



Community Medicine & Education Journal

Journal Homepage:

<https://hmpublisher.com/index.php/CMEJ>



The Effect of Income and Social Status on Interests are not Smoking on Active Smokers

Mutia Arnisa Putri ^{1*}

¹ Medical Education Study Program, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Smoking
Income
Social status
Planned behavior theory
Interest
Active smoker
Qualitative

Corresponding author:

Mutia Arnisa Putri

E-mail address:

mutiara_arnisa@gmail.com

The author has reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

<https://doi.org/10.37275/CMEJ.v1i1.99>

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Smoking is a phenomenon in society that emerged as an area of interest in research within the last decade, moreover due to the high prevalence in young adults. WHO reported that in 2008, Indonesia held the 3rd position out of 10 countries with highest population and cigarette consumption worldwide. High interest of cigarette consumption due to income and social status of individuals yielded such devastating effects in every aspects of life. High cigarette consumption had caused economic and social burden that never stopped to arise. Aizen and Fishbain described that interest was a good predictor to determine behavioral aspect of cigarette smoking in individual. Planned behavior theory stated that interest or intention were the closest determinant factors of behavior. From the above explanation, there were several factors that could alter one's interest to quit smoking viewed from income and social status aspects. This research was conducted to determine factors that influenced interest in smoking consumption, including the aspects of income and social status toward the interests of active smokers in Palembang to quit their smoking behavior. **Methods:** The method used was qualitative research and data were taken by observations, focus group discussion (FGD) and in-depth interview. The informants were 15 active smokers from various backgrounds in Palembang that were selected by purposive sampling technique. In FGD, out of 15 informants, 10 were taken and divided into 2 groups, and the rest 5 informants were chosen for in-depth interview. **Results:** Based on the three aspects of planned behavior theory, i.e. individual's interest, subjective social norm, and behavioral control, the result showed that individual's attitude did not influence the decision of active smokers to quit their smoking behavior, meant as not to quit but more inclined to reduce than to stop. Second, based on subjective social norm, from environment, parents, and peers, the result showed that this aspect could influence active smokers' interest to quit smoking. Third, based on the aspect of behavioral control by individual's income, the result showed that the income did not influence active smokers' interest to quit smoking because they were more driven by their cravings for cigarette. Based on behavioral control by social status, the results showed that educational level and marriage status did have influence on active smokers to their smoking behavior, but not to stop, rather only to reduce. The aspect of jobs also did not have any influence on active smokers to quit their smoking behavior. **Conclusion:** The aspect of income and job-related social status did not have any influence on active smokers to quit their smoking behavior, while social status viewed from educational level and marriage status yielded the influence on active smokers, but more inclined to reduce than to stop.

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of smoking in the community emerged as an important area of research in the last decade, especially because of the high prevalence in

young adulthood¹. Smoking is a preventable cause of death, disability, and from inequalities in health in high and middle income countries.



<https://hmpublisher.com/index.php/CMEJ>

Based on WHO data in 2008, Indonesia ranked third in the list of ten countries with the largest population and cigarette consumption in the world ². In 2015, the number of smokers in Indonesia was 39.5% (around 72,723,300 people), an increase of 3.8% compared to the number in 2010 of 35.7% smokers (around 60,270,600 people) ³. The number of smokers those aged ≥ 10 years in South Sumatra Province amounted to 24.7% above the average number of smokers who were aged ≥ 10 years in Indonesia which amounted to 24.3%.²

According to Willkinson and Shete's (2017) research conducted on Mexican tribes in the United States it was found that people with low to medium subjective social status, let alone related to conflicts that occur in the family, have an increased risk of smoking interest. What's more coupled with conditions of anxiety, age, gender, low understanding, the influence of peers, and family at home also smokes which can be a factor in smoking interest by smokers themselves.⁴

In the 2013 Action of Smoking and Health study, smoking prevalence can be attributed to people who are experiencing social and economic problems.⁵

The high interest in smoking because of income and social status of these individuals has a negative impact on all aspects of life. High consumption of cigarettes causes economic and social costs incurred continue to increase and the burden of this increase is largely borne by the poor.

