

# Compliance study of hotel and nightclub smoke-free zones in Bogor City, Indonesia

Al Asyary<sup>1,2</sup>, Meita Veruswati<sup>1,2</sup>

## Dear Editor

Indonesia is the largest of six developing countries that has not ratified the World Health Organization Framework Convention for Tobacco Control (WHO FCTC). However, local governments have established smoke-free zones (SFZs) in order to control tobacco use, as in Bogor City, a city of over 1 million people. Local regulation No.12 of 2009 was implemented in May 2010, and in 2011 Bogor City's Health Office released its monitoring and evaluation results with regard to compliance in smoke-free zones (SFZs)<sup>1,2</sup>.

Compliance to this local regulation was measured by eight indicators: 1) a no-smoking sign at the entrance gate, 2) no one found smoking inside the building's zones, 3) a no-smoking room within the building's zones, 4) no smoking equipment found such as ashtrays, 5) no smell of smoke, 6) no cigarette butts found inside the building's zones, 7) no one selling tobacco, and 8) no tobacco promotion on the premises<sup>1,3</sup>.

In the 2011 overall assessment, hotels and nightclubs were the only zones with poor compliance (below 80%)<sup>1</sup>. A previous study only describes hotel and nightclub compliance<sup>4</sup>. On the other hand, we conducted an observational study in 49 out of a total 71 hotels and nightclubs in Bogor City. For these 39 hotels and 10 entertainment outlets participants were selected by their willingness to participate, according to informed consent as ethical approval. For the hotels, a wide variety of zones were monitored, such as: the lobby, restaurant, waiting room, meeting room, business center, a minimum of two toilet rooms, fitness room, floors with a minimum of four bedrooms, and other places such as the bar and/or spa center.

Eleven questions were posed (Table 1) derived from eight indicators, and a score of 1 given if it met the criteria and 0 if it did not. Table 1 shows that 8 zones had a score of 8 (16.3%) while 7 zones (14.3%) had either a score 10 or 6. There were 2 zones (4.1%) that had zero score and 2 zones (14.3%) a score of 11.

Compliance in Bogor City increased over time. The compliance rate in 4453 buildings was 26% initially, but increased to 78% by the end of year<sup>5</sup>. However, this rate was still below the acceptable indicator rate of 80%. Our findings show that management support is essential for a successful SFZ local regulation.

**Table 1. Compliance indicators of the implementation of 49 zones for SFZ local regulation in Bogor City**

Compliance questions	Yes (%)	No (%)	Compliance rate (%) cum.)	Total of zones (n=49)
Is there a no-smoking sign at the entrance?	9 (18.4)	40 (81.6)	1 (9.1)	4
Are there any no-smoking signs inside the building?	40 (81.6)	9 (18.4)	2 (18.2)	7
Does the no-smoking sign mention the SFZ local regulation?	35 (71.4)	14 (28.6)	3 (27.3)	10

Continued

## AFFILIATION

**1** Department of Public Health Science, University of Muhammadiyah, Jakarta, Indonesia

**2** Problem Solving for Quality Hospitals Unit, Center for Education and Public Services, University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

## CORRESPONDENCE TO

Al Asyary. Department of Public Health Science, University of Muhammadiyah, Jakarta, Indonesia, Jl. Warung Buncit Raya No. 17, Pancoran, Jakarta Selatan, 12790 Jakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: al.asyary13@gmail.com

## KEYWORDS

smoking cessation, tobacco use, government regulation, law enforcement, social control policies

Received: 22 November 2017

Revised: 29 May 2018

Accepted: 21 June 2018

Table 1. Continued

Compliance questions	Yes (%)	No (%)	Compliance rate (% cum.)	Total of zones (n = 19)
Is there any law enforcement sign for the SFZ perpetrator?	35 (71.4)	14 (28.6)	4 (36.4)	12
Is there any particular place for smoking inside the building?	24 (49.0)	25 (51.0)	5 (45.5)	15
Is there any person found smoking inside the building?	30 (61.2)	19 (38.8)	6 (54.5)	22
Is there any cigarette butt found inside the building?	36 (73.5)	13 (26.5)	7 (63.6)	27
Is there any ashtray or such found inside the building?	15 (30.6)	34 (69.4)	8 (72.7)	35
Is there any smell of cigarette smoke inside the building?	27 (55.1)	22 (44.9)	9 (81.8)	40
Is there any item or similar thing with regard to smoking promotion (printed either on napkin table, glass, coaster, poster, banner, etc.)?	36 (73.5)	13 (26.5)	10 (90.9)	47
Is there either any shape or type of cigarette found written on sales promotion, or is it only written 'cigarettes available'?	31 (63.3)	18 (36.7)	11 (100)	49

