



Analysis of The Implementation of Smoke-Free Policies in Government Work Environments: A Case Study of the Cirebon City Education Office

Noval Nugraha¹, Adi Nugraha², Siti Khumayah³ Leni Rohida³

^{1,2,3,4}Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Swadaya Gunung Jati, Cirebon, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: siti.khumayah@ugj.ac.id

Abstract

Background. Smoking behavior remains one of the most significant public health issues in Indonesia. The country ranks third in the world in terms of the number of smokers, after China and India. According to the Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS, 2021) report, the prevalence of adult smokers in Indonesia reaches 34.5 percent or around 70.2 million people, of which 65.5 percent are men and only 3.3 percent are women, indicating a significant gender gap in smoking behavior (Tjandrarini et al., 2021).

Aims. This study aims to analyze the implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone (SFZ) policy in government work environments, particularly at the Cirebon City Education Office, focusing on supporting factors, obstacles, and the level of policy effectiveness.

Methods. The method used is a qualitative case study, supported by direct observation and document analysis. In-depth interviews were conducted with ten key informants, including structural officials, staff, and supervisors.

Result. The main problem in this study was the low level of compliance with the policy despite the issuance of regulations requiring it. The study showed that the Mayor's Circular Letter and no smoking signs had disseminated the SFZ policy normatively. Due to a lack of supervision, employee awareness, and clear sanctions, implementation has not gone well.

Conclusion. Factors supporting implementation include leadership commitment and the availability of legislation, while factors hindering implementation include a strong smoking culture, limited supervisory resources, and a lack of designated smoking areas. Because the policy has not been consistently implemented, SFAs (Smoke-Free Areas) in the Cirebon City Education Office remain ineffective.

Implementation. Recommendations include increasing education-based socialization, implementing administrative sanctions, and providing facilities in accordance with local regulations on SFAs.

Keywords: Policy Implementation, Smoke-Free Areas, Policy Enforcement, Compliance, Work Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Smoking behavior remains one of the biggest public health issues in Indonesia. The country ranks third in the world in terms of the number of smokers, after China and India. According to the Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS, 2021) report, the prevalence of adult smokers in Indonesia reaches 34.5 percent, or around 70.2 million people, of which 65.5

percent are men and only 3.3 percent are women, indicating a significant gender gap in smoking behavior (Tjandrarini et al., 2021). Cigarettes are the leading cause of non-communicable diseases such as heart disease, stroke, and lung cancer, which contribute significantly to the national mortality rate. The GATS Report (2021) estimates that more than 225,000 deaths each year are caused by cigarette consumption.

The Indonesian government has sought to reduce the prevalence of smoking through a Smoke-Free Zone (SFAs) policy that is regulated in stages in various laws and regulations. The legal basis for this is contained in Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health, which emphasizes the importance of protecting the public from exposure to cigarette smoke and controlling tobacco products (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). These provisions are further elaborated in Government Regulation No. 28 of 2024 concerning the Management of Addictive Substances (Indonesia's President, 2024), and reinforced by Joint Regulation of the Minister of Health and Minister of Home Affairs No. 188 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of No-Smoking Areas (Regulation of the Minister of Health of the Republic of Indonesia Number 188/Menkes/Per/2011 concerning Guidelines for Non-Smoking Areas, 2011).

Although regulations are in place, the implementation of SFAs policies still faces various obstacles. Weak technical guidelines and cross-sectoral supervision have prevented optimal implementation (Selfianus Efrid Dion & Sri Juni Woro Astuti, 2021). Based on data from the 2023 Indonesian Health Survey (SKI), the prevalence of smoking among people aged ≥ 10 years varies between provinces and shows that smoking behavior remains a public health challenge in Indonesia. Meanwhile, according to GATS (2021), exposure to cigarette smoke in the workplace reaches 44.8 percent, indicating that nearly half of workers in Indonesia, including civil servants (ASN), are still exposed to cigarette smoke in the workplace (Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024; Tjandrarini et al., 2021).

Regionally, West Java Province has a higher prevalence of smokers than the national average. Based on the Indonesian Health Survey (SKI, 2023), the prevalence of smokers in this province reached 27.3 percent, while data from the West Java Central Statistics Agency shows that 32.98 percent of residents aged 15 years and older still smoked in the last month (Central Statistics Agency of West Java, 2023; Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024). Then, based on GATS data (2021), it is estimated that there are around 3.4 million young people aged 15–19 who are active smokers, consuming 12 cigarettes per day (Tjandrarini et al., 2021). Although West Java Provincial Regulation No. 11 of 2019 on

Smoke-Free Areas has been enacted, its implementation within regional government organizations continues to face various obstacles, including weak supervision, insufficient socialization, and suboptimal enforcement. On the other hand, social resistance remains high because smoking in the workplace is considered normal, especially among male civil servants (Nasip, 2015; West Java Provincial Government, 2019).

Research by Lestari et al. (2025) in Cimahi City also shows that SFAs are still weak due to low employee awareness, insufficient facilities, and weak enforcement of sanctions. (Lestari et al., 2025). Then, in the city of Cirebon, a similar policy has been regulated through Local Regulation No. 8 of 2015 concerning Smoke-Free Areas. (Cirebon City Government, 2015). However, research by Supriyadi and Widyanto (2018) revealed that its implementation has not been optimal, as violations persist in office areas and supervision remains weak. (Supriyadi & Widyanto, 2018). Herawati et al. (2020) also found weaknesses in the implementation of management functions, particularly policy communication, planning, and monitoring systems. (Herawati et al., 2020).

