

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## Sociodemographic predictors for smoking persistence among young males in Indonesia

Vitri Widyaningsih<sup>1,2</sup>, Yusuf Ari Mashuri<sup>2,3</sup>, Septyan Dwi Nugroho<sup>4</sup>, Nurussyifa Afiana Zaen<sup>4</sup>, Sumardiyono<sup>2,3</sup>, Ari Probandari<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Disease Control Research Group, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup> Master Program in Public Health, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author** Vitri Widyaningsih **Email:** vitri\_w@staff.uns.ac.id

**Received:** 11 April 2022 **Revised:** 10 June 2022 **Accepted:** 18 June 2022 **Available online:** September 2022

**DOI:** 10.55131/jphd/2022/200314

### ABSTRACT

The prevalence and burden of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) in Indonesia are increasing. One major risk factor for NCDs is smoking. Thus, this study assessed sociodemographic predictors of smoking persistence among young males in Indonesia, who are at high risk for smoking and NCDs. We analysed the Indonesian Demographic and Health Survey (IDHS) conducted in 2017, a nationally representative survey in 34 provinces of Indonesia. We included data from 9957 young males aged 15-24 who had tried smoking and were interviewed by the IDHS enumerators for their smoking patterns and sociodemographic characteristics. Logistic regression analyses were used to assess the predictors of smoking persistency. Our analyses uncovered that those who started smoking at high-school age, lived in rural areas, had an occupation, and had lower education levels, had higher odds of smoking persistence than other young males. The use of internet, also increased the odds of smoking persistence, while those reading newspapers had lower odds of smoking persistence. Regarding household characteristics, young males who came from poor households, whose household heads were smokers or not married, also had higher odds of smoking. In conclusion, this study also showed the significance of several individual variables and household sociodemographic factors related to smoking persistence. Based on our findings, we recommend the need for intervention that aims not only at large-scale policy to ban smoking and educational campaigns through the internet but also specific educational intervention targeting families, particularly poor families with active smokers. The educational campaign is also needed to target the younger population, who are at higher risk for smoking persistence if they start smoking earlier.

### Key words:

smoking addiction; smoking persistence; non-communicable diseases

### Citation:

Vitri Widyaningsih, Yusuf Ari Mashuri , Septyan Dwi Nugroho, Nurussyifa Afiana Zaen, Sumardiyono, Ari Probandari. Sociodemographic predictors for smoking persistence among young males in Indonesia. J Public Hlth Dev. 2022;20(3):175-183 (<https://doi.org/10.55131/jphd/2022/200314>)

## INTRODUCTION

The increasing trends of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) globally, including in Indonesia, require targeted and specific primary prevention<sup>1</sup>. In Indonesia, several major NCDs have shown increasing trends in the past several years. One of the main NCDs, hypertension, is relatively prevalent in Indonesia. Approximately 33.4% of Indonesian adults had high blood pressure, with a 31% prevalence among males and 35.4% prevalence among females<sup>2</sup>. These figures are estimated to increase along with the changing lifestyle, diet, rising prevalence of obesity, and increasing life expectancy in Indonesia<sup>3</sup>. With the heavy burden of NCDs in Indonesia and the economic cost of these diseases, primary and secondary prevention becomes crucial.

Meanwhile, global discussion on NCDs in adolescents is still getting less attention, even though almost 35% of the global burden of disease comes from adolescents, and most of them are due to NCDs, injuries, and other preventable causes<sup>4</sup>. Hence, attention to NCDs in adolescents as a global public health concern should be increased because the risk factors for NCDs in adults usually begin in adolescence, and these risk factors can actually be prevented during adolescence<sup>5</sup>. Several major risk factors for NCDs include smoking, alcohol consumption, diet and obesity, and a sedentary lifestyle<sup>6,7</sup>. One of the main strategies for NCDs prevention is adopting a healthy lifestyle, including smoking cessation<sup>8</sup>. In this case, as a major cause of NCDs globally, tobacco use kills more than 7 million people worldwide every year<sup>4</sup>. The smoking prevalence is still high even though efforts to control tobacco use as a major global health threat have been carried out for decades<sup>9</sup>.

