009 have been the prime example for signing agreements regarding violence against women in railway transport. In 2009 FTTUB engaged in organizing round table discussions to raise awareness for the importance of the issue of violence against women working in the public transport sector. Furthermore FTTUB tries to encourage women to report cases of violence. Secondly, in 2009 FTTUB launched a questionnaire to identify cases of violence against women on the workplace and the measures undertaken by employers and trade union representatives. Thirdly, an agreement between FTTUB and the major of Sofia was signed regarding the violence against women in the transport sector. This agreement resulted in (1) the development of a methodology to gather information on cases of violence against women, (2) awareness raising campaigns, (3) consultations for women suffering violence and/or harassments.

This agreement has initiated the same procedure for two national railway companies in Bulgaria. In other words, the snowball effect of social agreements demonstrates its positive and decisive effects on the protection of women working in railway transport.

3.3.2

THE CLASSIFICATION OF AGGRESSIONS AS A CRIMINAL ACT

The issue of insecurity is closely connected to the diminishing respect for authority, which is reflected in many societal areas. One solution to restore respect, or at least counteract those who behave disrespectful and sometimes even aggressive towards staff members of railway transport, is to classify aggressions as a criminal act. The institutionalization of violence by law has been protected in most of West-European countries (except Germany because of conflicting positions by both union and company; and Austria which does not know). This in contrast to the stance of unions from east-European countries. Aggressions in none of the participating east-European countries have not been classified as a criminal act, according to the unions. Either way, a few exceptions are made by companies from Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary which state it does have a legal classification of aggressions. In total, aggressions in railway transport have been classified as a criminal act in mostly west-European countries. Regarding east-European countries it is uncertain, because of thriving positions of both unions and companies.

Furthermore, as has been said, the classification of aggressions as a criminal act could possibly stimulate restoring respect for the authority and work of employees in railway transport. Most of the countries in which aggressions in the railway sector not (yet) have been institutionalized by law –

Germany, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania – are still striving for a legal classification of aggressions in public transport.

3.3.3

EXTERNAL COÖPERATION WITH PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Even though Switzerland, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary (Rail Cargo Plc.) and Latvia are the exceptions to the rule, joint ventures, especially with police departments, are implemented by the majority of countries. Exceptions are made by only Switzerland, Norway and Latvia. To be precise, according to the companies 87.4% of the countries engages in external coöperation with public authorities. Although it is only a bit smaller, according to the unions the percentage of companies having alliances with public authorities rates 75%. In Czech Republic so-called "problem trains" are accompanied by the police or by employees of security agencies. The France trade union CFDT organizes regional meetings on a monthly basis with public authorities. Also, the French railway company SNCF works closely together with police departments. Luxembourg has founded steering committees on both the company and the ministry level. In Spain, Belgium and Austria meetings on both national and regional level are being held regularly. Besides that Austria provides training in situations of de-escalation, has developed a so-called *Speerpunkt Aktionen Plan* with the police and guarantees police assistance at train stations. Furthermore, Belgium has organized a Security Day in 2008 with all relevant parties on this subject. Finally, the same applies to several East-European countries. They work in close coöperation with representatives of police authorities and sometimes voluntary groups. For instance, members of the Hungarian *Railway Militia Group* are very

active in providing free services both on the route and at stations. Furthermore, meetings and discussions on the subject of insecurity are organized regularly within the structure of the municipality.

The missing coöperation with public authorities in Switzerland is due to the outsourcing of train police. The reason for the others, Norway and Latvia, is unknown.

Concluding, external coöperation with public authorities is conducted by 13 of 17 countries. These external alignments play a very important part in combating aggressions in railway transport. Since these partnerships are of essential value to tackling the problem, the results on this aspect should be considered as very positive to the sector.

