



## Evaluation Over the Implementation of the No-Smoking Policy in Pariaman City Transportation Office: A Qualitative Study

Dhea Synthia<sup>1\*</sup>, Tri Krianto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, [dhea.synthia7@gmail.com](mailto:dhea.synthia7@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, [tkarjoso@gmail.com](mailto:tkarjoso@gmail.com)

---

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received 6 Nov, 2024

Revised 8 Jan, 2025

Accepted 18 Jan, 2025

#### Keywords:

No Smoking Area;  
Evaluation;  
Regulation

---

### ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** The Pariaman City Government has tried to reduce the number of smokers and the number of people exposed to cigarette smoke by issuing several policies, one of which is the policy regarding the No Smoking Area (KTR) which is contained in the Pariaman City Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2017 concerning No Smoking Areas. This study aims to evaluate the implementation of the implementation of the No Smoking Area at the Office of the Transportation Agency of Pariaman City.

**Methods:** This research uses a qualitative study, with data collection through in-depth interviews and observations with an evaluation study design. The informants of this study were 7 people, namely 2 from the Health Office of Pariaman City and 5 from the Transportation Office of Pariaman City, taken using purposive sampling method.

**Results:** The result of this study is that the implementation of the implementation of the No Smoking Area (KTR) at the Pariaman City Transportation Office is still not going well. As there are still employees who smoke in the room, there has been uneven socialisation and monitoring from the Health Office for KTR at the Pariaman City Transportation Office, to the lack of strict sanctions for those who violate the rules in the No Smoking Area (KTR).

**Conclusion:** In conclusion, our study contributes to evaluating implementation of No Smoking Area (KTR) at the Pariaman city Transportation Office. This research provides insights into the implementation of No Smoking Area (KTR) is still not good enough, so it's necessary to improve the monitoring and evaluation of this program in the the Pariaman city Transportation Office. Future studies should expand the scope of the research site so that it can describe boarder conditions, which in turn will advancing knowledge in the field of health.

---

### Corresponding Author:

Dhea Synthia

Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

[dhea.synthia7@gmail.com](mailto:dhea.synthia7@gmail.com)

---

### INTRODUCTION

Cigarettes and other tobacco products are a major factor in non-communicable diseases. WHO data shows tobacco causes more than 8 million deaths per year, yet smoking rates are still high(1). By 2022, there will be 1.3 billion tobacco users in the world, more than 80% of whom live in low- and middle-income countries. In Indonesia, GATS 2021 data recorded that 34.5% of the population aged  $\geq 15$  years were smokers, with the majority being men (65.5%) and a small proportion of women (3.3%) (2). West Sumatra Province has a high rate of smoking, with Pariaman City at the top for the working age group, between 25-44 years old (3). In addition to active smokers, passive smokers also face disease risks. GATS data shows that 44.8% of adult workers are exposed to secondhand smoke at work, 59.3% at home, and 74.2% in restaurants(2).

Peraturan Pemerintah No. 109/2012 in article 52 states that local governments are obliged to establish No Smoking Areas in their areas by local regulation. However, up to the time of this research, not all districts/cities had local regulations on no smoking areas. According to data we obtained from the Ministry of Health, there are 113 districts/cities that do not yet have a Regional Regulation on No Smoking Areas and there are 211 districts/cities that do not yet have a Regional Regulation on Smokefree Areas. Sumatera Barat and especially Pariaman City, are areas that have issued regulations/policies regarding no smoking areas,

namely the Peraturan Daerah No.8/2012 concerning No Smoking Areas and Peraturan Daerah Kota Pariaman No. 9/2017 concerning No Smoking Areas. The Pariaman City Transportation Office is one of the workplaces included in the No Smoking Area where the majority of workers are men. After initial observation, employees were still found smoking in the office environment.