In Indonesia, tobacco use is also one of the main risk factors for NCDs and obesity<sup>10</sup>. In Indonesia, the prevalence of smoking, one of the main risk factors for NCDs, is relatively high, particularly among males. Almost 57% of males in Indonesia were regular smokers, with more than 75% of young males having tried smoking, and more than half of those continued to become regular smokers<sup>11</sup>. In addition, adolescent smoking and tobacco use are also high in Indonesia. Tobacco use in adolescents is closely related to tobacco use in parents and tobacco exposure as passive smokers<sup>12</sup>. Among school

students aged 13-15 years in Indonesia, as many as 32.1% of them have used tobacco products, and the percentage of males (54.1%) is higher than females (9.1%)<sup>13</sup>. Besides, the smoking prevalence among young males (15-19 years old) living in rural areas of Indonesia is also quite high at 41.8%<sup>14</sup>. Therefore, quitting smoking from a young age is vital because it can reduce the risk of developing NCDs in adulthood<sup>15</sup>. Moreover, interventions to improve health and reduce the disease burden targeted at young people can improve the population's health status in the future<sup>16</sup>.

In this regard, an effective strategy to improve healthy behavior, including reducing smoking prevalence, is to target high-risk populations<sup>17,18</sup>. With the high prevalence of smoking, including among young males, strategies to address the epidemic of smoking among these high-risk groups become essential. Therefore, this study aims to provide an understanding of the predictors for smoking persistence, particularly among high-risk young males in Indonesia. The finding of this study can be the basis for tailoring interventions to address the high smoking prevalence among young males, not only in Indonesia but also in other countries with similar characteristics. Eventually, an effective reduction in smoking prevalence, particularly starting from a younger age, will reduce the risk of developing NCDs.

## METHOD

Data from the latest Indonesian Demographic and Health Surveys (IDHS) conducted in 2017 were analysed. IDHS is a cross-sectional survey conducted in all provinces in Indonesia every three-five years since 1987. The IDHS 2017 was conducted in all 34 provinces in Indonesia. In this study, we used the young males' data, including questions on smoking habits and sociodemographic characteristics<sup>19</sup>. Of 10,036 young males who tried smoking, 79 were excluded due to missing values in educational level and current smoking variables. Thus, our analyses were conducted on 9,957 young males aged 15-24 years old (at the time of the surveys) who had tried smoking. Our dependent variable, smoking persistence, was obtained from two conditions: 1) young males who had tried smoking and 2) young males who were currently regularly smoking. Meanwhile, the non-smoking persistence

category included young males who had tried smoking but had stopped smoking or not currently smoking regularly.

In addition, we included several sociodemographic characteristics, including current age, level of education, area of residence, occupation, and age at first smoking. We also included exposure to the internet and mass media in our analyses. In this case, internet exposure is defined as the frequency of exposure to the internet and categorized into never, seldom, and regularly. Meanwhile, mass media exposure is described as radio, television, or newspaper exposure. Each was categorized into three categories: not at all, less than once a week, and at least once a week. Aside from the individual-level variables, we also included the household characteristics: smoking status, marital status, level of education of the household head, and household wealth status. All the variables were obtained by the IDHS through questionnaire-based interviews and were self-reported by respondents to the IDHS enumerator. We conducted descriptive statistical analyses on IDHS data using the Chi-square test and further analyses employing logistic regression. All

analyses were conducted in the STATA survey (svy) procedure to consider the sampling weight and sampling methods in IDHS 2017<sup>20</sup>. All analyses were conducted in STATA version 16 <https://www.stata.com/>.

## RESULTS

A total of 9,957 males aged 15-24 years old were included in this study. These young males were mostly (47.0%) less than 18 years old at the time of the interview. Most of them had at least senior high education (58.2%) and lived in urban areas (53.3%). Of all the young males that had tried smoking we included in this study, 48.7% (n=4,583) of them continued to be regular smokers at the time of the interview. In the descriptive analysis, a higher prevalence of smoking persistence occurred in young males aged 19-21 years (34.6%) and had at least senior high education (52.6%), lived in urban areas (51.5%), started smoking at the age of 13-18 years (77.0%), and not being exposed to the radio (53.2%) or newspapers (56.6%). Regarding the household characteristics, the analyses showed that being poor and having household heads who were smokers was associated with smoking persistence (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Sociodemographic characteristics