In addition, smoking can cause various effects of health problems, including cognitive decline and physical abilities of a person.⁴

According to Ajzen and Fishbain, interest is a good predictor in determining smoking behavior in an individual. The planned behavior theory (TPB) states that interest or intention is the closest determinant of behavior.⁶

From the explanation above, there are several factors that can actually cause a person's increased

interest not to smoke in terms of income and social status because smoking has a very detrimental impact on both the individual and the country. Therefore, this study was conducted to determine the factors that influence non-smoking interest, including the influence of income and social status on non-smoking interest in active smokers in the city of Palembang.

2. Methods

This type of research is a descriptive observational study with a qualitative research approach. This research was conducted to determine the effect of income and social status on smoking interest in active smokers using primary data through focus group discussions (FGD), and in-depth interviews on the basis of planned behavior theory.

The study was conducted in July 2017. The study was conducted in several regions in the city of Palembang. The population in this study were all active smokers who met the criteria determined by the sampling technique carried out purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is used to obtain information in accordance with research objectives.

Research requires the determination of key informants (key informants) in accordance with the focus of research. The selection of informants has criteria in accordance with the research topic and the adequacy of data that can describe all phenomena in the research topic. The informants of the research originally planned were the research informants were 15 active smokers from various groups in the city of Palembang who were selected by purposive sampling technique. In this case, 10 people were divided into two FGD groups, then 5 other people were interviewed in depth.

The data used in this study are primary data. Data obtained by focus group discussion (FGD) and in-depth, interviews. When directing the course of the discussion, the moderator uses the FGD guidelines



that were previously prepared with the assistance of a superviso Data obtained in the study based on FGD results, deep interviews, and observations were recorded and recorded. After the data is collected, the data will be grouped and interpreted into written form.

In maintaining data validity, data testing is carried out on the research. Data testing that will be carried out in this research is triangulation. The data is then presented and explained in the form of

descriptive descriptions and can be in the form of tables and charts.

3. Results

In this FGD, questions were asked to informants whether they knew the effects of smoking, and how they responded to these impacts. The following is an illustration of non-smoking interests based on individual attitudes. Shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Individual attitude (FGD results)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|---|--------|---|
| 1 | <p><i>“ buang duet jadi dampak negatifnyo, segi paru-paru jadi candu kan, nikotin merusak paru-paru, ado gambar rokok tuh biso merusak pita suaro samo stroke kan”</i></p> <p><i>“yo simple sih jawaban saya, kan di kotak rokok itu kan ado tulisannyo mengganggu kesehatan paru-paru, kehamilan, banyak dampak yang negatifnya dari merokoknya”</i></p> | FGD A | Informants already know the effects of smoking itself, what are the risks of smoking itself. |
| | <p><i>“ dampaknyo sakit tenggorokan, kanker paru-paru, atau yang seperti disebutkan di bungkusannya itu”</i></p> <p><i>“kalo menurut saya ya menurut itu efeknya di jangka panjang bisa kanker, jantung, stroke, ya penyakit dalam ya”</i></p> | FGD B | |
| 2. | <p><i>“kalo saya, berpikirnya saya perokok, tau dampak-dampaknya bagaimana, jadi agak mengurangi frekuensi merokok, niat untuk stop ada tapi insyaallah dalam jangka waktu cepetlah bisa berhenti...”</i></p> <p><i>“sekarang ini belum bisolah buat berenti, tapi adolah kepikiran nak ngurangi”</i></p> | FGD A | Responses range from informants who do not smoke or just reduce, there are also ignorant of all the impacts that exist on the basis of opium. |
| | <p><i>“Kalo menurut saya pribadi saya dengan tuhan ya, kalo dibilang bakalan buat mati ya itukan emang ditentukan sendiri kapan matinya, bukan ditentukan sama rokoknya”</i></p> <p><i>“kalo saya sih ya nggak harus selalu merokok, kalo merokok itu disaat saat tertentu misal abis makan, atau lagi ngerasa asem, ya merokok”</i></p> | FGD B | |



The following is a description obtained about the interest in not smoking based on subjective social norms.

It starts with how smoking started up to responses from family and friends about the individual's smoking habits.