3.3.4

EXTERNAL COÖPERATION WITH NGOs AND ACADEMICS

IV. The European social partners' complementarities and success of social- and civil dialogue can only be guaranteed by the strength of communication and dialogue between the various social partners and the representative bodies of trade unions and companies in the public transport sector. As mentioned before, social dialogue is necessary for the pursuit of convergence, procedures and measures, credibility and pragmatism.

Joint Recommendations, 2003

Nevertheless, combating violence and aggression with the help of police departments, is not similar to a deeper, more comprehensive understanding of the problem. That is where NGOs, academics, research groups and organizations of civil society play their important part. In this way we are able to keep track on both the quantitative and qualitative developments regarding the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in railway passenger transport. As the results demonstrate,

results are varied on this element. Eleven countries maintain strong alignments with research groups, groups of volunteers, schools, civil society organizations, passenger organizations and the political arena in order to tackle the problem of aggressions in railway transport. Besides, many countries participate in conferences, seminars and round tables to cooperate with others on building up security systems. The French union CFDT works closely together with the National Federation of Transport Users Association⁴ and the Federation of Users of Public Services⁵. The Slovenian union keeps close contact with football fan organizations. In this way the union is more able to predict possible situations of aggressions in case of high-risk soccer matches by forehand.

The EVG from Germany has written a letter to all parliamentarians and parties in the *Deutsche Bundestag*⁶ to address the need for a constructive and active approach on the issue of insecurity in railway passenger transport. Furthermore it engages in round table discussions with companies, lobbyists, transport associations and other trade unions. In 2008 EVG has organized an ITF Action Day. EVG conducted a questionnaire for staff members. In 2009 again the ITF Action Day was organized, this time the questionnaire was addressed to passengers of public transport. The most important achievement has been the agreement with Deutsche Bahn: *Sicher Unterwegs*.

Deutsche Bahn themselves is very keen on raising awareness among its younger generation by organizing activities on prevention at schools. The same applies to the trade union from Switzerland (SEV),

which is a very interesting case of good practice regarding policy on educational and preventive measures in the field of security in railway transport.

Another prime example comes from Switzerland. The SEV developed a charter, of which already sixty companies agreed on and signed since 2000. The main objective is to end violence in public transport. Questionnaires have been sent out to the presidents of public transport companies. The results of the questionnaire demonstrate the importance of coöperation between various actors. The majority of companies have formed special working groups on the subject of insecurity in railway transport. The activities and advertisement campaigns are directed to young generations, which is of special importance to future developments. In order to deal with the problem of violence and incivilities in public transport, achievements have been made regarding medical and psychological support to victims of violence (both passengers and employees) and educational programmes on managing situations of conflict. Nevertheless, one of the problems is still determined by the minority of companies who have agreed on the charter, but do not take action on improving their policy on insecurity.

In the end, statistics on aggressions in the public transport of Switzerland demonstrate a stagnation of physical violence, an increase of physical violence and a small increase of vandalism. Furthermore, staff members address the importance of more personnel in public transport. The visibility of employers in public transport is of essential value not only to diminish the number of aggressions, but also to strengthen the feeling of security by passengers in public transport. This example of good practice again demonstrates the importance of coöperation, dialogue and support. It has

⁴ FNAUT, Federation National des Association des Usagers des Transport

⁵ FUST, Federation des Usagers des Services Publics

⁶ German parliament

contributed to better working conditions. Most of all, this charter has opened up the dialogue and possibilities to a future of more security within public transport.

PARAGRAPH 4
GUIDEBOOK TO THE FUTURE: CAMPAIGNING
FOR A SAFER RAILWAY ENVIRONMENT

The element of awareness raising is of decisive importance for the future development regarding insecurity in the feeling of insecurity in railway transport. Almost 50% of the trade unions engages in awareness campaigns and activities to address the problem of violence and aggression with which their members are confronted in their daily work in railway transports. In the section several examples of good practice by trade unions will be demonstrated.