| Sociodemographic Characteristics | No Smoking Persistence (% , SE) n=5,374 | Smoking Persistence (% , SE)n=4,583 | Total (% , SE) n = 9,957 | P-value |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Total                            | 51.3 (0.6)                              | 48.7 (0.6)                          | 100 (0.6)                |         |
| Age*                             |   |                                     |                          | <0.001  |
| ≤18 years old                    | 59.5 (0.8)                              | 33.8 (0.9)                          | 47.0 (0.6)               |         |
| 19-21 years old                  | 23.5 (0.7)                              | 34.6 (0.9)                          | 28.9 (0.6)               |         |
| >21 years old                    | 17.0 (0.6)                              | 31.7 (0.8)                          | 24.1 (0.5)               |         |
| Educational level*               |   |                                     |                          | <0.001  |
| Elementary or less               | 6.5 (0.4)                               | 15.2 (0.6)                          | 10.7 (0.4)               |         |
| Junior high                      | 15.2 (0.6)                              | 22.8 (0.8)                          | 18.9 (0.5)               |         |
| Senior high                      | 63.5 (0.8)                              | 52.6 (0.9)                          | 58.2 (0.6)               |         |
| Academy/university               | 14.8 (0.6)                              | 9.5 (0.5)                           | 12.2 (0.4)               |         |
| Occupation*                      |   |                                     |                          | <0.001  |
| Others                           | 46.4 (0.9)                              | 21.3 (0.8)                          | 34.2 (0.6)               |         |
| Formal employee                  | 5.4 (0.4)                               | 6.0 (0.4)                           | 5.7 (0.3)                |         |
| Non-formal employee              | 36.0 (0.8)                              | 56.9 (0.9)                          | 46.1 (0.6)               |         |
| Farmer                           | 12.3 (0.5)                              | 15.9 (0.6)                          | 14.1 (0.4)               |         |
| Age of first smoking*            |   |                                     |                          | <0.001  |
| < 13 years old                   | 22.8 (0.7)                              | 19.1 (0.7)                          | 21.0 (0.5)               |         |
| 13-18 years old                  | 73.2 (0.8)                              | 77.0 (0.8)                          | 75.1 (0.5)               |         |
| >18 years old                    | 4.0 (0.3)                               | 3.9 (0.3)                           | 3.9 (0.2)                |         |

| Sociodemographic Characteristics | No Smoking Persistence<br>(%, SE) n=5,374 | Smoking Persistence<br>(%, SE)n=4,583 | Total<br>(%, SE)<br>n = 9,957 | P-value |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Internet use                     |   |                                       |                               | 0.061   |
| Never                            | 9.7 (0.5)                                 | 10.6 (0.5)                            | 10.1 (0.4)                    |         |
| Seldom                           | 64.2 (0.8)                                | 61.5 (0.9)                            | 62.9 (0.6)                    |         |
| Regularly                        | 26.1 (0.7)                                | 27.9 (0.8)                            | 27.0 (0.5)                    |         |
| Listening to the radio*          |   |                                       |                               | <0.001  |
| Not at all                       | 50.3 (0.8)                                | 53.2 (0.9)                            | 51.7 (0..6)                   |         |
| Less than once a week            | 35.1 (0.8)                                | 30.5 (0.8)                            | 32.9 (0.6)                    |         |
| At least once a week             | 14.6 (0.6)                                | 16.3 (0.7)                            | 15.4 (0.5)                    |         |
| Watching television              |   |                                       |                               | 0.061   |
| Not at all                       | 2.6 (0.3)                                 | 2.2 (0.3)                             | 2.4 (0.2)                     |         |
| Less than once a week            | 19.6 (0.7)                                | 21.8 (0.8)                            | 20.6 (0.5)                    |         |
| At least once a week             | 77.8 (0.7)                                | 76.0 (0.8)                            | 76.9 (0.5)                    |         |
| Reading newspaper*               |   |                                       |                               | <0.001  |
| Not at all                       | 44.5 (0.9)                                | 56.6 (0.9)                            | 50.4 (0.6)                    |         |
| Less than once a week            | 40.1 (0.8)                                | 30.9 (0.8)                            | 35.6 (0.6)                    |         |
| At least once a week             | 15.4 (0.6)                                | 12.6 (0.6)                            | 14.0 (0.4)                    |         |
| Household education*             |   |                                       |                               | <0.001  |
| Elementary or less               | 43.5 (0.9)                                | 54.0 (0.9)                            | 48.6 (0.6)                    |         |
| Junior high                      | 16.1 (0.6)                                | 17.6 (0.7)                            | 16.9 (0.5)                    |         |
| Senior high                      | 29.3 (0.8)                                | 22.1 (0.8)                            | 25.8 (0.5)                    |         |
| Academy/university               | 11.1 (0.5)                                | 6.3 (0.4)                             | 8.8 (0.3)                     |         |
| Household marital status         |   |                                       |                               | 0.111   |
| No                               | 18.0 (0.6)                                | 19.5 (0.7)                            | 18.7 (0.5)                    |         |
| Yes                              | 82.0 (0.6)                                | 80.5 (0.7)                            | 81.3 (0.5)                    |         |
| Household head smoking*          |   |                                       |                               | <0.001  |
| No                               | 49.0 (0.9)                                | 21.7 (0.8)                            | 35.7 (0.6)                    |         |
| Yes                              | 51.0 (0.9)                                | 78.3 (0.8)                            | 64.3 (0.6)                    |         |
| Wealth*                          |   |                                       |                               | <0.001  |
| Non-Poor                         | 62.0 (0.8)                                | 54.4 (0.9)                            | 58.3 (0.6)                    |         |
| Poor                             | 38.0 (0.8)                                | 45.6 (0.9)                            | 41.7 (0.6)                    |         |
| Area of residence*               |   |                                       |                               | 0.008   |
| Rural                            | 45.1 (0.9)                                | 48.5 (0.9)                            | 46.7 (0.6)                    |         |
| Urban                            | 54.9 (0.9)                                | 51.5 (0.9)                            | 53.3 (0.6)                    |         |

