

The Evaluation on the Impact of Semarang Local Regulation Number 03 of 2013 Policy on "Other Groups"

Dyah Hariani^{1*} Mochammad Yoga Rifai²

^{1,2} *Public Administration Department, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Central Java 1269, Indonesia*

^{*}*Corresponding author. Email: dyahhariani@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Smoking behavior is a behavior that can harm others; it is one of the reasons why some regional has ‘non-smoking areas’ regulation to minimize the negative impact of this behavior. Semarang is one of the regional having ‘non-smoking areas’ regulation stipulated in the Local Government Regulations of Semarang City No. 3 of 2013 about the region without smoking, but the implementation encountered several problems especially related to the Low level of Community discipline in complying with it. This research aims to analyze the impact of the non-smoking areas regulation on “Other Groups” in Manyaran Public Health. This study is a descriptive qualitative research, the data of which were derived from interviews, observations, documentation, and library studies. The results showed that the impact of the policy on "other groups" can be seen from 3 (three) aspects: (1) support aspect: the Community supports positive policies and the adoption of a non-smoking area policy in the Community space, (2) social aspect: the environment becomes more comfortable and brings healthier interaction into the community, (3) perspective: the public is known to see that smoking is unhealthy behavior and tends to suggest that smokers should be able to minimize the negative impact of it on them. The advice that can be given in this case is that the Manyaran Public Health is necessary to increase socialization and mentoring conducted to optimize the implementation of ‘non- smoking areas’ regulation

Keywords: *Policy impact, evaluation, local government regulations, non-smoking areas, other groups*

1. INTRODUCTION

Smoking behavior is known as one of an unworthiness behavior because the smokers oftentimes do smoking at every turn regardless the people around them. Smoking activities cause people around the smokers feel discomfort. This seems to be a common problem in our community these days. Cigarette smoke along with the adverse effects in it would be risky to some people’s conditions. In order to rectify the problem of it, the government, as a stakeholder who is responsible for creating a regulation that regulates the social condition of community, should try to minimize the negative effects of cigarette smoke by making a regulation that prohibits the smoking activities in the public places. It is known as ‘non- smoking areas’ regulation. The ‘non-smoking area’ policy in Semarang City is governed by the local regulations of Semarang City number 03 of 2013 about the area without smoking. This

Regulation regulates some places constructed without smoking areas or areas where smokers are not allowed to do smoking activities. Prohibition of smoking in the area that has been designated as a non-smoking area is backed by the existence of data from the Jakarta Health office showing that in 2019, 47.14% of Semarang city population has a living pattern as a smoker.

The implementation of Semarang local regulation number 03 of 2013 about the area without smoking runs into several obstacles. These obstacles can be seen from the individuals’ low awareness of compliance or discipline, it is evidenced by the violation of health officers at Karyadi Hospital arrested by civil service police Unit and the enforcement of smoking violations in Semarang City Hall being spotlight in the media of the year 2018[1]. Other issues arising in the implementation of the non-smoking area regulation or policy are the limited operational funds, the installation constraints of the Board,

the lack of intensive counseling related to the non-smoking area in the Semarang city, and the absence of a special supervision team who supervising the implementation of this policy in the field [2]. All of the obstacles proved that the implementation of non-smoking area policy has not been optimal yet. For this study, it is interesting to investigate the implementation of non-smoking area policy in Semarang City in depth. With this aim in mind, in this paper the researcher chooses Manyaran Public Health Center as a locus. The locus selection is based on the determination of Manyaran Public Health Center as a pilot Public health center based on the Health Minister Decree number SK 01.07/Menteri/636/2018 about Public health center as a pilot. This research will focus on the impact of non-smoking area policy for other group in Manyaran Public Health Center.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Public Administration

Public administration, according to Nicholas Henry[3], is a complex mixing between theory and practice with the intention of promoting understanding of government roles as community servants and making policies more suited to people's needs. Its definition carries on the dimensions of public management and public policy, constituting a branch of science in the public administration that cannot be detached from one another.

