

## RESOURCE AND BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE ASPECT IN REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION NUMBER 10 OF 2013 CONCERNING SMOKING AREA WITHOUT CIGARETTES IN HIGH SCHOOLS OF PANGKEP REGENCY

**Khumairah<sup>1</sup>, Amran Razak<sup>2</sup>, Syamsuar<sup>3</sup>, Darmawansyah<sup>2</sup>, Sukri<sup>2</sup> & Aminuddin Syam<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Student of the Department of Administration and Health Policy, Faculty of Community Wealth, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, **INDONESIA**

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer at the Department of Health Policy and Administration, Faculty of Community Wealth, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, **INDONESIA**

<sup>3</sup> Lecturer at the Department of Environmental Health, Faculty of Community Weaknesses, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, **INDONESIA**

<sup>4</sup> Lecturer at the Department of Nutrition, Faculty of Community Wealth, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, **INDONESIA**

### ABSTRACT

Smoking habit is widespread in almost all circles of society. Regional Regulation No. 10 of 2013 concerning No Smoking Area (KTR) is expected to reduce or even eliminate smoking habits from the community in Pangkep Regency especially in the educational environment. This study aims to determine the implementation of regional regulation No. 10 of 2013 concerning No Smoking Areas in Pangkep Regency High School in the aspects of resources and bureaucratic structure. This type of research is a qualitative descriptive approach to explore phenomena and information regarding the implementation of no-smoking area regulations through in-depth interviews, observation, and FGDs. The results showed that the ineffective implementation of regional regulation No. 10 of 2013 concerning No Smoking Areas in Pangkep Regency High School in the aspect of resources caused by the absence of specific human resources engaged in the sector of policy oversight, the allocation of budget resources have not been available in schools while the facilities and infrastructure as KTR supporting resources such as banners, stickers, and posters are not available. installed still not effective. Implementation of KTR in the structure aspect of the bureaucracy is constrained by the division of authority and SOP that have not yet been formed.

**Keywords:** Implementation, No Smoking Area, Cigarettes, Bureaucratic Structure, Resources.

### INTRODUCTION

Smoking habit is widespread in almost all circles of society. In Indonesia, smoking habits tend to increase among children and adolescents due to the incessant promotion of cigarettes in various mass media. The problem of smoking is becoming more serious, considering that smoking has the risk of causing disease, both for smokers themselves and others (passive smokers). In addition, smoking causes many losses in terms of economic and health resulting in death (Ministry of Health, 2011). Other losses arising from smoking are increasing the proportion of diseases such as hypertension, stroke, diabetes, heart disease, cancer (UGM, 2018). children who are exposed to secondhand smoke can have an increased risk of developing bronchitis, pneumonia, sensory infection of the middle hearing, asthma, and slow growth of the lungs (Ministry of Health, 2011).

WHO in 2008 noted that Indonesia ranked third in the five largest smokers in the world after China, India, Russia, and the United States. The United States managed to reduce the number of smokers in the country while Indonesia continued to increase. Based on 2018 Riskesdas data, the prevalence of smokers over the age of 10 years in Indonesia, especially in South Sulawesi is in the national data range of 28.8% and based on data from the Pangkep District Health Office the number of active smokers in the working area of Pangkajene City Health Center is 2.743 people (Pangkep Health Office, 2019).

Various efforts have been made to overcome the problem of smoking. One of them with the strategy offered by the World Health Organization is 6 MPOWER "Cost-Effective" Policy Intervention Packages to control cigarette consumption, one of which is protection against exposure to cigarette smoke. protection of exposure to cigarette smoke is able to effectively if 100% of the implementation of a Smoking Area (Rifqi, 2017).

Although Indonesia has not ratified the FCTC (Framework Convention on Tobacco Control) efforts to protect healthy people by the existence of Minister of Health regulation No. 7 of 2011. Considering, the issuance of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 36 of 2009 concerning Health. South Sulawesi Regional Regulation (PERDA) No.1 Year 2015 and Pangkep Regency Regional Regulation No.10 Year 2013 concerning No-Smoking Areas (KTR). The No Smoking Area referred to in the Regional Regulation includes places for teaching and learning.