Note: \*) Chi-square test was conducted to assess differences in proportion by sociodemographic factors, and all tests were significant at  $p < 0.01$ .

In the logistic regression, older age at interview (aOR 3.4 95%CI 2.9-4.0 compared to those  $\leq 18$  years old), being a primary school student or less, having an occupation, and tried smoking at high school were factors that related to smoking persistence among young males in Indonesia (Table 2). In addition, other factors also related to smoking persistence among

young males in Indonesia, which included using the internet both regularly and rarely and not being exposed to the newspaper at all. The habit of household heads who smoked (aOR 3.1 95%CI 2.8-3.5), rural living areas, and low-income family welfare conditions were also significant factors in smoking persistence among young males (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Predictors of smoking persistence

| Sociodemographic Characteristics | Odds Ratio (95%CI) | Adjusted Odds Ratio (95%CI) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Age                              |                    |                             |
| $\leq 18$ years old              | Reference          | Reference                   |
| 19-21 years old                  | 2.6 (2.3-2.9)*     | 2.5 (2.1-2.8)*              |
| $>21$ years old                  | 3.3 (2.9-3.7)*     | 3.4 (2.9-4.0)*              |
| Educational level                |                    |                             |
| Elementary or less               | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Junior high                      | 0.6 (0.5-0.8)*     | 0.7 (0.6-0.9)*              |
| Senior high                      | 0.4 (0.3-0.4)*     | 0.5 (0.4-0.6)*              |