International Action Day Against Violence

Each year FTTUB from Bulgaria organises several campaigns on April 28th: International Action Day Against Violence. Meetings are organized in order to inform about the importance of campaigning for transport workers all over the world. The topic of violence and insecurity in transport is discussed with Bulgarian employees in the railway sector.

Germany, France, Luxembourg, Romania and Bulgaria are the main countries actively organizing campaigns and activities in order to address the problem of aggressions in railway transport.

As has been shown earlier in the report, the EVG from Germany developed an agreement together with several parties, called *Sicher Unterwegs*. Furthermore the EVG engages in advertisement campaigns to inform employees in railway transport about their rights. Especially since one of

their employees has been the victim of a very brutal and aggressive attack with severe consequences in 2008, EVG has dedicated itself to intensifying the activities regarding security in railway transport. *IMPULS 19*, one of the campaigns, directly provides telephone numbers for legal assistance, police departments and legal and psychological assistance at the office of EVG. It informs about procedures and gives straightforward instructions on what to do in case of aggressions.

Furthermore, CFDT from France uses a lot of works from the National Security Commissions (SNCF) and all functional national commissions. The CFDT transmits information to the staff members, especially train staff, commercial staff and police railway staff.

CONCLUSION & FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

This research justifies the legitimate concern of increasing numbers of different types of aggressions and harassments against both passengers and staff members. The figures show an overall increase of the number of aggressions, incivilities and vandalism in both west- and east-European countries. Furthermore, the contradiction between the relatively small number of countries reporting on numbers, and the majority of countries indicating they do practice a reporting system is very interestingly. Both the increase of aggressions, incivilities and vandalism in railway passenger transport, and the pitfalls in reporting and sharing data leads to the conclusion that still much effort has to be made on unifying reporting system on aggressions in railway passengers transport in Europe.

This research continued by posing the central question on what has been achieved in the railway passenger transport sector regarding the implementation of the

Joint Recommendations of 2003. The analysis brings us to the conclusion that the right areas have been tackled.

First of all, many countries introduced measures in the fields of prevention and recovery. One could question the balance or imbalance between technological devices taking the lead ahead of measures in the field of human resources and organization. This is a very interesting question to research more in-depth. Secondly, the majority of countries have been developing activities of their own, in several areas, depending on their needs. Except Bulgaria, all countries maintain cooperative relationships with external organizations, especially with police departments. Furthermore, coöperation with civil society in terms of NGOs and academics could be intensified by more countries.

In sum, in view of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 several important developments have come into practice which could possibly contribute to the tackling of the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in railway passenger transport.

Nevertheless, scientific research does not come without any criticism. Several comments have to be made, in order to be able to do a more comprehensive research in the future. First of all, total numbers of passengers and staff members (male and/or female) from each individual country are needed in order to compare data and come to conclusions. Until now we are restricted analyzing only the individual cases, without being able comparing these to others. Secondly, unions and companies do not agree very often. This is both unsurprisingly and could be very interestingly. The best way of comparing figures is done when the total number of unions is equal to the total number of companies. In other words: to analyze data when both union and company from the

same country replied to the questionnaire. Thirdly, without being detrimental to the data on the questionnaire so far, we have not been able to collect information on which measures are more or less affective, in comparison to others. In other words, the real impact of the measures in relation to others is still unclear. Finally, future research should focus on the question whether the undertaken measures have been introduced following, or inspired by the Joint Recommendations of 2003, or by other factors, such as the context specific to the national or regional situation, internal policies or as a consequence of agreements between union and company, independent of the Joint Recommendations of 2003.

In sum, in order to achieve sustainable conclusions and recommendations which benefit all companies and trade unions in the public transport sector, it is necessary to do more in-depth research.

Nevertheless, this research provides an overview on the developments regarding the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003. It is an important step forward in achieving a better understanding of the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in the passenger transport sector.

Brussels, 26th April 2011

Tessa Nova



With the support of the European Union