Table 2. Subjective social norms (FGD Results)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|--|--------|--|
| 1 | <p><i>“Ya kalo aku gara-gara lingkungan ya, temen temen saya itu pada merokok kan, jadi saya ikut-ikutan juga merokok dulu, sampe sekarang”</i></p> <p><i>“ya sama sih sebenarnya pergaulan inilah pemicu merokok”</i></p> | FGD A | The environment which initially influenced these informants in their smoking habits. |
| | <p><i>“kalo saya sih dari SMP mbak, sekitaran umur 13 tahun, itu gara gara pengaruh lingkungan saya juga sihhhh...”</i></p> <p><i>“Kalo saya sih karena lingkungan saya itu agak nakal, jadi ikut nakal dari SD umur 10 tahun”</i></p> | FGD B | |
| 2. | <p><i>“awalnya sempat tidak diperbolehkan, karena orangtua saya kan perokok, jadi sakit, orangtua melarang saya merokok seperti itu, jadi saya merokok seperti diluar rumah gitu dan juga mengurangi merokok sedikitlah”</i></p> | FGD A | The family responded negatively to smoking habits informan. |
| | <p><i>“kalo orangtua saya biasa aja sih, tapi kalo orangtua saya yang cewek ya merokok itu ya begini begini, tapi kalo orangtua saya yang cowok ya biasa aja karena dia juga merokok, jadi ya saya biasa aja ”</i></p> | FGD B | |
| 3 | <p><i>“kalo di lingkungan pergaulan sih , ada yang menganggap itu tidak keren, tapi saya tekankan setiap orang punya pilihan masing-masing, jadi kita nggak bisa memaksakan kehendak kepada orang tersebut”</i></p> | FGD A | Friends of informants respond negatively to non-smoking from informants. |
| | <p><i>“kalo nggak merokok, pasti dikasih rokok sama mereka, sama-sama, jadi ujung-ujungnya ya pasti merokok hahaha”</i></p> | FGD B | |



The following is an illustration of non-smoking interest based on behavioral control of individual income:

Table 3. Behavioral control of individual income (FGD Results)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|--|--------|---|
| 1 | <i>"Masihlah , Kito kan kecanduan walaupun sekali-kali masih diejokelah nak merokok tuh, dak ado istilah mun buntu dak merokok"</i> | FGD A | Informants do not care about their financial condition and still smoke. |
| | <i>"masih mau merokok, karena kalo saya nggak ngerokok saya merasa nggak hidup"</i> | FGD B | |
| 2. | <i>"yo cak itulah , dak perlu nak beduet mun nak ngerokok tuh, umpanyo dio kecanduan lagi dak ado duit. Yo cakmanolah nyari kawan, sebatang jadilah"</i> | FGD A | People who smoke do not have to be people who have a high economic level who smoke. |
| | <i>"Ndak juga sih, kayak tukang bakso keliling aja kalo mau merokok ya merokok aja"</i> | FGD B | |

The following is an illustration of non-smoking interest based on behavioral control of individual income:

Table 4. Control of behavior from social status

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|---|--------|---|
| 1 | <i>"Kalo wong sekolahan cak itu pola pikirnyo leboh kehidup sehat lah ye kalo berenti mgerokok tuh"</i> | FGD A | The informant stated that a person's level of education could be the influence of a smoker's interest in smoking. |
| | <i>"Kalo saya sih, kalo pendidikan lebih tinggi sebenarnya mereka lebih tau dampaknya, jadi mungkin mereka lebih mengurangi tapi tidak berhenti"</i> | FGD B | |
| 2. | <i>"Sebenemnyo, merokok itu gaya hidup, , karena rokok nih kalo lagi jenuh tuh bisa jadi temen, misal lagi galau, atau masalah keluarga, jadi idak ngaruh dari gawean untuk minat dio idak merokok"</i> | FGD A | The informant stated that the work could not influence the interest in not smoking to a smoker. |
| | <i>"idak sih, kalo menurut aku ye dio nak siapa be, gawe apo be, mun dio la beniat nak ngerokok, yo tetep nak ngerokok itulah, sebabnyo mungkin ado wong stress karno gawean dio, yo merokok bae dio"</i> | FGD B | |
| 3 | <i>"Kalo sebelum nikah yo beterasan merokok, kalo la sudah nikah sampe sekarang la tuo nih, la mulai bekuranglah banyak merokoknyo dibanding dulu"</i> | FGD A | There is a married status factor to the habit of reducing the frequency of smoking. |
| | <i>"Ah sebenemnyo pas masih bujang deres merokok, pas la deket deket nikah ngurangi, nah kalo sudah nikah ini mulai sembunyi sembunyi sih, dak lemak jago dengan anak kito dak"</i> | FGD B | |
| 4. | <i>"Kalo sekarang kan kareno la lanjut usia jadi dilarang, dibilangke berhentilah merokok pak"</i> | FGD A | Negative response from family or partner about smoking habits. |
| | <i>"kalo pasangan saya melarang, kalo ketemu misal merokok pasti dimarahin, ya pacar saya mau ngejauh nggak mau deket-deket, jadi saya stop dulu merokoknya"</i> | FGD B | |
| | <i>"Ngocehlah, terutama sudah punya anak kan, anak kecil kayak gitu kan, jadi gimanalah harus kasih contoh"</i> | FGD B | |



The following is a description obtained about the interest in not smoking based on individual attitudes, shown in the table:

Table 5. Individual attitudes (Results of in-depth interviews)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|---|--------|---|
| 1 | <i>“yang dikotak rokok itulah dok, kanker, kanker tenggorokan, banyak lagi”</i> | DI 1 | Informants already know the effects of smoking itself, what are the risks of smoking itself. |
| | <i>“taulah dok, paru-paru pokoknyo, yang ado dibungkus rokok itunah”</i> | DI 2 | |
| 2 | <i>“ Idak, biaso bae, la telanjur ngerokok jugo kan.”</i> | DI 1 | Informants are ignorant of all the impacts that exist on the grounds that they have already smoked. |
| | <i>“ kadang suka kepikiran sih, buat berenti merokok tapi jalani baela”</i> | DI 4 | |

The following is a description obtained about the interest with how smoking started up to responses from family and in not smoking based on subjective social norms. It starts friends about the individual's smoking habits.

Table 6. Subjective social norms (In-depth interview results)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|--|--------|--|
| 1 | <i>“iya awalnya dari temen-temen nih, ikut pergaulan pas di sekolah kan, tentu dipengaruhi kayak itu, kalo dulu, kita nggak ikut-ikutan seperti itu, kita dianggepnya nggak kerenlah, nggak ah udah nggak mau berteman,”</i> | DI 3 | The informant told that the association that caused smoking in the beginning. |
| | <i>“awalnya merokok itu, karena lingkungan ya, karena sekitar saya dulu itu banyak anak-anak nakal, waktu SD lah umur 10 tahun, saya ikut terpengaruh juga gitu”</i> | DI 4 | |
| 2 | <i>“aduh kalo orangtua waktu itu pastinya belum tau, kalo sampe tau, pastinya saya kena marah, abis saya itu! Jadi sembunyi-sembunyi dulu, tapi waktu itu sempet blesu kan nak sembunyi terus jadi sempet stop jugo”</i> | DI 5 | Family responses to smoking habits influence the informants' decision to smoke or not smoke. |
| | <i>“dulu pasti dilarang ya namanya anak-anak dilarang orang tua, ya bagaimana caranya sembunyi-sembunyi gitu”</i> | DI 4 | |
| 3 | <i>“karena biasanya saya ini kan termasuk yang merokok terus kan, tiba-tiba tidak merokok, tentu teman-teman saya akan merasa aneh”</i> | DI 3 | The responses from friends of the informants determine the decision to smoke or not from the informants. |
| | <i>“ya pasti pada bingunglah, yang biasanya merokok tiba tiba nggak ngerokok, ya ditanyainlah kenapa nggak ngerokok”</i> | DI 5 | |



The following is an illustration of non-smoking interest based on behavioral control of individual income:

Table 7. Behavioral Control of Individual Income (In-depth interview results)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|---|--------|---|
| 1 | <i>"masih dok, masih tulaah aku nih nak merokok, kan la aku bilang, kalo dak merokok tetep bae aku nak merokok"</i> | DI 2 | Informants still want to smoke no matter what their financial condition. |
| 2 | <i>"dak masalah, samo, ado yang dak ado duet bae masih merokok, yo namonyo lah candu, yosudah cak itulah dio"</i> | DI 2 | People who smoke do not have to be people who have a high economic level who smoke. |
| | <i>dak jugo sih, yo karena di Indonesia ini rokok tuh murah ye, jadi siapapun bisa menjangkaunya</i> | DI 4 | |

The following is a description obtained about the interest in not smoking based on behavioral control of individual income.