Based on these findings, researchers are interested in examining whether this regulation has been implemented properly or not, especially in workplaces that are indeed non-smoking areas in accordance with Pariaman City Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2017, for this reason researchers want to study or evaluate the Implementation of the No Smoking Area Policy (KTR) at the Pariaman City Transportation Office in 2023.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This research adopts a structured and methodical approach to guarantee the accuracy and credibility of the results. The components are described below:

### **Research Type**

This research uses a qualitative study, data collection is done by in-depth interviews and observation with an evaluation study design. In this study, it is analyzed more deeply about the implementation of the no smoking area policy at the Dinas Perhubungan Pariaman City. Qualitative data in the form of primary data obtained by in-depth interviews with sources of information or informants who are authorized and competent in providing related information and observation. Secondary data obtained by reviewing documents related to the smoke-free area policy. This research was conducted with several ethical considerations, namely a letter of permission to conduct research from the Faculty of Public Health, University of Indonesia addressed to the Head of the Pariaman City Transportation Office and the Head of the Pariaman City Health Office and informed consent signed by the informant as a form of approval before conducting in-depth interviews.

### **Population and Sample/Informants**

Seven person were selected as informants in this qualitative research using the principle of appropriateness, namely that the informant is a person who can provide information and has data and in-depth knowledge about the matter to be studied. Selection of informants using purposive sampling method. Therefore, the retrieval of information sources (informants/samples) is based on a predetermined purpose. The informants in this study are Head of the Pariaman City Health Office, Non-smoking Area Program Management Staff at the Health Office of Pariaman City, Head of the Transportation Office of Pariaman City, and Employees of the Transportation Office of Pariaman City.

### **Research Location**

The study was conducted in the Transportation Office of Pariaman City, This research was conducted at the Pariaman City Transportation Office, one of the workplaces included in the No Smoking Area where the majority of workers are men. After initial observation, employees were still found smoking in the office environment.

### **Instrumentation or Tools**

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to explore the participants' experiences, focusing on the evaluation of the implementation of no smoking areas in the Transportation Office of Pariaman City.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

In-depth interviews were conducted in accordance with a predetermined interview guide containing a list of questions according to the research topic, about 20-30 minutes via Zoom-Meeting.

### **Data Analysis**

The data analysis of this study involved five main stages: understanding the data, coding, displaying the data, reducing the data, and interpreting the data. This process includes identifying themes, grouping data by theme, filtering information to make inferences, and finding relationships between concepts to explain the core meaning of the data.

### **Ethical Approval**

This study was approved by the Public Health Faculty of Universitas Indonesia (Approval Number: S-2347/UN2.F10.D1/PDP.04.00/2022). Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to their participation in this study. Throughout the research process, the confidentiality of all participants was strictly maintained.

## RESULT

This research was conducted to evaluate the implementation of the No Smoking Area at the Pariaman City Transportation Office. The things identified in this research include knowledge about the No Smoking Area policy and policy evaluation criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, and responsiveness).

### Implementation of No Smoking Area

According to information obtained from informants, the implementation of the No Smoking Area in the Transportation Office of Pariaman City has been implemented and socialized since 2017. The No Smoking Area (KTR) policy is implemented in schools, offices, the Pariaman City Transportation Agency and public places. This is confirmed by statements in interviews with the Head of the P2P Division of the Pariaman City Health Office and the Health Office Staff in Charge of the KTR Program as follows: "The implementation initially we have a movement for all, especially for schools, offices and the transportation agency as well..."(RA); "...starting from schools, then to office institutions, also to the community..."(LPD). The staff of the Transportation Department of Pariaman City in a different interview gave the same statement regarding the socialization of this No Smoking Area policy: "There has been socialization once or twice a year but that was during the pandemic, along with the ban on gathering" (RC).

Monitoring activities carried out by the Health Office of Pariaman City include visits to institutions and city-level coordination meetings. The implementation of monitoring will also describe field conditions directly. It will also show conditions that have not reached expectations and will then become evaluation material in the implementation of this No Smoking Area (KTR) policy. This is confirmed by the statement in the interview with the Health Office staff in charge of the KTR Program as follows: "...after we conduct monitoring to the institution or place that we will evaluate the implementation, the implementation of no smoking, we will hold a coordination meeting. Well, in this coordination meeting, we do it at the city level..." (LPD).