2.2 Public Policy

Public policy, according to Mac Rae and Wilde [4], is an action chosen by the Government and has an important influence on a large number of people. It led to an understanding that the public policy regarding the government's arrangements to create a life better due to the nature of binding policies has specific objectives and most importantly the public interest.

2.3 Policy Evaluation

Policy evaluation is conducted to determine the level of performance of a policy in terms of achieving the objectives and objectives of the policy, in addition to taking the policy efficiency into account. The evaluation of the policy in this case is also done with the purpose of measuring the output quality or output produced, at a later stage the evaluated policy also measures the resulting impact, from both the positive and negative sides

The evaluation of policy in terms of impact can be known from Leo Augustine [5]'s approach:

- a) Dimensions of main subject.

- b) Dimension to other situations and groups.
- c) Time dimension.
- d) Cost dimensions.

Langbein [6] explains that in the most noteworthy impacts are:

- a) Time.
- b) Impact relationships with potential impacts.
- c) Level are garage impact.
- d) The types of impact of the program or policy impact.
- e) The social units affected.

The impact in public policy evaluation, according to Dye [7], can be seen from some indicators or dimensions that need to be considered:

- a) Impact of a situation or group of targets.
- b) Impact of policy on other situations or groups.
- c) The impact of policy on current conditions and future conditions.
- d) Direct cost of a policy.
- e) Indirect benefits.

3. METHODS

This study described the impact of 'non-smoking area' policy on other group in Manyaran Public Health Center. For its case, qualitative method was essential [8]. The data were collected through interviews, observation & documentation methods. The informants in this study was chosen through purposive sampling technique, in which the data is sorted by the consideration and the types of data source in this research were primary data and secondary data[9]. The data analysis used in this research involved data reduction, data presentation and conclusion withdrawing [10]. Therefore, for the data validation, this study used triangulation method.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Other groups of policy, according to Dye [7] are the outer group of policy which can be understood as a policy's external effect. Moreover, other groups of policy are not considered as the primary goal of a policy. Notwithstanding in this case they are still affected by policy either directly or indirectly. Other groups of policy based on the impact of the implementation of the regional

regulation of Semarang No. 03 of 2013 about the area without smoking is interesting to be examined. Ordinarily many implementations of non-smoking area cases just focus on the policy target or the smokers. Conversely, this policy affects not only one subject, but also the other subject.

In a non-smoking area, there are other groups of people who are not smoking as well as people who are in the neighborhood of Manyaran Health Center. The impact of policy on other groups in this study can be seen from several aspects: support, social, and community's perspective, as presented below.

4.1 Aspect of support

Community support can be seen from people who are in Manyaran Public Health Center support the implementation of the area without smoking. In this aspect of support, it can be seen that, in fact, the community seeks to rebuke anyone violating the rules. The courage to rebuke can be seen as a result of Community's support to the district's 'zero smoking' policy. People are trying to reprimand anyone breaching the rule, and if they are unable to report to the officer, another option is to still enforce the regulations of the "zero smoking" area.

Moreover, another community supports can be seen from the implementation of 'non-smoking area' policy in their environment around the Manyaran Public Health Center. The community of Manyaran health centers in MMK (Village Community Discussion) agreed to implement a non-smoking area and did not provide cigarettes in every citizen meeting; this followed up the findings from Manyaran Public Health Center stating that cigarette problems are the main health issue in their area. The number of smokers recorded by Manyaran Public Health Center can be seen in the table below:

Table 1: The Number of Smokers based on the mapping results of Manyaran Public Health Center 2019

No	Village	The number of smokers
1.	Manyaran	1292
2.	Krapyak	782
3.	Kembangarum	2660

Sources: Manyaran Public Health Center, 2019

4.2 Aspect of Social

The social aspect in this study can be seen from how social communities change in relation to the comfort of social life as a result of the delivery of information on the hazard of smoking and the social space of community running. The result indicates the environment's level of comfort for them who do not smoke increasing. People who do not smoke feel more comfortable after this policy is implemented. This assumption relates to some smokers in a society who are aware that cigarettes are something useless to themselves and others. Notwithstanding, the provision of information about the danger of cigarettes and smoking prohibition conducted by the government is still less influential to non-smoking people.