Various studies have been carried out related to the No Smoking Area (KTR) policy including inhibiting and supporting factors for KTR (Taruna, 2016), aspects of KTR implementation (Ikhsan, 2015; Rifqi, 2017; Farahdina & Emmy, 2016; Monica, 2017; Mua et al, 2016; Sandi, 2019). Aspect of perception Khan (2016), aspects of the effectiveness of promotional media Purwadi et al, (2019), aspects of knowledge and attitudes Putra and Sutarga (2015) but it is still very rare to find research that focuses on the implementation of KTR in the education area especially in Pangkep Regency. From this, this study seeks to examine the implementation of Regional Regulation No.10 of 2013 concerning No-Smoking Areas in Pangkep Regency High School which is within the working area of the Pangkajene city health center on the aspects of resources and bureaucratic structure.

## **METHODS**

This research was carried out in Pangkep Regency by focusing on locations in SMAN 1 Pangkep, SMAN 11 Pangkep, Muhammadiyah Pangkep High School, and SMK 7 Pangkep. This type of research is qualitative with a descriptive approach to explore phenomena and information regarding the implementation of the No Smoking Area (KTR) regulations in high schools in Pangkep Regency through in-depth interviews and continuous observation during the research (Sugiyono, 2018; Martha, 2017; Creswell, 2012).

Data collection through informants was carried out using purposive sampling techniques, the number of informants in this study were 19 people. Data analysis was performed using Miles & Huberman interactive analysis techniques in the interactive model of data analysis techniques there are three stages, as follows Sugiyono (2018) data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Resource Aspect

Variables that influence implementation in a policy are resources. Resources regarding the availability of supporting resources, it requires clarity and consistency in carrying out a policy implementation. If the responsibility holders who implement the policies are less responsible for doing the work effectively, then the policy implementation will not be effective, the sources that will support effective policies consist of (Agustino, 2008) (Winarno, 2012): (1) staff, the main resource in policy implementation is the staff. One of the failures that often occur in implementation is one of which is caused by insufficient, inadequate or incompetent staff in their field. Increasing the number of staff and implementers is not enough, but it also requires adequate staffing and the expertise and ability needed to implement the policy or carry out the tasks desired by a policy. (2) Information is an important source in policy implementation. Information in resources is information that is owned by human resources to carry out predetermined policies. Information to implement the policy here is all information in written form or messages, guidelines, instructions, and procedures for the purpose of implementing the policy. (3) Authority, in general authority, must be formal in order for an order to be carried out. The authority possessed by resources in implementing a policy that has been determined. Authority is related to the thing mandated in a policy. (4) Facilities and infrastructure, all of which are available for the implementation of a policy and are used to support it directly.

### Aspects of Bureaucratic Structure

Bureaucratic structure has a significant influence on policy implementation. In accordance with the suitability of public organizations, the challenge is how to prevent "bureaucratic appreciation" because the structure makes the implementation process much more effective (Ayuningtyas, 2018). Although the resources to implement a policy are sufficient and the implementors already know and what and how to do it, and have the desire, policy implementation can be an effective problem, because there are inefficient bureaucratic structures that exist. Complex policies according to the cooperation of many people. The bureaucracy as the executor of a policy must be able to support policies that have been politically decided by clearly coordinating well.

According to George C. Edward III, there are two characteristics that can boost the work of the bureaucratic structure in a better direction, namely through the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and implementing fragmentation (Winarno, 2012). (1) Procedural Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), that is, all routine activities that will be carried out by implementing implementers every day in each activity that is regulated from established standards (2) Fragmentation, namely the distribution of authority responsibilities given to policy implementers in carrying out tasks.