| Sociodemographic Characteristics | Odds Ratio (95%CI) | Adjusted Odds Ratio (95%CI) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Academy/university               | 0.3 (0.2-0.3)*     | 0.3 (0.2-0.4)*              |
| Occupation                       |                    |                             |
| Others                           | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Formal employee                  | 2.4 (1.9-3.0)*     | 1.7 (1.3-2.2)*              |
| Non-formal employee              | 3.4 (3.1-3.9)*     | 2.0 (1.7-2.3)*              |
| Farmer                           | 2.8 (2.4-3.3)*     | 1.7 (1.4-2.0)*              |
| Age of first smoking             |                    |                             |
| < 13 years old                   | Reference          | Reference                   |
| 13-18 years old                  | 1.3 (1.1-1.4)*     | 1.1 (1.0-1.3)               |
| >18 years old                    | 1.2 (0.9-1.5)      | 0.6 (0.4-0.8)*              |
| Internet use                     |                    |                             |
| Never                            | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Seldom                           | 0.9 (0.7-1.0)      | 1.4 (1.1-1.7)*              |
| Regularly                        | 1.0 (0.8-1.2)      | 1.3 (1.0-1.6)*              |
| Listening to radio               |                    |                             |
| Not at all                       | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Less than once a week            | 0.8 (0.7-0.9)*     | 0.9 (0.8-1.0)               |
| At least once a week             | 1.0 (0.9-1.2)      | 1.1 (0.9-1.2)               |
| Watching television              |                    |                             |
| Not at all                       | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Less than once a week            | 1.3 (0.9-1.8)      | 1.0 (0.7-1.4)               |
| At least once a week             | 1.1 (0.8-1.6)      | 1.0 (0.7-1.5)               |
| Reading newspaper                |                    |                             |
| Not at all                       | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Less than once a week            | 0.6 (0.5-0.7)*     | 0.7 (0.6-0.8)*              |
| At least once a week             | 0.6 (0.6-0.7)*     | 0.7 (0.6-0.8)*              |
| Household education              |                    |                             |
| Elementary or less               | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Junior high                      | 0.9 (0.8-1.0)      | 1.0 (0.9-1.2)               |
| Senior high                      | 0.6 (0.5-0.7)*     | 0.8 (0.7-1.0)*              |
| Academy/University               | 0.5 (0.4-0.6)*     | 0.9 (0.7-1.1)               |
| Household marital status         |                    |                             |
| No                               | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Yes                              | 0.9 (0.8-1.0)      | 0.8 (0.7-1.0)*              |
| Household head smoking           |                    |                             |
| No                               | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Yes                              | 3.5 (3.1-3.9)*     | 3.1 (2.8-3.5)*              |
| Family wealth                    |                    |                             |
| Non-Poor                         | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Poor                             | 1.4 (1.2-1.5)*     | 1.1 (0.9-1.2)               |
| Area of residence                |                    |                             |
| Urban                            | Reference          | Reference                   |
| Rural                            | 1.1 (1.0-1.3)*     | 1.0 (0.9-1.1)               |

Note: \*) showed that the predictor was significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

## DISCUSSION

This study showed a relatively high smoking persistence among young males who had tried smoking. Furthermore, we revealed several sociodemographic characteristics, which were important predictors for smoking persistence: age, age of first smoking, having an occupation, and lower level of education. We also identified several household characteristics associated with

smoking persistence: being poor, having household heads who were smokers, and living with household heads who were not married. This study also highlights the importance of exposure to the internet, which increases the odds of smoking persistence.

Previous studies have underlined the importance of age of first smoking as a predictor of smoking persistence. The high persistence of smoking in young adults begins as teenagers when

they first try and has become a problem for millions of young adults today<sup>21</sup>. This study found that young males who first tried smoking as adolescents were influenced by their closest friends who smoked and shared their habits. Related to that, convincing by coercion to smoke is also often done to test their loyalty<sup>22</sup>. In addition, those who first tried smoking as adolescents were considered a cultural transition, extending into adulthood with a higher risk of persistent smoking in adulthood compared to non-smokers without a history of tried smoking, known as the "sleeper effect" phenomenon<sup>23</sup>.

Moreover, with the increasing prevalence of NCDs, detecting risk factors and early screening becomes an important step in the global strategy to address NCDs<sup>24,25</sup>. Specifically, smoking prevention is essential in reducing the burden of NCDs. As one of the main risk factors for NCDs, smoking is a major burden for NCDs and accounts for approximately 14.1% (95% CI 13.3–15.0) mortality and 9.2% (95% CI 8.0–10.3) Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) in males in Iran<sup>26</sup>. Based on research in Indonesia, the risk of death is 48% higher in current smokers than in non-current smokers aged 40 years or more<sup>27</sup>.

The increasing risk of smoking persistence with increasing age also shows the need to provide continuous health education about the danger of smoking. Aside from conventional educational outlets, the use of informational technology, website, and social media might be an effective strategy in the current setting, particularly among youth<sup>28</sup>. In addition, prevention through education in junior and senior high schools and targeting youth under 18 years is not enough to prevent the harm of smoking. Thus, current prevention efforts also need to focus on the young adult populations<sup>29</sup>. Moreover, additional information on the mechanism of how age at first tried smoking, level of education, family, and media affect smoking behavior is important to provide recommendations for specific educational materials. The anti-smoking campaign is important, particularly in countries with high smoking prevalence as Indonesia.