A different statement came from the staff of the Pariaman City Transportation Office, who said that monitoring has never been done specifically. Only in the form of reprimands for people who smoke in the KTR area. "If there is no special monitoring, such as visiting rooms, looking at people who smoke, only if they are with people who smoke, they usually immediately reprimand them."(KG).

Talking about the implementation of the No Smoking Area policy, of course there are sanctions or consequences for anyone who violates it. The existence of strict sanctions for violators of this policy is expected to increase people's awareness and commitment not to smoke in Smokefree Areas. According to the Head of the P2P Division of the Pariaman City Health Office, there are strict sanctions that have been listed in the Pariaman City Regional Regulation No.9 of 2017. The sanctions are in the form of warnings (warnings), coaching, up to a maximum of imprisonment and a maximum fine of 1 million rupiah. "... the maximum is imprisonment or the maximum fine is one million. But in this case, even though there are many violations because we are still coaching so ehh... maybe in the form of a warning to the person concerned." (RA)

The KTR program holder also stated that there are administrative and criminal sanctions for anyone who violates the No Smoking Area policy in Pariaman City and this has been stated in the Pariaman City Regional Regulation No.9 of 2017. "As for the sanctions themselves, the local regulation is clear, there are administrative sanctions and criminal sanctions. This means that in the regulation itself there are already sanctions, but the implementation is still not." (LPD). Based on interviews conducted with the Head of the Transportation Agency and staff, sanctions related to violations of the No Smoking Area (KTR) policy have not been implemented. This is certainly not in accordance with what has been conveyed by the Health Service above. "Sanctions may not exist" (A), "There are no sanctions, the most is just being told to smoke outside the room." (FZ)

### Effectivity

The implementation of KTR in the transportation office of the city of Pariaman has actually been carried out starting in 2017 but until now in 2023 it still does not look effective enough. In fact, the success of the KTR program is currently not quite visible in the work area of the transportation department office, this is in accordance with the information conveyed by informant RE, one of the transportation department staff as follows: "as far as I know, the application of the policy is only in this room because it is air-conditioned and closed, we only remind them, and there is a writing prohibiting smoking, that's all, because they realize that in an air-conditioned and closed room smoking is not allowed, but sometimes one or two still smoke and if in the yard and parking lot even though there is a writing prohibiting smoking, employees still smoke because it is an open space, they think that way" (RE).

The second informant also obtained the same answer as the first informant, the second informant is a staff of the transportation department explaining that awareness not to smoke is only in the room in an air-conditioned office, while outside the room such as the yard and parking lot of the office it is legal for

employees to smoke, as follows: “They still smoke in the courtyard and parking lot even though it is written that they still smoke because it is an open space so yes they still smoke in open spaces because they think the smoke will disappear quickly” (RA). This answer is supported and in line with the answer from the head of the transportation department of the city of Pariaman, who explained that most of his employees still smoke outside the room which is still included in the transportation department office area, as follows: “If I judge (Paused for a moment due to network interference), it means that the success rate according to us is the success rate of this smoke-free regional regulation, employees do not smoke in air-conditioned rooms, they smoke outside the room. It just so happens that the condition of our office is not too big, so it is easier to smoke outside, the proof is that they don't smoke in the air-conditioned room” (A).

### **Efficiency**

Some of the efforts that have been made by the Health Office in implementing KTR itself are expected to produce benefits for the common good including producing clean air, increasing awareness in people who smoke to see more places when they want to smoke, this was conveyed by the Health Office Staff as follows: “... now there is a sense of shame to smoke in the office and then every guest who comes because there is a marker area in front of the door, immediately put out the cigarette. So, specifically, it appears that if there are notices in certain places, people will oh, here you can't smoke.” (LPD)

The Pariaman City Health Office hopes that the policies they make can produce a good efficiency value, seeing from some of the efforts that the health office has made so far. A similar hope is also wanted to be felt by fellow employees of the transportation department of the city of Pariaman as explained by one of the informants Mr. RE as follows: “the first thing is the comfort of working, calmer, like not being disturbed by cigarette smoke, better air, good for children for employees too” (RA). But on the other hand, they also know that so far the desired expectations have not been maximized, seeing from the efforts of the employees themselves in implementing the KTR policy: “but from this expectation, it remains in reality that smoking employees apply it only indoors, outside the room they still smoke” (RE). Some of the efforts that have been made are good enough to support the expectations of this KTR policy to be achieved, but seeing from the results this situation is not efficient enough because the benefits obtained at this time are not in accordance with the efforts that have been made.