These findings are consistent with research in various other regions. Putri, Ridwan, and Azhari (2025) in Merangin Regency; Dolly et al. (2020) in Bungo Regency; and Iriani (2019) in Palembang City show that barriers to the implementation of SFAs are generally related to communication, resources, disposition, and the enforcement of sanctions. (Amelia Gustina Putri et al., 2025; Dolly et al., 2020; Iriani, 2019). Furthermore, Nuraziza et al. (2024) in South Tangerang City also highlighted the weaknesses in socialization and supervision. (Nuraziza et al., 2024). Research by Al Shiddiqy et al. (2025) in South Jambi District reinforces these findings, showing that poor policy communication, limited resources, and low employee awareness are factors that hinder policy effectiveness. (Al Shiddiqy et al., 2025). In addition, research by Yuri et al. (2022) in Rejosari Pekanbaru and Hasibuan & Ulfha (2022) in Binjai found that a permissive work culture and weak cross-sector coordination also hindered policy implementation. (Hasibuan & Ulfha, 2022; Yuri et al., 2022).

Therefore, the author feels that research on the implementation of SFAs' policies in the ASN work environment is significant because it concerns the exemplary behavior and credibility of state officials. ASN are expected to be pioneers of healthy living, but in reality, there are still many violations of SFAs' rules in the work environment. Research by Nurjaeni et al. (2025) shows that the success of SFAs is greatly influenced by leaders' commitment, socialization, and consistent field supervision (Nurjaeni et al., 2025). Two other relevant

studies are those by Sidiq et al. (2025) at the Sukabumi City Education and Culture Office and Siswanto & Ningsih (2025) at the North Morowali Regency Education Office, both of which found that the main obstacles lie in communication, supervision, and resource availability (Maulana Sidiq et al., 2025; Siswanto & Ningsih, 2025).

However, this study has significant differences. First, this study uses the latest legal basis, namely Law No. 17 of 2023 and Government Regulation No. 28 of 2024. Second, the study focuses on the work environment of civil servants in the Cirebon City Education Office, as a representation of the culture of local government bureaucracy. Third, the social and cultural characteristics of Cirebon, which differ from those of other regions, provide a unique context for policy implementation. (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023; Indonesia's President, 2024).

Thus, this study seeks to fill a gap in the literature by examining the implementation of SFAs' policies in government work environments using the latest legal framework, while emphasizing the role of civil servants in fostering a healthy work culture. Recent literature shows that communication, implementer commitment, human resources, and organizational support are determinants of successful SFAs implementation. (Kahendra et al., 2023). Therefore, this study, entitled "Analysis of the Implementation of Smoke-Free Area Policy in Government Work Environments: A Case Study of the Cirebon City Education Office," will examine the implementation of the SFAs policy using George C. Edwards III's policy implementation theory, which highlights four main aspects: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. (Edwards, 1980). Based on the above description, this study aims to determine and analyze how the No Smoking Area policy is implemented at the Cirebon City Education Office, and the factors that influence its success and the obstacles encountered.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public Policy Implementation

Etymologically, the term implementation in the KBBI is defined as the execution or application of a plan or policy. In the context of public administration, policy implementation is the process of translating decisions or regulations into concrete actions that involve various social, political, and economic dimensions, because their implementation often affects the interests of many parties (Language Development and Development Agency, 2025).

According to Iskandar Zulkarnaen, implementation is a means by which policies

achieve their objectives through concrete activities carried out by policy implementers, thereby producing outputs and outcomes aligned with policy objectives (Iskandar Zulkarnaen, 2014). Meanwhile, Bharoto and Angriyawati (2018) emphasize that the implementation stage is the most decisive phase in the public policy process because the success or failure of a policy greatly depends on the effectiveness of its implementation in the field. Thus, implementation becomes the bridge between policy formulation and the expected results (Bharoto & Angriawati, 2018).

According to Van Meter and Van Horn, implementation includes actions by individuals or groups, both from the public and private sectors, that are directed toward achieving policy objectives (Suaib, 2016; Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). This confirms that policy implementation is not only the responsibility of the government, but also requires the involvement of various actors. Ripley and Franklin in Winarno (2014) state that implementation is a series of activities after a policy has been established, in which the authorized institutions carry out programs, distribute benefits, and produce tangible outputs (Ripley & Franklin, 1982; Winarno, 2014).

Similarly, Mazmanian and Sabatier in Agustino (2016) define implementation as the process of executing decisions that determine problems, objectives, and implementation mechanisms. They emphasize that implementation must be directed at transforming formal decisions into actions that produce concrete outcomes for society (Agustio, 2016; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983).

George C. Edwards III (1980) states that implementation is an important stage in the policy cycle that bridges the gap between policy formulation and policy outcomes. He identifies four key factors for successful implementation, namely communication, resources, the disposition of implementers, and bureaucratic structure. These four factors are interrelated in determining the extent to which policies can be effectively implemented in the field (Edwards, 1980).