Several previous smoking interventions include a policy to ban smoking in public spaces, mass media campaigns, and smoking cessation clinics<sup>30,31</sup>, and banning the open display of cigarettes have also been proven effective in reducing smoking prevalence<sup>32</sup>. Our findings disclose that those who tried smoking during high

school were more likely to be regular smokers, also providing a window of opportunity for smoking prevention. In this case, a multilevel and comprehensive approach to preventing smoking among students is important, particularly during high school. This program should involve not only the school and the students but also the family/parent. Family support has an essential role in the transition from adolescence into early adulthood in reducing risky behaviors and as a protective factor in adverse environments<sup>33</sup>. School-based tobacco control intervention programs also have a long-term role in reducing smoking behavior in adolescents and preventing adolescents from starting smoking. Thus, school-based tobacco control intervention programs also need to involve teachers and staff and follow consistent enforcement of policies to avoid adolescent failure to internalize personal anti-smoking beliefs<sup>34</sup>.

In our study, education also showed a dose-response association with smoking persistence. A higher risk for smoking persistence was observed in young males with less educational background, with the highest risk among elementary school graduates. In this regard, lower levels of education had a lower chance of providing information and knowledge about smoking and its effects on health than colleagues with higher education. In the community view, academic qualifications are also the reason for the difference in smoking prevalence in young males as observed between the university and senior high school graduates<sup>35</sup>. It might be due to the lack of knowledge and awareness of the danger and effects of smoking and less favorable social network or peers<sup>31,36</sup>.

Previous studies have notified that a reduction in smoking prevalence will reduce NCDs. In particular, implementing the WHO tobacco control policy by reducing the prevalence of tobacco use by 30% by 2025 compared to the annual trend of smoking prevalence from 1990 to 2015 can prevent 23,600 deaths and reduce the mortality rate by 7.8%. In addition, tobacco control can also help reduce 16,000 cancer deaths, 6000 CRD deaths, and 2,000 CVD deaths each year<sup>37</sup>. For this reason, intervention strategies tailored to address the highly susceptible population should also be undertaken, particularly young males with lower education for whom the school-based intervention might not reach. For these populations, increasing the smoking tax, a stricter policy on smoke-free areas, or a social

media intervention might be more useful<sup>38,39</sup>. Our findings also highlighted the importance of a targeted intervention strategy to address the high prevalence of smoking among young males. These strategies include the large-scale strategy of the smoking ban and educational campaigns. Further, specific and targeted intervention for the high-risk population found in this study is also needed for poor communities with lower education levels. With the increasing use of the internet and the importance of internet exposure in smoking persistence, there is also a need to develop an anti-smoking campaign targeting young males.

#### **Limitation and strength**

This study has several limitations. First, the self-reported nature of smoking persistence might risk reporting bias. Second, we could not address several factors, i.e., peer factors in this study, which might influence smoking persistence. Despite these limitations, this study provides evidence on several key risk factors in smoking persistence among young males. This study also highlights the importance of intervening on multilevel factors associated with smoking persistence, including family. Currently, most smoking prevention program focuses on the community and individual level. Thus, a comprehensive program involving family, school, and community is needed to prevent smoking persistence, particularly among young males.

## **CONCLUSION**

Our study provides evidence of the relatively high smoking persistence among young Indonesian males. This study also showed several sociodemographic factors related to smoking, including older age, those who started smoking at high school, having an occupation, and young males with less educational background. We also highlighted the importance of family factors in smoking persistence, i.e., being poor and having a household head who smokes or is not married also increased smoking persistence. Therefore, an effective and comprehensive intervention to prevent smoking initiation, particularly among high school students, while simultaneously implementing a community-based anti-smoking policy might be a useful method for reducing smoking prevalence in Indonesia. As our findings also revealed the importance of access to media, specifically the

internet, on smoking persistence, an educational campaign targeting high-school students and their families through online media is an important step in reducing smoking persistence in Indonesia.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

This study was funded by Universitas Sebelas Maret Research Grant. We thank the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) for giving access to the datasets.

## **DISCLAIMER**

The content is solely the authors' responsibility and does not necessarily represent the official views of Universitas Sebelas Maret.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

None declared.