Another similar study was undertaken in luxury hotels in Badung Municipality, Bali in 2014<sup>6</sup>. It showed that hotel compliance to the SFZ local regulation was still low (15.4%) and that the smoking behaviour of the management of these zones significantly obstructed SFZ implementation<sup>6</sup>.

In developed countries, SFZs are well implemented by applying effective law enforcement, accompanied by preparatory health education campaigns and quitting facilities and advice. In Bogor City, government compliance indicators for SFZs are the same as in California, but in Bogor there is no obligation to provide smoke detectors in each room. The California Government's Smoke-Free Act resulted in 88% compliance, a decrease in the number of smokers, and protection of both employees and visitors from second-hand smoke<sup>7</sup>. Similarly in Scotland, the SFZs government Act was supported by pub workers before implementation<sup>8,9</sup>. In all, 80% of pub workers believed that this regulation would help to protect their health at work, but 49% were concerned that it would negatively affect business. After implementation, support for this regulation increased and the negative perception decreased to 20%<sup>8,9</sup>. These studies showed that compliance rates in SFZs not only depend on political commitment but also implementation and enforcement by management, as well as perception by workers and the community.

Our study found that the Bogor City SFZ implementation was still below 80%, but it was progressing, involving political and managerial commitment, and community and worker acceptance. However, sustained and new approaches are necessary to achieve the target of 80%, with ongoing monitoring.

## REFERENCES

1. Dinas Kesehatan Kota Bogor. Survey Kepatuhan Terhadap Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Tatanan Sekolah Kota Bogor. Bogor; 2014.
2. Pemerintah Kota Bogor. Peraturan Daerah Nomor 12 Tahun 2009 Tentang Pengendalian Dan Pengawasan Ketertiban Umum. Pemerintah Kota Bogor Bogor; 2010.
3. Setiawan NP, Hermawan D, Salbiah E. Evaluasi Kebijakan Peraturan Daerah Kota Bogor

- No 12 Tahun 2009 tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (Studi Kasus Pelaksanaan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok pada Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri Di Kota Bogor). *GOVERNANSI*. 2017;3(12):13–22. doi: 10.30997/jgs.v3i1.809
4. TCSC IAKMI. Pedoman, Pengawasan/Penegakan Hukum Perda Kawasan Tanpa Rokok. TCSC IAKMI. Jakarta: TCSC IAKMI; 2011.
  5. No Tobacco Community. Survei Kepatuhan Penerapan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Kota Bogor. Bogor; 2014.
  6. Devhy NLP, Astuti PAS, Duarsa DP. Pengaruh Faktor Pengelola Terhadap Kepatuhan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Daerah Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Pada Hotel Berbintang Di Kabupaten Badung. <http://www.pps.unud.ac.id/thesis/detail-1048-pengaruh-faktor-pengelola-terhadap-kepatuhan-pelaksanaan-peraturan-daerah-tentang-kawasan-tanpa-rokok--padahotel-berbintang-di-kabupaten-badung.html>. Accessed November 22, 2017.
  7. Weber MD, Bagwell DAS, Fielding JE, Glantz SA. Long term compliance with California's Smoke-Free Workplace Law among bars and restaurants in Los Angeles County. *Tob Control*. 2003;12(3):269–73. doi: 10.1136/tc.12.3.269
  8. Hilton S, Semple S, Miller BG, MacCalman L, Petticrew M, Dempsey S, et al. Expectations and changing attitudes of bar workers before and after the implementation of smoke-free legislation in Scotland. *BMC Public Health*. 2007;7(1):206. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-7-206
  9. Semple S, Maccalman L, Naji AA, Dempsey S, Hilton S, Miller BG, et al. Bar workers' exposure to second-hand smoke: the effect of Scottish smoke-free legislation on occupational exposure. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 2007;51(7):571–80. doi: 10.1093/annhyg/mem044

**CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest and none was reported.

**FUNDING**

There was no source of funding for this research.

**PROVENANCE AND PEER REVIEW**

Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.