According to Purwanto and Sulistyastuti (2015), policy implementation is the process of distributing policy outputs to target groups (Purwanto & Sulistiyastuti, 2015). This means that they emphasize that the success of an implementation is measured by the extent to which the output is acceptable and can have a positive impact on the target audience. Furthermore, Sahya Anggara (2014) also adds that implementation is not only a technical execution, but also ensuring that the policy actually achieves its predetermined objectives (Sahya Anggara, 2014). In line with this, Agustino (2016) assesses that

implementation is complex because it contains political dimensions and involves various bureaucratic and external interests (Agustio, 2016).

Furthermore, Anderson in Tahir (2020) highlights four main aspects in policy implementation, namely the implementing actors; the administrative process; the level of compliance with the policy; and the impact of implementation. These aspects serve as benchmarks in assessing the effectiveness of public policy implementation (Anderson et al., 1978; Tahir, 2020). Meanwhile, Grindle (1980) argues that policy success can be measured by the process and final results achieved, taking into account two important variables, namely policy content and context of implementation, which includes the role of actors, implementing agencies, and the level of compliance (Merilee S. Grindle (Ed.), 1980)

Based on these various perspectives, it can be concluded that the implementation of public policy is a crucial stage that determines the overall success of the policy process. Furthermore, the success of an implementation is greatly influenced by clear communication, sufficient resources, the integrity of the implementers, bureaucratic support, and the suitability of the formulated policy to the social, economic, and political conditions in the field. Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of these factors is very important so that public policy can be effective, fair, and sustainable.

Public Policy

Etymologically, the term policy comes from the Greek word polis, which means state or city, and from the Latin word politia, which means state government. In modern public administration, policy is defined as a set of decisions that are planned and implemented to achieve specific objectives in the administration of government. Anderson (1990) defines policy as “a purposive course of action followed by an actor in dealing with a problem or matter of concern.” In simple terms, public policy is a series of actions that have a specific direction and purpose that are followed and carried out by an actor (individual) or a group of actors with problems in dealing with public issues (Agustio, 2016; Anderson, 1990).

Policy is not just a single decision, but a series of continuous and coordinated actions. Nugroho (2017) explains that policy functions as a strategic instrument to achieve organizational goals, covering the processes of formulation, implementation, and evaluation. He emphasizes three main dimensions of policy: normative, procedural, and substantive, which together form the direction and content of policy (Nugroho, 2017).

Specifically, public policy focuses on government decisions and actions in fulfilling

the interests of society. Harold Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan in Nugroho (2017) define it as a program that is projected with specific goals, values, and practices (Lasswell & Kaplan, 1957; Nugroho, 2017). Meanwhile, Thomas R. Dye asserts that “public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do,” indicating that public policy includes both government actions and decisions not to act (no action), as long as they are based on conscious considerations (Dye, 1984; Suaib, 2016).

In a more practical context, Ipik Permana (2023) explains that public policy is a decision made by government institutions or officials to regulate people's lives, either through concrete actions or no action policies, in order to create order and social welfare (Permana, 2023). According to Chief J.O. Udoji in Wahab (2015), public policy is defined as actions that have formal legitimacy and are aimed at solving problems that have a broad impact on society (A. Wahab, 2015; Udoji, 1981). Knoepfel et al. (2007) expanded on this concept by viewing public policy as the result of dynamic interactions between various public and private actors in formulating solutions to complex social problems. Thus, public policy is not only administrative in nature, but also the result of political and social processes involving various interests (Knoepfel et al., 2007).

Furthermore, Nugroho (2017) asserts that public policy is a strategic decision by the state to manage public affairs and realize the national mission. He emphasizes that public policy is the concrete manifestation of the government's constitutional mandate to provide direction, regulation, and protection to the community (Nugroho, 2017). In the process, public policy goes through several main stages: agenda setting, formulation, ratification, implementation, and evaluation. According to Winarno (2014) and Wahab (2015) in Siswoyo et al. (2019), implementation is the most crucial stage because without effective implementation, policies will only become administrative documents without substantive benefits for the community (A. Wahab, 2015; Siswoyo et al., 2019; Winarno, 2014)

Based on these various perspectives, it can be concluded that public policy is a systematic, rational, and multidimensional process that encompasses stages from formulation to evaluation. Public policy not only functions as a regulatory instrument, but also as a means to solve social problems and achieve prosperity. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of the concept of public policy is very important in assessing the effectiveness of government programs.

Policy Implementation Models

The implementation of public policy is a dynamic process involving various actors, institutions, and social conditions that interact with each other in realizing policy objectives. A number of implementation models have been developed to understand the relationship between formulated policies and the results achieved in the field. The three most influential models are the Van Meter and Van Horn model (1975), the George C. Edwards III model (1980), and the Merilee S. Grindle model (1980).

Van Meter and Van Horn Model (1975)

The model proposed by Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn is known as the model of the policy implementation process. This model emphasizes that the effectiveness of policy implementation is influenced by the characteristics of the policy itself and the relationship between policy formulation and implementation (Suaib, 2016; Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). They identified six key variables that determine the success of implementation, namely policy standards and objectives; resources; characteristics of the implementing agency; inter-organizational relationships; attitudes of implementers; and social, economic, and political conditions. Each of these variables interacts with one another, so that implementation is viewed as a complex process that requires coordination, understanding of objectives, and a conducive environment (Suaib, 2016).