## **ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE**

The Indonesian Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) took informed consent from respondents before administering the questionnaire. We obtained permission to use the data for the present study from the DHS program. Ethical approval was also obtained from Universitas Sebelas Maret Ethics Review Board.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Dhungana RR, Bista B, Pandey AR, de Courten M. Prevalence, clustering and sociodemographic distributions of non-communicable disease risk factors in Nepalese adolescents: secondary analysis of a nationwide school survey. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(5):e028263. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028263.
2. Peltzer K, Pengpid S. The Prevalence and Social Determinants of Hypertension among Adults in Indonesia: A Cross-Sectional Population-Based National Survey. *Int J Hypertens*. 2018;2018: 5610725. doi: 10.1155/2018/5610725.
3. Purnamasari D. The Emergence of Non-communicable Disease in Indonesia. *Acta Med Indones* 201; 50(4):273-4.

4. Sollis L, Emmel A, Klein J, Dain K, Kanayson P, Brumana L, et al. Noncommunicable Disease Prevention and Adolescents. Plan Int. UK; 2017.
5. Akseer N, Mehta S, Wigle J, Chera R, Brickman ZJ, Al-Gashm S, et al. Non-communicable diseases among adolescents: current status, determinants, interventions and policies. *BMC Public Health.* 2020; 20(1):1908. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09988-5.
6. Allen L, Williams J, Townsend N, Mikkelsen B, Roberts N, Foster C, Wickramasinghe K. Socioeconomic status and non-communicable disease behavioural risk factors in low-income and lower-middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2017;5(3):e277-e289. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30058-X.
7. Chompikul J. Cancer Prevention lifestyle Editorial. *J Public Hlth Dev.* 2016;14(1):1-2.
8. World Health Organization (WHO). Follow-up to the Political Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases. Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly vol. 1; 2013.
9. Xiao D, Wang C. Tobacco dependence should be recognised as a lethal non-communicable disease. *BMJ.* 2019;365: l2204. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2204.
10. Kataria I, Hale J, Watkins D, Kulkarni N, Hutchinson B, Nugent R. Reducing Noncommunicable Disease Risk Factors in Adolescents: An Investment Case for Indonesia. *RTI Int.* 2018;1-8.
11. Widyaningsih V, Hastuti H. A Call For Action : High Smoking and Alcohol Prevalence among Indonesian Male Youth. *2019(22):1-3.*
12. Xi B, Liang Y, Liu Y, Yan Y, Zhao M, Ma C, et al. Tobacco use and second-hand smoke exposure in young adolescents aged 12-15 years: data from 68 low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2016;4(11):e795-e805. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30187-5.
13. World Health Organization (WHO). Global Youth Tobacco Survey (GYTS): Indonesia report 2014. WHO-SEARO; 2015.
14. Efendi F, Aidah FN, Has EMM, Lindayani L, Reisenhofer S. Determinants of smoking behavior among young males in rural Indonesia. *Int J Adolesc Med Health.* 2019;33(5). doi: 10.1515/ijamh-2019-0040.
15. UNICEF. Programme Guidance for Early Life Prevention of. United Nations Child. Fund; 2019.
16. Mokdad AH, Forouzanfar MH, Daoud F, Mokdad AA, El Bcheraoui C, Moradi-Lakeh M, et al. Global burden of diseases, injuries, and risk factors for young people's health during 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet.* 2016;387(10036): 2383-401. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00648-6.
17. Riley L, Guthold R, Cowan M, Savin S, Bhatti L, Armstrong T, et al. The World Health Organization STEPwise Approach to Noncommunicable Disease Risk-Factor Surveillance: Methods, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Am J Public Health.* 2016; 106(1):74-8. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2015.302962.
18. Malta DC, Szwarcwald CL. Population-based surveys and monitoring of noncommunicable diseases. *Rev Saude Publica.* 2017;51 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):2s. doi: 10.1590/S1518-8787.201705100 sup1lap.
19. Statistics Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik—BPS), National Population and Family Planning Board (BKKBN), Indonesia Ministry of Health (Depkes RI). Indonesia Demographic and Health Survey 2017. 2018.
20. StataCorp. Stata: Release 13. Statistical Software. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2013.
21. Pérez A, Kuk AE, Bluestein MA, Penedo E, N'Hpang R S, Chen B, et al. Prospective estimation of the age of initiation of cigarettes among young adults (18-24 years old): Findings from the Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) waves 1-4 (2013-2017). *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(5): e0251246. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0251246.
22. Kishun J, Kumar A, Singh U. Correlates of Cigarette Smoking Among Adolescents in India. *Indian J Community Med.* 2021; 46(3):389-95. doi: 10.4103/ijcm.IJCM\_168\_20.
23. O Oztekin C, Batra M, Abdelsalam S, Sengezer T, Ozkara A, Erbas B. Impact of Individual, Familial and Parental Factors on Adolescent Smoking in Turkey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(7): 3740. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18073740.
24. Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) for 333 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global

Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10100): 1260-344. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32130-X.