Table 8. Control of behavior from social status (Results of in-depth interviews)

| No | Statement | Source | Interpretation |
|----|---|--------|--|
| 1 | <i>"iyo biasonyo, kalo wong pendidikannyo tinggi yo caro pikirnyo lebih bagus dok... lebih bepikirlah dio ngurusi hidup dio apolagi la tau resiko rokok kan , jadi lebih mudah untuk berenti merokok"</i> | DI 1 | The informant stated that a person's education level could be the influence of a smoker's interest in merokok. |
| 2 | <i>"ya nggaklah, nggk ngaruh, atasan saya aja masih merokok, namanya sudah candu, apalagi kalo lagi ada kasus-kasus sulit ya, pasti ya tambah banyak aja merokoknya biar fresh pikirannya"</i> | DI 4 | The informant stated that the work could not influence the interest in not smoking to a smoker. |
| 3 | <i>"pas masih bujang ya, namanya masih muda ya masih sering bener merokok, tapi seiring waktu ya sudah menikah agak dikurangi dan juga sekarang nggak terlalu ekspos depan istri ya, lagian punya anak kecil"</i> | DI 4 | There is a married status factor to the habit of reducing the frequency of smoking. |
| 4 | <i>"ya tentunya melarang, ya dia juga tau dampak-dampak dari merokok"</i> | DI 4 | Negative response from family or partner about smoking habits. |



4. Discussion

Interest in not smoking is based on individual attitudes

In accordance with the theory of planned behavior, attitude is a concept formed by three components, namely cognition, affect and kon5. Of the three elements, individual smokers can be triggered to be negative towards smoking because they know the effects of smoking.

From the results of the FGDs and in-depth interviews it was found that the responses varied from informants who did not smoke or just reduced, there were also ignorant of all the effects that exist with opium reasons.

From the results of the interviews, the three components forming attitudes, namely cognition, affect, and konasi influence in taking attitude from the informants who are invited to interview and discuss.

From Cognition, it was found that the informant already knew the effects of smoking, which then led to confidence in the informant about it. Then in terms of Afek, the informants mentioned that after knowing the effects of smoking, the informant had the intention to quit, but little by little. Then Konasi or attitude determination, from the informants obtained information that from some informants have different attitude determination decisions, there are informants who intend to stop, by reducing it first, while the other informants are more inclined to be indifferent where the informant says to submit fully with God's decision. Do not care about the effects of these cigarettes.

Interest in not smoking based on subjective social norms

According to Ajzen, subjective norms are based on an individual's perception of social pressure not to do or do the behavior considered.⁷ Social influence in this case can be obtained from peers and parents.^{1,11,12}

As for the parental factor, it was clear that both during the FGD and in-depth interviews, the parental factor clearly influenced the informants' behavior in making smoking decisions or not. At the time of the FGD,

the informant in the FGD admitted that smoking habit was with his father, so that when the mother banned his habit, the informant was normal, because he had an example of someone who smoked, namely his father. his parents who forbid him, the informant became secretly smoking and finally had time to stop

For the factor of association with peers. From the FGD results, if this informant decides not to smoke, his friends tend to be negative about the decisions made by the informant. Next, his friends encouraged the non-smoking informant to smoke. In FGD A informants, negative responses were obtained from friends in their relationships, but the informants remained in their stance, this is in accordance with one aspect of subjective social norms, namely Normative belief. Normative belief is a belief that is associated with expectations about a behavior that affects individuals to do or not do certain behaviors.¹