George C. Edwards III Model (1980)

Edward developed a top-down approach that emphasizes four key variables, namely communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure (Agustio, 2016; Edwards, 1980). Communication is important to ensure clarity and consistency of policy information; resources include human, financial, and informational support; disposition relates to the attitude and commitment of implementers; while bureaucratic structure determines the effectiveness of coordination and organizational working mechanisms. Edwards asserts that overly rigid bureaucracy can hinder implementation, while adaptive bureaucracy actually facilitates implementation (Agustio, 2016). This model provides a comprehensive analytical framework for assessing the success of public policy implementation, as it takes into account structural, resource, and human behavior aspects.

Merilee S. Grindle Model (1980)

Grindle emphasizes two main components, namely policy content and

implementation context. According to Grindle, successful implementation depends not only on policy design, but also on the social, political, and economic conditions in which the policy is implemented (Merilee S. Grindle (Ed.), 1980; Nugroho, 2017). The content of the policy includes the interests of affected parties, types of benefits, degree of change, the position of policy makers, implementers, and available resources. Meanwhile, the implementation context includes power relations, actor interests, institutional characteristics, and community responses to the policy. This model emphasizes that implementation is a political and administrative process influenced by actor interactions and the social environment.

Relevance of the Models in Research The three models provide complementary perspectives. Van Meter and Van Horn highlight the link between policy design and implementation, Edwards III emphasizes the importance of communication, resources, and bureaucratic structures, while Grindle highlights the balance between policy content and the social context of implementation. In this study, George C. Edwards III's model is considered most relevant for analyzing the implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone (SFZ) policy in the government work environment. This is because Edwards III's model provides a systematic analytical framework for assessing the effectiveness of communication, resource availability, implementer disposition, and bureaucratic structure at the local government level.

Public Policy Models

In public administration studies, public policy models are used to understand how a policy is formulated, implemented, and evaluated. Each model has a different approach and focus according to the nature of the policy and the surrounding socio-political dynamics (Anderson, 1990; Nugroho, 2017).

Policy Process Model; This model was developed by Harold D. Lasswell (1957), who viewed policy as a series of rational and systematic processes including problem identification, agenda setting, formulation, approval, implementation, and evaluation. This model explains that public policy is the result of interrelated stages in the policy cycle (Lasswell & Kaplan, 1957; Winarno, 2014).

Rational Model; Herbert A. Simon (1957) emphasized that policy decisions must be made logically and analytically in order to select the best alternative. However, in practice, policymakers face limitations in information and resources, resulting in bounded rationality. This model highlights the importance of efficiency and rationality in the policy process

(Nugroho, 2017; Simon, 2014).

Incremental Model; Charles E. Lindblom (1980) argues that public policy is rarely adopted in its entirety, but rather through small, incremental changes to previous policies. This process is more realistic because it takes into account political, time, and resource constraints. This model emphasizes compromise and adaptation as key features of policy-making (Dunn, 2008; Lindblom, 1980)

Institutional Model; According to Theodore J. Lowi (1972), public policy is influenced by the structure of government institutions, which serve as arenas for political and administrative interaction. This model emphasizes that bureaucratic structures and legal systems play a major role in determining the form and effectiveness of public policy (A. Wahab, 2015; Lowi, 1972)

Group Model; This model assumes that public policy is the result of compromise between various interest groups that seek to influence the government. The policy process is understood as an arena of bargaining between different interests to gain political legitimacy (Anderson, 1990; Dye, 1984)

Elite Model; This model argues that public policy often reflects the interests of the ruling political or economic elite, rather than the aspirations of the wider community. Thus, public policy reflects the distribution of power and resources within society (Nugroho, 2017; Pareto, 1935)

Political System Model; Developed by David Easton (1979), this model describes policy as the output of a political system that processes inputs in the form of public demands and support. Policy outcomes generate feedback that then influences subsequent policies (Easton, 1979; Winarno, 2014)

Policy Analysis Model; William N. Dunn (2008) emphasizes that public policy must be based on scientific analysis through the stages of problem identification, forecasting, recommendation, monitoring, and evaluation. This model affirms the importance of data and a rational approach in the policy process so that the resulting decisions are effective and efficient (Dunn, 2008). Each public policy model offers a different perspective in understanding policy dynamics. The Process and Rational model emphasizes logical and systematic stages, the Incremental and Institutional model highlights practical limitations and the role of bureaucratic structures, while the Group, Elite, and System model explains political interactions between actors. The Policy Analysis model complements this with a data-based scientific approach. Understanding these various models is important for

assessing the effectiveness of public policy formulation and implementation. In the context of this study, the researchers used George C. Edward III's policy implementation model, as it comprehensively assesses the success of policy implementation through four main variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, which are highly relevant in analyzing the implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone policy in the government work environment. (Agustio, 2016; Edwards, 1980)

Smoke-Free Zone (SFAs)

Smoke-Free Areas (SFAs) are areas designated to prohibit all forms of tobacco-related activities, such as smoking, manufacturing, selling, promoting, and advertising tobacco products. The main objective of this policy is to protect the public from exposure to tobacco smoke and to create a healthy, clean, and comfortable environment. Thus, SFAs is a strategic instrument for the government in controlling tobacco consumption and improving public health.

The SFAs policy in Indonesia is implemented in stages, starting from the central government to the regional level. This policy is both preventive and repressive in nature, i.e., it not only prevents exposure to cigarette smoke but also regulates restrictions on the production and distribution of tobacco products. The main legal basis is contained in Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health, which emphasizes the responsibility of the central and regional governments in creating a healthy environment and regulating the mechanisms for guidance and supervision of public facilities (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023).