25. Jarvis JD, Woods H, Bali A, Oronsaye E, Persaud N. Selection of WHO-recommended essential medicines for non-communicable diseases on National Essential Medicines Lists. *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14(8):e0220781. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0220781.

26. Azadnajafabad S, Mohammadi E, Aminorroaya A, Fattahi N, Rezaei S, Haghshenas R, et al. Non-communicable diseases' risk factors in Iran; a review of the present status and action plans. *J Diabetes Metab Disord*. 2021;1-9. doi: 10.1007/s40200-020-00709-8.

27. Holipah H, Sulistomo HW, Maharani A. Tobacco smoking and risk of all-cause mortality in Indonesia. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(12):e0242558. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0242558.

28. Cremers HP, Mercken L, Candel M, de Vries H, Oenema A. A Web-based, computer-tailored smoking prevention program to prevent children from starting to smoke after transferring to secondary school: randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17(3):e59. doi: 10.2196/jmir.3794.

29. Barrington-Trimis JL, Braymiller JL, Unger JB, McConnell R, Stokes A, Leventhal AM, et al. Trends in the Age of Cigarette Smoking Initiation Among Young Adults in the US From 2002 to 2018. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(10): e2019022. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19022.

30. Bigwanto M, Mongkolcharti A, Peltzer K, Laosee O. Determinants of cigarette smoking among school adolescents on the island of Java, Indonesia. *Int J Adolesc Med Health*. 2017;29(2). doi: 10.1515/ijamh-2015-0036.

31. Ganley BJ, Rosario DI. The smoking attitudes, knowledge, intent, and behaviors of adolescents and young adults: Implications for nursing practice. *J Nurs Educ Pract*. 2013;(3):40–50.

32. Ford A, MacKintosh AM, Moodie C, Kuipers MAG, Hastings GB, Bauld L. Impact of a ban on the open display of tobacco products in retail outlets on never smoking youth in the UK: findings from a repeat cross-sectional survey before, during and after implementation. *Tob Control*. 2020;29(3):282-8. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054831.

33. Zaborskis A, Kavaliauskienė A, Eriksson C, Klemara E, Dimitrova E, Melkumova M, et al. Family Support as Smoking Prevention during Transition from Early to Late Adolescence: A Study in 42 Countries. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021; 18(23). doi: 10.3390/ijerph182312739.

34. Kim SY, Jang M, Yoo S, JeKarl J, Chung JY, Cho SI. School-Based Tobacco Control and Smoking in Adolescents: Evidence from Multilevel Analyses. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(10):3422. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17103422.

35. Tomioka K, Kurumatani N, Saeki K. The Association Between Education and Smoking Prevalence, Independent of Occupation: A Nationally Representative Survey in Japan. *J Epidemiol*. 2020;30(3): 136-42. doi: 10.2188/jea.JE20180195.

36. So ES, Yeo JY. Factors Associated with Early Smoking Initiation among Korean Adolescents. *Asian Nurs Res (Korean Soc Nurs Sci)*. 2015;9(2):115-9. doi: 10.1016/j.anr.2015.05.002.

37. Wang Z, Luo Y, Yang S, Zou K, Pei R, He J, et al. Premature deaths caused by smoking in Sichuan, Southwest China, 2015-2030. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):171. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-79606-2.

38. Durkin S, Bayly M, Cotter T, Mullin S, Wakefield M. Potential effectiveness of anti-smoking advertisement types in ten low and middle income countries: do demographics, smoking characteristics and cultural differences matter? *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;98:204-13. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.09.022.

39. Nurwidya F, Takahashi F, Baskoro H, Hidayat M, Yunus F, Takahashi K. Strategies for an effective tobacco harm reduction policy in Indonesia. *Epidemiol Health*. 2014;36:e2014035. doi: 10.4178/epih/e2014035.