### **Adequacy**

Adequacy looks at the relationship between a policy and the expected results, adequacy looks at how far the achievement of the desired results in the implementation of the smoke-free area policy in Pariaman City and the Transportation Agency has been considered sufficient in several efforts made since the KTR policy was implemented, in accordance with the statement explained by the head of the health department, as follows: “In terms of this application, the results that we get are that until now, yes, and the last monitoring of the implementation of the KTR, there is no longer what ... cigarette advertisements in these KTR places. It becomes a ... that there is no evidence in these KTR places that we made this ... banners, billboards, that this place is not allowed to smoke. So it is an instrument in terms of, a document in terms of assessing the city of Pariaman or a healthy city, so that the achievement of the city of Pariaman is increasing. (RA)

It is indeed quite difficult to implement this KTR policy in office areas, not like health facilities such as hospitals, if in office places there are more employees who smoke. This is supported by the following statement from the Health Office Staff: “Then there are several offices, it's not bad, the implementation, for example the Education Office, PKK, it has implemented. about 30-40% of it has implemented at the socialization stage. Especially for offices, institutions, workplaces that are mostly women, we quickly embrace them. If there are many men, like SAPOPP, it is a bit difficult, because there on average, if there are many women, the awareness is quite good. Okay, good. That means for the whole is around 30-40%, ma'am? Yes, around 30-40% yes. For office places, yes” (LPD)

In office areas, it can only cover 30-40% for awareness raising, especially offices where the majority of employees are male, such as the transportation department, where the majority of employees are male.

### **Equity**

Evaluation of the implementation of the Regional Regulation of Pariaman City Number 9 of 2017 concerning Smokefree Areas in Pariaman City in terms of leveling, where this policy has been socialized in offices and schools, but the implementation of this policy is still not optimal, but from several monitoring times there have been changes from previous monitoring, in accordance with the information submitted by informants from the Pariaman City Health Office, namely the Head of P2P. “For the initial stage, we conducted socialization starting from schools, then to office institutions, as well as to the community. So, for socialization we go into all aspects related to the implementation of the temparoko area itself. This means that all places that are considered places that must later make it a smoke-free area, we do socialization.” (LPD).

While evaluating the leveling at the Pariaman City Transportation Office, where the implementation of this policy has been socialized to all employees, but in terms of benefits it has not been evenly distributed because many employees are not compliant, who still smoke indoors according to information from Pariaman City Transportation Office employees. "For all staff yes and especially the men. So far, maybe not all of them have felt it because many who still smoke are not obedient" (RE).

### **Responsiveness**

With regard to how far a policy can satisfy the needs, preferences or values of groups in a particular society or commonly called responsiveness, researchers get information that there is still dissatisfaction because there are still many who violate policies including at the Transportation Office, but there has been a slight change for the better, especially for the Head of Service who directly provides an example of implementing this KTR policy, so that employees do not feel burdened to participate in implementing the policy. In addition, cigarettes have also not become the main sponsor of tourism activities or other activities in Pariaman City according to the results of the interview: "Not too satisfied, yes. as I explained earlier. But actually to succeed this KTR policy, it still has to be built on the awareness of each person if they don't comply, it's the same" (RA), "In general, there is, we can say that this provides a good thing from what we do. In this case there are several obstacles such as for example ehh...from the tourism office or the finance agency, because they expect that in tourist attractions or in places with a big influence on the image, cigarettes are not much of a main sponsor in terms of tourism activities or other activities" (RA).