As a derivative of this law, Government Regulation No. 28 of 2024 concerning the Safety of Addictive Substances in Tobacco Products for Health details the provisions for implementing SFAs, including prohibitions on smoking, production, promotion, and sale of cigarettes in certain public areas. Areas included in the SFAs category include health facilities, educational institutions, places of worship, public transportation, workplaces, and other public spaces (Presiden Indonesia, 2024).

In addition, Joint Regulation of the Minister of Health and Minister of Home Affairs No. 188 of 2011 provides technical guidelines for the implementation of smoke-free areas in the regions. This regulation stipulates the types of public spaces that must be smoke-free, the procedures for monitoring, and the enforcement of sanctions for violators, thereby strengthening coordination between the central and regional governments in the

implementation of this policy (Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia Nomor 188/Menkes/Per/2011 Tentang Pedoman Kawasan Tanpa Rokok, 2011).

At the local level, the implementation of smoke-free areas in Cirebon City is regulated through Local Regulation No. 8 of 2015 concerning Smoke-Free Areas. This regulation contains specific provisions regarding the location of smoke-free areas, implementation mechanisms, supervision, and administrative sanctions. Its formulation takes into account the socio-cultural conditions of the local community, while remaining based on national policy. The enactment of this Regional Regulation affirms the commitment of the Cirebon City Government to supporting the national tobacco control program and creating smoke-free public spaces and work environments (Cirebon City Government, 2015).

Overall, the hierarchically structured SFZ regulations from the central to regional levels form a strong and integrated legal basis. This policy demonstrates the government's seriousness in protecting the public from the dangers of tobacco through legal, health, and social approaches. With the support of continuous monitoring, the implementation of SFZs is expected to reduce exposure to cigarette smoke, improve public health, and create a more productive and sustainable living environment. Previous studies have shown that the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (SFAs) policy in government agencies still faces a number of obstacles, both in terms of communication, resources, and compliance by implementers.

Supriyadi and Widyanto (2018) studied the implementation of Cirebon City Regional Regulation No. 8 of 2015 at the Cirebon City Transportation Agency using Merilee S. Grindle's theory. Their research results show that the implementation of SFAs has been carried out, but not optimally. There are still employees who smoke in the office area, low employee awareness, and weak supervision and sanctions. Supporting factors include socialization and coordination between agencies, while obstacles lie in employee compliance and non-functional smoking facilities (Cirebon City Government, 2015; Supriyadi & Widyanto, 2018).

Furthermore, Maulana Sidiq, M. Rijal Amirulloh, and Andi Mulyadi (2025) studied the implementation of SFAs in the Sukabumi City Education and Culture Office using Diana M. DiNitto's theory. This study found that the implementation of SFAs was not yet effective due to limited human resources, an unorganized bureaucratic structure, and a lack of enforcement of regulations (Maulana Sidiq et al., 2025). Researchers recommend increasing

awareness, supervision, and the provision of special smoking facilities. A study by Adi Siswanto and Fitriah Ningsih (2025) at the North Morowali Regency Education and Culture Office used a descriptive approach with four indicators of public policy implementation. The results showed that policy communication had been carried out, but was not yet optimal. Limited facilities, weak supervision, and inconsistent implementation were the main factors contributing to the policy's ineffectiveness (Siswanto & Ningsih, 2025).

Meanwhile, I Gede Yudha Eka Pramana Putra and Yuli Setyowati (2022) studied the implementation of SFAs in government agencies in the city of Yogyakarta using George C. Edwards III's theory. The results of the study showed that the policy had not been implemented optimally due to weak communication, low discipline among implementers, limited supporting facilities, and a lack of supervision. The recommendation of this study is the use of surveillance technology such as CCTV and the establishment of separate smoking areas to improve compliance (Putra & Setyowati, 2022). Based on these four studies, it can be concluded that the implementation of SFAs in various government agencies faces relatively similar problems, particularly in terms of ineffective communication, limited human resources and facilities, weak commitment from implementers, and a lack of supervision and strict sanctions. However, there have also been efforts to improve the situation through increased socialization, inter-agency coordination, and strengthening the role of leaders in enforcing policies.

In terms of contextual relevance, the research by Supriyadi and Widyanto (2018) is most similar to this study because it was also conducted in the city of Cirebon, although it involved a different agency and theory. The research by Maulana Sidiq et al. (2025) and Adi Siswanto & Fitriah Ningsih (2025) have similarities in terms of institutional objects (Education Office), but differ in terms of region. Meanwhile, Pramana Putra & Setyowati (2022) share similarities in theory (Edwards III) and the context of government bureaucracy, although it was conducted in the city of Yogyakarta (Maulana Sidiq et al., 2025; Siswanto & Ningsih, 2025).

From these four studies, research gaps that underlie this study can be identified. First, previous studies have not examined the implementation of SFAs in educational institutions in Cirebon City with a focus on civil servants. Second, most studies still use the old legal framework, such as Law No. 36 of 2009 and Government Regulation No. 109 of 2012, while this study is based on the more recent Law No. 17 of 2023 and Government Regulation No. 28 of 2024. Third, this study uses George C. Edwards III's (1980) theory to assess the

effectiveness of policy implementation through four main dimensions: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, which provides a more comprehensive analytical framework than previous studies.