From the results of in-depth interviews, negative responses from friends of the informants regarding their decision not to smoke, they tend to say that the action is strange and become a question mark in their minds why the informant did so. However, the informants' decision returned to one aspect of subjective social norms, namely motivation to comply. Motivation to comply is a person's motivation to follow the expectations of another person or group of people to do or not do, in this case not to smoke.¹

Interest in not smoking is based on behavioral control of individual income

According to Ajzen, controller issues are considered to be feelings of self-efficacy, or the ability to manifest behavior, which is called perceived control behavior. Perceived behavioral control is determined by two factors, namely control beliefs (beliefs about the ability to control) and perceived power (perception of the power possessed to perform a behavior).^{1,11,12}

From the FGD results it was found that the informant did not have a behavioral control attitude if his financial condition was difficult. This is contrary to one aspect of



behavioral control, namely Control beliefs. Control beliefs are beliefs about the ability to control their behavior, in this case smokers do not have control over their smoking habits.

From the results of in-depth interviews, there is also no attitude control attitude towards financial condition. This is actually one aspect of behavioral control that is control beliefs. If the individual has strong control beliefs about existing factors that facilitate the behavior, in this case the interest not to smoke, then the individual has a high perception to be able to control the behavior, and vice versa.^{1,7,11,12}

In a discussion with the informants at the FGD, the interviewer asked questions about whether the person who smokes must be a person who has good money. From the results of the FGD discussions, it was found that the informants agreed, the person who smokes, does not have to be someone who has a high economic level. All walks of life can smoke. Whoever it is. This is in accordance with one aspect of behavior control theory, namely perceived power.^{1,7,11}

From the results of in-depth interviews, it was found that the informants also assumed that people who smoke do not have to be people who have a high economic level. Their perception is the same as the results of the discussion in the previous FGD group. This shows that income has no effect in the decision making of active smokers not to smoke.

Interest in not smoking is based on behavioral control of individual social status

Social status according to Ralph Linton is a set of rights and obligations that a person has in his society. Social status is usually based on various elements of human interest in social life, namely employment status, status in the kinship system, status of position.⁸

In the results of discussions in the FGD and in-depth interviews the question was asked whether if someone with a lower level of education with a person with a higher level of education would be less inclined to smoke. From the results of the FGD and in-depth interviews it

was found that the informants argued that people with high education could be the influence of a smoker not to smoke. This is because according to those who have higher education, they will better understand the problems caused by people who smoke. So according to them it would be easier for an active smoker to reduce, even actually quit smoking.

This is consistent with research from the study of Vidal et al in 2011 which stated that an individual with better education had a lower interest in smoking compared to someone who had a low education.⁹

Then later, in the FGD discussions and in-depth interviews the question was asked whether if someone with a lower type of work with someone who has a better type of work would be less inclined to smoke.

From the results of the FGDs and in-depth interviews, it was found that these informants thought that work did not affect their interest in not smoking. This is because according to them smoking does not look at what work is, because smoking is when someone is addicted then do not look at their work whether they will continue to smoke. In addition they assume that smoking can relieve stress from their work and their own lives.

This is in accordance with research from Espinoza and Najera at Central American University in 2013, which stated that there was no relationship between a person's position in a particular job or institution with the smoking of an individual in a day. Individuals with jobs that demand time, or who demand high levels of concentration and extra work smoke more often¹⁰. Then a study states that the prevalence of smoking is high among people who are experiencing social and economic problems, they claim smoking can be a method that can treat and cope with stress⁵.

Then later, in the FGD discussions and in-depth interviews the questions were asked about how smoking informants before and after marriage.

From the results of the FGDs and interviews it was found that the smoking habits of the informants tended to change. From before marriage the smoking habits are many, often and continuously until when they are



married, their smoking habits are reduced. This is consistent with research from Espinoza and Najera at Central American University in 2012, which said that unmarried individuals smoke more frequently than married people. This is caused by several external factors, including pressure and support from the couple, which can significantly reduce smoking behavior.¹⁰

Then FGD informants and in-depth interviews were asked about how their partners thought about their smoking habits.