Resources regarding the availability of supporting resources, especially human resources related to the ability to implement public policies to carry out policies effectively (Ayuningtyas, 2018). Every policy implementation has implications for the cost, energy, and other resource needs. The amount of resources needed depends on the choice of program actions to be implemented in order to meet the needs or overcome the policy problem (Winengen, 2017).

Resources include several resources used to support the successful implementation of policies, namely (Dachi, 2017): (1) Human Resources (Staff), the implementation of policies will not succeed without the support of adequate human resources both in quality and

quantity. The quality of human resources is related to skills, dedication, professionalism, and competence in their fields. Quantity is related to whether the amount of human resources is sufficient to cover the entire target group. Human resources are very influential on the success of implementation, because, without reliable human resources, the implementation of a policy will run slowly starting from the budget, facilities, information and authority (Grizzle & Pettijohn, 2002; Ssenooba et al., 2007)

Based on the results of interviews with members of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) Commission II of Pangkep Regency, information was obtained that the formation of a special task force for a No Smoking Area in Pangkep Regency was based on Perda No. 10 of 2013 Article 15 paragraph 4. The results of in-depth interviews and FGDs conducted at schools found that there were not enough resources available to implement the No Smoking Area. The absence of human resources has become a special supervisory team, organizational and institutional. Implementers of the No Smoking Area (KTR) supervision are all parties in the school environment including students, teachers, and also all people who are in the school environment. In addition, there is no specific allocation of funds from either the government or from schools in relation to the No Smoking Area budget. If funds are needed for the implementation of KTR by schools, the budget is sourced from the results of sanctions against violations of KTR regulations in schools.

Research conducted by Marchel (2019) shows that human resources are considered to be essential in the successful implementation and enforcement of policies with cross-sectoral cooperation making the implementation of KTR in schools better. The results of research conducted by (P. Ay, 2016) say that an important component for enforcing a smoke-free policy is determining the allocation of resources in law enforcement as well as fines for violators of these rules.

Perda No. 10 of 2013 concerning no-smoking zones article 4-7 states that local governments provide information media such as advertisements about KTR, hotlines, and service posts. Observation results show that there are information boards and banners smoking bans in the school environment. The information media in the form of advertisements, hotlines, and service posts were not found.

According to the Ministry of Health KTR Development Guidelines (2011). Implementing the policy, at the school that is all school residents must have guidelines that contain information on how to apply KTR in schools. Schools must fulfill several things in order to be able to implement KTR effectively. Among other things, adequate infrastructure and infrastructure for the implementation of KTR such as writing, posters, and banners smoking bans.

Based on the results of the study, it can be seen that those targeted in the implementation of the no-smoking area policy are in accordance with Perda No. 10 of 2013 concerning No Smoking Areas namely human resources (HR) in SMAN 1 Pangkep, SMAN 11 Pangkep, SMA Muhammadiyah Pangkep, and SMKN 7 Pangkep, all within the school environment from school leaders to students. But the human resources do not yet have KTR implementation guidelines. There is no direct awareness from the school to make the division of authority at school. In addition to human resources, no less important is the availability of non-human resources such as non-smoking area facilities that support the effectiveness of the implementation of policies in schools according to Regional Regulation No. 10 of 2013 in article 12 which requires the existence of signs/instructions for smoking prohibitions in places that are easily seen in special locations without smoking areas including banners with

a minimum size of 20X30 cm that reads "No-Smoking Areas" and there are signs of smoking prohibitions in the teacher's room, classroom and on the walls of the classroom in order to streamline KTR No. 10 of 2013 at a high school in Pangkep Regency.

Bureaucracy is an institution that has a great ability to move the organization as the executor of a policy must be able to support the policies that have been decided, by conducting good coordination. The policy implementers can know what needs to be done, have the desire and support for the facilities to do it, but in the end, can not do anything because it is blocked by the organizational structure. Weaknesses in the bureaucratic structure can result in failure of policy implementation. When the bureaucratic structure is not conducive, this will hamper policy implementation. There are two characteristics that are able to influence a bureaucratic structure towards better, namely by doing Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and carrying out fragmentation. SOP is a guideline developed to provide standards for every work carried out by members of an institution or organization in an effort to maximize the implementation of a predetermined policy. While fragmentation is a division of tasks or responsibilities to members in several positions that have been determined (Hutahayan, 2019). Bureaucratic structures that are too long and fragmented will tend to weaken supervision and cause complicated and complex bureaucracy that will cause organizational activities to become inflexible (Dachi, 2017).