Thus, the novelty of this study lies in the use of the latest regulations, its focus on the work environment of civil servants in the education sector, and the use of Edwards III's theory as the main analytical tool. This study is expected to not only enrich academic studies on public policy implementation in the health sector, but also provide practical recommendations to strengthen the internal governance of the Cirebon City Education Office in creating a healthy, clean, and productive work environment in line with the local government's bureaucratic reform agenda.

METHOD

This study uses qualitative research methods with a descriptive qualitative approach. Qualitative research is a type of research used to understand what a person or group thinks about social or humanitarian issues (Creswell, 2014). This study examines the implementation of smoke-free policies in government workplaces, using the Cirebon City Education Office as a case study. This research can provide insight into the factors that influence the performance of the Cirebon City Education Office, as this method can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how smoke-free policies are implemented in government workplaces.

In this study, data collection methods such as observation, interviews, and document analysis were used. The purpose of the observation was to collect information directly about the analysis of the implementation of smoke-free areas in government work environments; the purpose of the interviews was to find out their experiences and perceptions of the implementation of smoke-free areas; and document analysis would help to understand the policies and procedures used by the Cirebon City Education Office to implement smoke-free areas. Data triangulation was used to increase the reliability and validity of the findings to test the validity of the data obtained. Stakeholders, civil servants, and temporary employees of the Cirebon City Education Office were interviewed to collect this data. Furthermore, the collected data was analyzed, interpreted, and supplemented with additional information to help support the research findings.

DISCUSSION

This study analyzes the implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone (SFZ) policy in the Cirebon City Education Office using George C. Edwards III's policy implementation theoretical framework. Data was obtained through interviews with civil servants, structural officials, honorary staff, and supervisory sub-units. From the data collection results, the dynamics of SFAs policy implementation were found to be explained by Edward III's four main variables, namely communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, as well as the aspects of awareness and strategic recommendations.

The results of the study show that, in general, communication of the SFAs policy at the Cirebon City Education Office has been running quite well. Information about the smoking ban has been disseminated through various media, such as banners, stickers, circular letters, and direct instructions from leaders. Many informants, such as Lisyanti, Ida, and Mitha, mentioned that the policy message was clear and easy to understand. On several occasions, leaders often reminded employees of the importance of maintaining a smoke-free environment.

However, there are still notes that communication is not yet fully optimal. As stated by Lukman and Fauzan, even though the information is available, not all employees fully understand the monitoring and sanction mechanisms. This has led to inconsistent behavior between understanding and compliance. These findings are in line with Edward III's theory, which emphasizes the importance of clarity, consistency, and information transmission in policy implementation. If communication is uneven, field implementers tend to interpret the rules differently. This condition also supports the results of Putra and Setyowati's (2022) research in Yogyakarta, which states that SFAs socialization media are available, but their effectiveness in increasing compliance is still limited (Putra & Setyowati, 2022). Resources are an important factor in supporting the successful implementation of smoke-free areas. From the interviews, it can be seen that physical facilities such as no smoking signs, designated smoking areas, and banners are available at various points. Nia Nurul Hayat emphasized that almost all areas of the office have been equipped with smoke-free signs. This shows that in terms of facilities, the policy is well supported.

However, the main obstacle lies in human resources. Almost all informants, including Komarudin, Lisyanti, and Kartino, stated that there are no internal officers specifically assigned to supervise the SFAs. Supervision is only carried out by the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP), and even then only once a month or even once a year. In other

words, the implementation of the SFAs policy at the Cirebon City Education Office is highly dependent on external supervision, rather than internal mechanisms. Edward III explains that policies cannot be effective if they are not supported by sufficient human and financial resources. This finding is consistent with Iriani's (2019) research in Palembang, which emphasizes that weak supervision due to a lack of officers is a serious obstacle to the implementation of SFAs (Iriani, 2019).

The attitude and commitment of implementers are important assets in policy implementation. From the interview results, all sources agreed that the leadership of the Education Office fully supports the SFAs policy. Ida said that the leadership always reminds employees at every opportunity, while Fauzan believes that the leadership's support sets a positive example for employees and the community, especially for the younger generation. Civil servants and temporary employees also generally showed supportive attitudes, arguing that SFAs is important for maintaining health and creating a comfortable working environment.

Although the attitude of implementers appears positive, in practice, violations are still found and are only dealt with by verbal warnings. This shows a permissive attitude and tolerance towards violations, which ultimately reduces the effectiveness of the policy. According to Edwards III, an attitude that is not accompanied by concrete actions will weaken implementation. These findings are similar to the research by Sidiq, Amirulloh, and Mulyadi (2025) in Sukabumi, which shows that despite the support of senior leaders, violations still occur because the attitude of the implementers is not accompanied by strict supervision (Sidiq et al., 2025).

Formally, the SFAs policy at the Cirebon City Education Office has a clear legal basis, namely Cirebon City Regulation No. 8 of 2015. Technical regulations are also outlined in circular letters and internal memos. However, the mechanism for enforcing sanctions is still unclear. Several sources, such as Lisyanti and Mitha, mentioned that violations are generally only dealt with by verbal warnings, while written sanctions have never been applied. The process of supervision and enforcement is mostly left to the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP), resulting in internal bureaucracy that is not functioning effectively.

From Edwards III's perspective, a bureaucratic structure that is overly dependent on external parties and lacks an internal oversight unit will lead to fragmentation of authority. As a result, policy implementation is slow and inconsistent. These findings are consistent with the research by Widyanto & Supriyadi (2014) at the Cirebon City Transportation

Agency, which shows that even though regulations exist, employee compliance remains low due to weak internal oversight (Supriyadi & Widyanto, 2018).