From the results of the FGD and in-depth interviews the same results were obtained, namely the couple responded more negatively to informant smoking habits, this is because smoking was considered a dangerous behavior. This is the same as the results obtained in Espinoza and Najera's research at the University of Central American in 2012, saying that individuals who are married or who are "feeling love" have household companions who tend to suppress harmful behaviors, especially their health.¹⁰

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of research on the effect of "income" and social status on non-smoking interest in active smokers in this study based on the planned behavior theory the following results are obtained:

1. Based on individual attitudes, the three components forming individual attitudes namely cognition, affect, and konasi influence in taking the attitude of active smokers who are invited to interview and discuss. from these results, it was found that individual attitudes did not influence the decision of active smokers not to smoke. No influence here is meant not to stop, but rather to reduce rather than stop.
2. Based on subjective social norms the results show that this can affect the interest of an active smoker to not smoke. In this case, the environment, parents and friends play an important role in influencing the decision of active smokers not to smoke.

3. Based on behavioral control in terms of individual income, the results show that income does not affect the interest of an active smoker to not smoke. Because, first of all financial condition, if they are opium will still smoke, and secondly, active smokers agree, the person who smokes it, does not have to be someone who has a high economic level.
4. Based on behavioral control in terms of individual social status, the results obtained that education, as well as marital status can affect an active smoker in their smoking habits. But not to not smoke, but rather tend to reduce smoking. In terms of work, this does not affect one's interest in not smoking.

6. Suggestion

1. Understanding the dangers of the effects of cigarettes must be further enhanced, because most active smokers just simply know the effects of smoking, without understanding clearly. Education and promotion in the danger of the effects of smoking can be emphasized again by relevant agencies such as the health department, hospitals, puskesmas, posyandu, health workers, and anti-smoking organizations to all levels of society.
2. Supervision of children's relationships by parents must be improved again, because association is one of the main triggers for someone to have a smoking habit. Parents should also set a good example in front of their children so that the parents' bad habits are not imitated by their children.
3. Families should be more aware of smoking habits from family members with each other, because the family has a good bond between one family member and another family member, which can motivate these active smokers to leave the smoking habit.

7. References

1. Mahyarni M. Theory Of Reasoned Action dan Theory Of Planned Behavior (Sebuah Kajian Historis Tentang Perilaku). El-Riyasah, 2013; 4(1): 13-22.



2. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesehatan Kementerian Kesehatan RI. Riset Kesehatan Dasar. 2013; 132-134.
3. World Health Organization. WHO Global Report on Trends in Prevalence of Tobacco Smoking 2015. WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2015.
4. Shete SS, Wilkinson AV. Identifying demographic and psychosocial factors related to the escalation of smoking behavior among Mexican American adolescents. Preventive Medicine. 2017 Jun; 99: 146-151.
5. ASH (Action on Smoking and Health). 2013. Fact Sheet: on Smoking and Mental Health. (dalam www.ash.org.uk, diakses 29 Juni 2017).
6. Trisnaniar, RI. Studi Fenomenologi: Intensi Merokok pada Remaja. Naskah Publikasi. Fakultas Psikologi UMS. 2015.
7. Rosdiana S. Faktor- Faktor Psikologis yang Mempengaruhi Intensi Merokok pada Remaja. Skripsi Fakultas Psikologi UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. 2011.
8. Meijer E, Gebhardt WA, Laar CV, Kawous R, Beijik S. Socioeconomic status in relation to smoking: The role of (expected and desired) social support and quitter identity. Social Science and Medicine 2016 Nov; 162: 41-49.
9. Vidal PM, Cerveira JM, Paccaud F, Waeber G, dkk. Prevalence and Factors Associated with Difficulty and Intention to quit smoking in Switzerland. BMC Public Health, 2011; 11: 1-9
10. Espinoza LA, Najera JM. Effect of Marital Status, Gender, and Job Position in Smoking Behaviour and Cessation Intent of Staff Members in a Central America Public University. *Cuardenos de Investigacion UNED*, 2013; 5(1): 157-161.
11. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and Reflections. Routledge : Psychology and Health, 2014; 26(9): 1113-1127.
12. Achmat Z. 2010. Theory Of Planned Behavior, Masihkah Relevan?, (dalam www.umy.ac.id, diakses 1 Juli 2017).