### **DISCUSSION**

We found that the implementation of KTR at the Pariaman City Transportation Office is still not effective, as seen from the fact that there are still employees who do not comply with the smoking ban. this is due to the lack of socialization and monitoring from both the Health Office and the Pariaman City Transportation Office. Monitoring requires monitoring tools to guide the work of the Task Force. The monitoring tools include indicators of compliance with the KTR, namely: the presence or absence of a 'no smoking' sign in the KTR; whether or not people are smoking in places designated as KTRs; whether or not there is a designated smoking area in the building; whether or not there are cigarette promotion/advertising signs in the KTR; whether or not there are cigarette sales in the KTR; the presence/absence of ashtrays and/or smoking support facilities in the KTR; whether or not there is an odour of cigarettes in the KTR; whether or not there are cigarette butts in the KTR (4). Another study found that the obstacles in achieving the effectiveness of this KTR policy were conflicts of interest in policy implementation, lack of monitoring and evaluation, and misunderstanding of 'enclosed areas' as smoke-free areas (5). In addition, the No Smoking Area ( KTR ) policy in Medan City has not yet implemented the concept of KTR, especially in relation to the prohibition of cigarette advertising which has not been fully implemented, the prohibition of cigarette advertising in KTR locations has only been implemented in educational institutions and offices such as banks and plazas (6).

Efficiency of KTR implementation policy includes the utilisation of budget, human resources, and the achievement of the objectives of the KTR policy. The implementation of a smoke-free policy demonstrates significant cost-effectiveness both in the short term and long term by reducing healthcare expenses, mitigating the risks associated with tobacco-related illnesses, and promoting overall well-being among individuals (7). At the Pariaman City Transportation Office, the implementation of the KTR policy is still not efficient enough. Although the National Health Office of Pariaman City has made efforts such as socialisation in several places, there are several obstacles in the efficient implementation of the policy. seen from the lack of facilities in the form of no smoking signs in office areas and the absence of special rooms for smoking, so smoker employees are still free to smoke. Previous researchers have assessed implementation fidelity using four key factors: reach, dosage and delivery, mechanisms of change and the context of the intervention components. Apart from compliance issues, the policy component had high implementation fidelity. However, the implementation fidelity of the smoking cessation support component was low. They identified three social mechanisms that influenced employees' response to the policy: expectations, social aspects of the smoking facility, and management leadership (8). These findings are also consistent with research in university settings that found lower support for smoke-free campus policies among tobacco users and lower knowledge of policies, compliance and enforcement among non-tobacco users compared to tobacco users (9).

From the side of adequacy, the reality in the field is different from the expectations of the transportation department employees themselves, and the expectations of the health department, in the transportation department office itself there are still employees who smoke carelessly, do not comply with the no smoking sign in the transportation department office area, there are still some cigarette butts scattered in the work area. In terms of influential factors, 'available resources' and 'knowledge and beliefs about the intervention' were most commonly reported for barriers, and 'relative priority' for facilitators. Implementation

strategies were measured and 'training and education of stakeholders' was most commonly reported (10). Because its implementation has not been effective and efficient, the No Smoking Area policy at the Pariaman City Transportation Office is still unequal. To improve the equality of no smoking area policy implementation, interventions such as raising workers' awareness of the risks associated with secondhand smoker exposure through health education and developing smoking prevention and cessation programs to reduce secondhand smoker exposure in the workplace are urgently needed (11). The government's capacity to ensure the equitable implementation of No Smoking Area (KTR) policies is crucial for fostering a safe environment and maintaining clean air quality for everyone.