Based on the results of interviews, it was obtained that most of the bureaucratic structure of the implementation of the no-smoking area (KTR) did not have its own structure. BK (Counseling Guidance) has a role in coaching students, besides that there is no division of authority over the supervision of a non-smoking area, SOP for the implementation of a No-Smoking Area (KTR) does not exist specifically, the working group for the implementation of a No-Smoking Zone (KTR) does not exist specifically, all involved in the implementation of the No Smoking Area (KTR).

Research result (Javid, 2016) shows that of the 16 campuses surveyed, smokers were still found in 12 campuses that smoked in the canteen area, sports hall, and garden). Even cigarettes are sold within a radius of five hundred meters from the main door. Strict monitoring efforts are needed through the formation of committees / working groups to oversee the implementation of KTR policies. The involvement of various parties in policy implementation aims to equalize perceptions and determine the role that can be carried out by each sector in the determination of KTR. The existence of a committee or working group is expected to make plans and provide input related to the implementation of policies, determine the person in charge, and discuss ways of effective socialization for all people in the environment. (Free, 2009). Cross-sectoral collaboration, government, and community participation are principles for the implementation of healthy cities. Every plan that involves collaboration across sectors, government, and the community in making decisions about public health and the environment will have an impact on the quality of life of the population in each local government (Batara, 2018).

Research conducted by Zismeda 2015 related to the implementation of the Medan City Regulation on KTR in Gajah Mada High School showed that the results of the bureaucratic structure played an important role, but in Gajah Mada High School it did not run effectively. According to the Ministry of Health's KTR Development Guidelines (2011), schools should fulfill several things in order to be able to implement KTR effectively, namely forming a KTR committee or working group to formulate KTR policies in schools, in which the KTR committee or working group will be formed by KTR supervisors who directly oversee the

implementation of KTR school. Based on the KTR supervision activities, monitoring and evaluation of the application of KTR can be carried out.

Measures of success or failure of a policy are largely determined at the time of policy implementation. At this stage problems that are sometimes unpredictable will arise. In addition, the main threat to a policy is consistency in implementation. Implementation must be done carefully because the results of the implementation of government performance can be assessed and get feedback on whether the policy needs to be revised or not (Dachi, 2017).

Based on various studies and realities in the field, there are several lessons that can be drawn from the success of a policy, including (Dachi, 2017): (1) Implementation will be disrupted, if a policy is designed not based on a strong and clear framework and theoretical references, implementation must be made a clear correlation between policies so that the desired consequences are also clear. (2) Implementation of a policy will fail if too many institutions play a role. (3) Policy socialization to policy implementers is very important because it will greatly affect the success of implementation. (4) Continuous policy evaluation (monitoring) of a policy is crucial because a policy will evolve to be good and efficient if there is a continuous and continuous evaluation. (5) To succeed well, policymakers must pay equal attention to the implementation and formulation of policies. (6) Public policy in Indonesia is mostly focused on how public policy is made, not on how policy implementation is managed and monitored properly.

## CONCLUSION

The implementation of No Smoking Areas in SMA (High School) in Pangkep Regency has not been effective. This is due to the aspects of resources and structure of the bureaucracy that have not been met in accordance with the standards stipulated by Regional Regulation No.10 of 2013. In the aspect of Resources implementation of KTR (No Smoking Area) especially in HR and funding is not yet available while other resources that support KTR such as smoking ban boards, banners , stickers and posters installed are available but not yet effective. In the aspect of bureaucratic structure the ineffective implementation of KTR in high schools in Pangkep Regency is due to the division of authority and KTR SOPs in schools have not yet been formed.