The results of the study also show that the level of awareness among employees and the surrounding community regarding the dangers of smoking is relatively high. Many informants stated that they understand the health risks of smoking, both for active and passive smokers. However, compliance with the policy has not been fully realized. Informants such as Yana, Fauzan, and Kartino admitted that violations still occur frequently.

This shows a gap between awareness and behavior. In other words, even though employees' knowledge is quite good, without strict sanctions and consistent supervision, smoking in smoke-free areas still continues. These findings reinforce Edward III's opinion that awareness alone is not enough to guarantee the successful implementation of policies; clear control mechanisms are needed.

Based on the interview results, there are a number of recommendations that are considered important to strengthen the implementation of SFAs in the Cirebon City Education Office. First, there is a need for more intensive and continuous socialization so that all employees understand the applicable rules and sanctions. Second, internal supervisors or a special team are needed to handle the implementation of SFAs, so that it does not only rely on Satpol PP. Third, sanctions need to be enforced consistently to create a deterrent effect, whether in the form of written warnings, administrative penalties, or reward and punishment mechanisms. Fourth, supporting facilities such as designated smoking areas need to be increased to minimize violations. These recommendations align with Edward III's framework, which emphasizes that effective communication, adequate resources, consistent disposition, and a clear bureaucratic structure are key factors in the successful implementation of public policy.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (SFA) policy at the Cirebon City Education Office has not been optimal. In terms of communication, information about the SFZ has been disseminated through banners, circular letters, and leadership directives, but it has not been fully understood, resulting in some employees still violating the policy. In terms of resources, signage prohibiting smoking is available, but there are no internal supervisors who consistently enforce the rules, so supervision still depends on the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP).

In terms of disposition, management and most employees support the SFAs policy, but this support has not been followed by firm action against violations, which are generally only given verbal warnings. Meanwhile, from the dimension of bureaucratic structure, formal rules already exist through local regulations and circular letters, but the sanction mechanism is not consistently applied, thereby reducing the effectiveness of the policy.

Overall, employee awareness of the dangers of smoking is quite high, but compliance remains low due to weak supervision and the absence of strict sanctions. Therefore, there is a need for more equitable communication, additional internal supervisors, consistent enforcement of sanctions, and the provision of supporting facilities so that the SFAs policy can run more effectively within the Cirebon City Education Office.

IMPLICATION

This study has several important implications. Theoretically, the results reinforce public policy implementation theory, particularly the Edwards III model, by showing that communication, resources, implementer disposition, and bureaucratic structure are key factors in the successful implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone (SFZ) policy.

Practically, these findings provide a basis for the Cirebon City Government, especially the Education Office, to improve the effectiveness of SFZ implementation through strengthened socialization, leadership role modeling, provision of supporting facilities, and consistent monitoring.

From a policy perspective, this study recommends the need for more operational technical guidelines, inter-agency coordination, and the involvement of occupational health elements in the implementation of SFAs. Socially and health-wise, the successful implementation of SFAs has implications for improving the quality of the work environment, employee health, and the positive image of government agencies as pioneers of healthy living in the bureaucracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al Shiddiqy, M. Irpansyah, Saputra, Fajar, & Yulia, Dwita. (2025). Strategi Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) di Wilayah Kerja Kecamatan Jambi Selatan Kota Jambi Tahun 2023. *Jurnal Ilmu Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 13(06), 418–428. <https://doi.org/10.33221/jikm.v13i06.3264>
- Amelia Gustina Putri, Ridwan Ridwan, & Rifqy Azhari. (2025). Implementasi Penerapan Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) di Organisasi Perangkat Daerah Kabupaten Merangin. *JURNAL RISET RUMPUN ILMU KESEHATAN*, 4(2), 109–123.