## CONCLUSION

Implementation of the No Smoking Area (KTR) at the Office of the National Transportation Agency of Pariaman City is still not going well, communication related to socialization and monitoring between the Health Office and the National Transportation Agency is not in sync and sanctions against violators of this regulation are still not firm. Effectiveness and efficiency in implementation are also considered insufficient because there are still staff who smoke in the office area and lack of self-awareness to comply with the KTR policy. In terms of adequacy, the implementation of the KTR policy in the office of the National Transportation Agency of Pariaman city is not satisfactory because the application in the field is still not effective and efficient. In terms of equity, socialization is evenly distributed, but still uneven in its application. This policy certainly shows the responsiveness of the government in creating a safe environment from cigarette smoke for the community, although its implementation is still not optimal. The implementation of a smoke-free area policy can be reinforced if the program is effectively promoted and well-coordinated across multiple sectors (12). Strengthening communication, collaboration, and outreach among sectors is essential to establish smoke-free areas. Additionally, enhancing the government's role in enforcing smoke-free regulations is important for creating a supportive and conducive work environment.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Pariaman City Health Office needs to conduct an evaluation related to the implementation of the KTR Policy in Pariaman city, conduct socialization again, coordinate across sectors, and disseminate health promotion media in places that are included in the No Smoking Area (KTR). The Pariaman City Transportation Agency also needs to re-socialize this KTR Policy in the office environment so as to increase the awareness of everyone who works there.

## REFERENCES

- World Health Organization. Mortality and Global Health Estimate [Internet]. 2022. Available from: <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death>
- WHO. Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) Indonesia Report 2021 [Internet]. World Health Organization. Country Office for Indonesia; 2023. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/378343>
- Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Sumatera Barat. Persentase Penduduk Usia 15 Tahun Ke Atas yang Merokok dalam Sebulan Terakhir Menurut Kabupaten/Kota dan Kelompok Umur di Provinsi Sumatera Barat [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://sumbar.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/3/ZGxsdU15dEtNWepNYmpCSUyVkdaRnBpVkv0dVFUMDkjMw==/persentase-penduduk-usia-15-tahun-ke-atas-yang-merokok-dalam-sebulan-terakhir-menurut-kabupaten-kota-dan-kelompok-umur-di-provinsi-sumatera-barat--2023.html?year=2021>
- Qudus H, Hadi EN. Overview of the Implementation of the No Smoking Area (KTR) Policy in the Indonesian Campus Environment: Literature Review. *J Soc Res.* 2023;2(6):1916–28.
- Sufri S, Nurhasanah N, Ahsan A, Saputra I, Jannah M, Yeni CM, et al. Barriers and opportunities for improving smoke-free area implementation in Banda Aceh city, Indonesia: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open.* 2023;13(12):1–13.
- Siregar PA. Monitoring and Evaluation of Smoke Free Policy in Medan City: Case Study of Medan City. *J Ilm Permas J Ilm STIKES Kendal.* 2023;13(1):67–76.
- McMeekin N, Wu O, Boyd KA, Brown A, Tweed EJ, Best C, et al. Implementation of a national smoke-free prison policy: An economic evaluation within the Tobacco in Prisons (TIPs) study. *Tob Control.* 2023;32(6):701–8.
- Rasmussen SKB, Lidegaard LL, Pisinger C, Johnsen NF, Kristiansen M. Implementation fidelity of a smoke-free workplace intervention in a private medical company: A mixed-methods process evaluation. *Tob Prev Cessat.* 2023;9(May):1–13.
- Al-Jayyousi G, Kurdi R, Alsaedi S, Al-Kaabi H, Alrushdi A, Abdul Rahim H. Students' perceptions of a university 'No Smoking' policy and barriers to implementation: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11(6).

- Nagasawa T, Saito J, Odawara M, Kaji Y, Yuwaki K, Imamura H, et al. Smoking cessation interventions and implementations across multiple settings in Japan: a scoping review and supplemental survey. *Implement Sci Commun* [Internet]. 2023;4(1):1–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-023-00517-0>
- Jia X, Wang R, Qiu X, Huang Y, Wang Y, Jia X, et al. Factors associated with secondhand smoke exposure among non-smoking employees in the workplace: A cross-sectional study in Qingdao, China. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2022;17(8 August):1–12. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263801>
- Noviana N, Maulana AZ, Nisa LS. The Role of Government in Enforcing Smoking Policies in The Workplace: A Case Study. *Partners Univers Int Res J*. 2022;1(3):20–5.