## REFERENCES

- Agustino, L. (2008). *Dasar-Dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Ayuningtyas, D. (2018). *Analisis Kebijakan Kesehatan*. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Batara. (2018). *Healthy Setting Ruang Publik Perkotaan*. Makassar: CV Sosial Politic Genius (SIGn).
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Plening, Conductiong and Evaluating Quantitatif and Qualitatif Reseach*. Boston: Boston Person.
- Dachi, R. (2017). *Proses dan Analisis Kebijakan Kesehatan*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Pangkep. (2019). *Profil Kesehatan Kabupaten Pangkep*. Kabupaten Pangkep, Dinas Kesehatan.
- Free, G. S. (2009). *Smokefree Air Law Enforcement*. Washinton DC: Global Smokefree Partnership.
- Grizzle, G. A., & Pettijohn, C. D. (2002). Implementing performance-based program budgeting: a system-dynamics perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 62(1), 51-62.

- Hutahayan, J. F. (2019). *Informasi & Kinerja Pelayanan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Ikhsan, M. R. (2015). Implementasi Peraturan Daerah Nomor 15 Tahun 2011 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Kota Payakumbuh . *JOM FISIP*, 1-10.
- Javid, A. K. (2016). *Tobacco Control Laws in Pakistan and Their Implementation*. Pakistan: A Pilot Study in Karachi.
- Marchel, Y. A. (2019). Implementasi Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Sebagai Pencegahan Merokok Pada Remaja Awal. *Jurnal Promkes: The Indonesian Journal of Health Promotion and Health Education*, 7(2), 144-155.
- Martha, K. (2017). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Untuk Bidang Kesehatan*. Depok : Raja Grafindo Persada
- Ministry of Health. (2011). *Guidelines for the Development of No-Smoking Areas*. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Mua, E., Sudirman, & Kadri, A. (2018). *Implementasi Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Sigi Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) di Puskesmas Kulawi*. Fakultas Kesehatan Masyarakat Universitas Palu
- Ay, P., Evrengil, E., Guner, M., & Dagli, E. (2016). Noncompliance to smoke-free law: which hospitality premises are more prone?. *Public Health*, 141, 1-6.
- Monica, R. (2017). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Kota Yogyakarta. *Adinegara*, 6(2), 129-140.
- Pangkep Health Office. (2019). *Profil Kesehatan Kabupaten Pangkep*. Kabupaten Pangkep: Dinas Kesehatan.
- Rifqi, A. I. (2017). *Implementasi Peraturan Daerah Kota Makassar Nomor 4 Tahun 2013 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Universitas Hasanuddin*. Universitas Hasanuddin, 11.
- Sandi, K. (2019). *Implementasi Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) Pada Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA) di Kecamatan Mariso Kota Makassar*. UIN Alauddin Makassar, 12.
- Farahdina, K. C., & Emmy, R. (2016). Analisis Implementasi Peraturan Daerah Kota Semarang Nomor 3 Tahun 2013 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Kantor Kelurahan Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 4 Nomor 3.
- Ssengooba, F., Rahman, S. A., Hongoro, C., Rutebemberwa, E., Mustafa, A., Kielmann, T., & McPake, B. (2007). Health sector reforms and human resources for health in Uganda and Bangladesh: mechanisms of effect. *Human resources for health*, 5(1), 1-13.
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Alfabeta*.
- Taruna, Z. (2016). Implementasi kebijakan kawasan tanpa rokok di SMA Gajah Mada Yogyakarta. *Spektrum Analisis Kebijakan Pendidikan*, 5(6), 567-577.
- UGM. (2018). *Jumah Perokok Indonesia diatas 15 Tahun Tinggi*. Yogyakarta: UGM.
- Winarno. (2012). *Kebijakan Publik: Teori, Proses dan Studi Kasus*. Yogyakarta: CAPS.
- Winengan, W. (2017). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Asap Rokok Di Kota Mataram. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu dan Praktek Administrasi*, 14(1), 1-16.