<https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrikes.v4i2.5269>

- Badan Pusat Statistik Jawa Barat. (2023). Persentase Penduduk Usia 15 Tahun Ke Atas yang Merokok dalam Sebulan Terakhir Menurut Kabupaten/Kota dan Kelompok Umur di Provinsi Jawa Barat. Retrieved September 10, 2025, from <https://jabar.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/3/ZGxsdU15dEtNWEpNYmpCSUsyVkdRnBpVkv0dVFUMDkjMw==/persentase-penduduk-usia-15-tahun-ke-atas-yang-merokok-dalam-sebulan-terakhir-menurut-kabupaten-kota-dan-kelompok-umur-di-provinsi-jawa-barat-2023.html?year=20>
- Creswell, John. W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dolly, F. I., Rahmawati, M. P., & Alfari, I. (2020). Studi Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok pada Fasilitas Pelayanan Kesehatan di Kabupaten Bungo. *Jurnal Administrasi Nusantara (JAN)*, 3(2), 52–59.
- Edwards III, George C. .. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy* (Robert L. Peabody (Johns Hopkins University), Ed.). Washington, D.C., United States: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Hasibuan, Rapotan, & Ulfa, Rizky Safhara. (2022). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Wilayah Kerja Puskesmas Binjai Kota. *Publikasi Penelitian Terapan Dan Kebijakan*, 5(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.46774/pptk.v5i1.475>
- Herawati, Cucu, Kristanti, Lin, & Jannah, R. S. (2020). Penerapan fungsi manajemen pada kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Kota Cirebon. *DIMASEJATI: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Iriani, Atrika. (2019). Faktor Penguat Dalam Implementasi Kebijakan: Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Instansi Pemerintahan Kota Palembang. *Wacana Publik*, 3(1), 53–60.
- Kahendra, F., Widjanarko, B., & Agushybana, F. (2023). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok : Literature Review. *MPPKI (Media Publikasi Promosi Kesehatan Indonesia): The Indonesian Journal of Health Promotion*, 2(3), 430–435.
- Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. *Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia Nomor 188/Menkes/Per/2011 tentang Pedoman Kawasan Tanpa Rokok.* , (2011).
- Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Laporan Survei Kesehatan Indonesia (SKI) 2023 dalam Angka (Revisi I)*. Jakarta.
- Lestari, Mia, Irawaty, Tinda, & Fujilestari, Noer Apptika. (2025). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Dalam Pembatasan Area Merokok di Kota Cimahi. *Jurnal Praxis Idealis*, 2(1).
- Nasip, M. (2015). Analisis Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) pada Pegawai Negeri Sipil di Lingkungan Instansi Pemerintah Daerah Provinsi Kalimantan Barat Tahun 2014. *Jurnal Sanitarian*, 7(1), 85–92.
- Nuraziza, Dyda., Veruswati, Meita., Rachmawati, Emma., & Fadli, R. Khairunnisa. (2024). Implementasi Perda No. 4 Tahun 2016 tentang KTR di Kantor Disdukcapil Kota Tangerang Selatan Tahun 2023. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kesehatan STIKes Pekanbaru Medical Center*, 4(1), 14–18. Retrieved from <https://journal.stikespmc.ac.id/index.php/JK>
- Nurjaeni, N., Islamiah, L. N., Athaya, H. D., Legoningsih, A. N., & Trisnowati, H. (2025). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) untuk Mendukung Program

- Bandara Sehat di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Promkes*, 47–56.
- Pemerintah Kota Cirebon. (2015). *Peraturan Daerah Kota Cirebon Nomor 8 Tahun 2015 tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok*. Retrieved from <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/181921/perda-kota-cirebon-no-8-tahun-2015>
- Pemerintah Provinsi Jawa Barat. (2019). *Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Barat Nomor 11 Tahun 2019 Tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok*. Bandung.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2023 tentang Kesehatan*. Jakarta.
- Presiden Indonesia. (2024). *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2024 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2023 tentang Kesehatan* (No. 28). Retrieved from <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/294077/pp-no-28-tahun-2024>
- Putra, I. G. Y. E. P., & Setyowati, Yuli. (2022). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok Di Lingkungan Instansi Pemerintah Kota Yogyakarta. *The Journalish: Social and Government*, 3(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.55314/tsg.v3i1.223>
- Selfianus Efrid Dion, & Sri Juni Woro Astuti. (2021). Penerapan Kebijakan Kawasan Bebas Rokok di Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal Inovasi Sektor Publik*, 1(2), 157–178.
- Sidiq, Maulana, Amirulloh, M. Rijal, & Mulyadi, Andi. (2025). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) di Kantor Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Kota Sukabumi. *Jurnal Propesional*, 12(1), 197–204.
- Siswanto, A., & Ningsih, F. (2025). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Daerah Kabupaten Morowali Utara. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Riset Pendidikan*, 3(4), 6110–6117. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v3i4.2890>
- Supriyadi, Agus, & Widyanto. (2018). Implementasi Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok di Kota Cirebon : Studi Kasus di Kantor Dinas Perhubungan. *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 3(6), 1–13. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.syntaxliterate.co.id/index.php/syntax-literate/article/view/398/569>
- Tjandrarini, Dwi Hapsari, Mubasyiroh, Rofingatul, Tarigan, Ingan Ukur, Indriasih, Endang, Suryati, Tati, Puspita, Tities, Rachmalina, Rika, Wurisastuti, Tri, Yulianti, Anni, Senewe, Felly P., Karyana, Muhammad, Ariati, Jusniar, Setiaji, Bambang, Avrina, Rossa, Risniati, Yenni, Kismayanti, Heni, Nainggolan, Olwin, Opitasari, Cicih, Permana, Meda, Sundari, Totih Ratna, Fitriani, Desi, Afrilia, Annisa Rizky, Dila, Afifah Nasyahta, Farida, Ana, Wulan, Febrima, Renata, Desy Sosanti, Sari, Nurul Desita, Djunaedi, Kristanto, Antonius Yudi, Arifia, Narendro, Nugroho, Gottfried Christophorus Prasetyadi, Kania, Dina, Fauzi, Ridwan, Ministry of Health, Republic of Indonesia, (BRIN), National Research and Innovation Agency, (CDC), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, & Foundation, C. D. C. (2021). *Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) Indonesia Report 2021* (World Health Organization, Ed.). Retrieved from World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia website: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/390491>
- Yuri, I. M., Widodo, M. D., Abidin, Z., Hanafi, A., & Kamal, Y. (2022). Implementasi Kepatuhan Terhadap Kebijakan Kawasan Tanpa Rokok (KTR) Di Puskesmas Rejosari Kecamatan Tenayan Raya Kota Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Olahraga dan Kesehatan (ORKES)*, 1(2), 151–163. <https://doi.org/10.56466/orkes/Vol1.Iss2.15>