4.3 Aspect of Perspective

The community has a negative perspective on the smokers and cigarettes all this time. They assumed that cigarette is something unworthy and they try to avoid it. Moreover, they assumed that the smokers who have active smoking behavior should be more aware by knowing when and where they will smoke, so that their smoking activities will not disturb others. The problems of smoking behavior should be returned to individual consciousness. Nevertheless, the reprimand given by non-smoking people to the smokers becomes more acceptable to society nowadays, particularly when they did it in non-smoking area. This effort is intended to make the smokers obey the rules and not to interfere with the nonsmoker's health. The result shows that people's perspective on the smokers began to change slightly. They do not blame the smokers but remind them to understand and to be more aware of smoking activities that can interfere with others.

Non-smoking area policy brings more savvy into non-smoking people and can warn others in order not to smoke. Moreover, caring for one another is important to the problem of cigarettes, recalling that quitting smoking is a choice of the smoking individual importantly to have a strong desire to stop, in addition to the comfort of the non-smoking one needed in such places as health centers, and the public health center is a place for people who need healthcare treatment.

5. CONCLUSION

Non-smoking area policy implementation in Manyaran public health center in regard to Other Groups is known to have some policy impacts. The analysis leads to the following conclusions:

5.1 Aspect of Support

The community showed that they support this policy, as can be seen from how they assumed that smoking is an undesired behavior and they also reprimand smokers who breach the rules. Then, the people around the Manyaran public health also implement the policy in their environment.

5.2 Aspect of Social

The people in society feel more comfortable because there is no cigarette smoked. notwithstanding the information that given by government is less understandable, but the social condition is getting better than before

5.3 Aspect of Perspective

The community views smoking activity as an unworthy behavior especially for our health. The society also has a new perspective that smoking is an individual choice; the most important thing is that they who do smoke should recognize when and where they will smoke. It is important to make the society aware, so that the impact of smoking can be minimized to the person in the vicinity.

This assumption might be addressed in the future studies. Moreover, the recommendations given by the researchers based on this conclusion are: (1) It should take more supportive socialization to develop more understanding and awareness of the danger that caused by cigarettes within community; (2) the government should monitor the implementation of non-smoking areas in public environment more seriously by doing it periodically. And (3) a healthy life campaign without cigarettes should be made by holding a race in the community environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by Public Administration Department, Social and Political Faculty Universitas Diponegoro and also Manyaran Public Health Center.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. A. Utama, "Ketahuan Merokok di Rumah Sakit, 12 ASN di Semarang Diciduk Satpol PP," *Merdeka.com*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.merdeka.com/peristiwa/ketahuan-merokok-di-rumah-sakit-12-asn-di-semarang-diciduk-satpol-pp.html>. Accessed: 09-Sep-2019].
- [2] P. Wulanningrum, E. Riyanti, and K. Cahyo, "Evaluasi Penerapan Kebijakan Peraturan Daerah Kota Semarang Nomor 3 Tahun 2013 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) Pada Program Studi Kesehatan Masyarakat Di Perguruan Tinggi Kota Semarang," *J. Kesehat. Masy. Univ. Diponegoro*, 2016.
- [3] H. Pasolong, *Teori Administrasi Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2007.
- [4] U. Suyatna, *Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Kencana Utama, 2009.
- [5] L. Agustino, *Dasar-Dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2016.
- [6] S. Anggara, *Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia, 2014.
- [7] Herabudin, *Studi Kebijakan Pemerintah Dari Filosofi ke Implementasi*. Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia, 2016.
- [8] B. Bungin, *Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2015.
- [9] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta, 2017.
- [10] P. Andi, *Metode Kualitatif Dalam Perspektif Rancangan Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Ar-ruzzmedia, 2012.