GLOBAL INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

https://global-us.mellbaou.com/

Open Access

Civil Implications of Monopoly Practices in Business Competition Law in Indonesia

Dharma Setiawan Negara

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Indonesia

Monopoly practices present substantial challenges to both civil rights and economic equity in Indonesia. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the civil implications of monopolistic behavior within the context of Indonesian business competition law. The study delves into the multifaceted impacts of monopolies on market dynamics, consumer rights, and overall economic health. It is evident that monopolistic practices distort market fairness by limiting consumer choices, inflating prices, and diminishing the quality of goods and services. These adverse outcomes highlight significant violations of civil rights, particularly in restricting individuals' freedom to make informed and free choices in the marketplace.

The legal framework in Indonesia, while foundational, often lacks the robustness required to effectively address the sophisticated nature of modern monopolistic strategies. The effectiveness of these laws is crucial in curbing monopolistic behavior and ensuring fair market conditions. Through a detailed examination of existing regulations and their enforcement, this article identifies key areas where legal improvements are necessary. It advocates for a more comprehensive policy approach and enhanced regulatory mechanisms to safeguard against the civil and economic repercussions of monopoly practices.

Furthermore, the economic implications of monopolistic practices are discussed, emphasizing how they contribute to market inefficiencies and economic disparities. By concentrating market power, monopolies not only stifle competition but also create barriers to entry for smaller businesses, thereby hindering innovation and economic growth. The article concludes with recommendations aimed at strengthening Indonesia's legal and regulatory framework to better protect consumer rights and promote a more equitable economic environment.

Cite this article: : Dharma Setiawan Negara et al. (2024). Civil Implications of Monopoly Practices in Business Competition Law in Indonesia. Global International Journal of Innovative Research, 2(8). https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i8.272

Received: July, 2024
Accepted: August, 2024

Keywords: Monopoly practices, civil rights, business competition law, Indonesia, consumer rights, economic implications, market fairness, regulatory framework, legal enforcement, economic equity

Author for correspondence:
Dharma Setiawan Negara
E-mail: dharmajournal1@gmail.com

Published by:

GLOBAL SOCIETY
PUBLISHING

1. Introduction

Monopoly practices significantly impact market dynamics and competition, often leading to adverse consequences for consumers and businesses alike. In Indonesia, where economic growth and market liberalization have been rapid, the implications of monopoly practices within the framework of business competition law have become increasingly pertinent (Sutrisno, 2020). These practices can distort market efficiency, limit consumer choices, and lead to unfair pricing strategies, which ultimately affect the economic well-being of individuals and businesses (Hidayat, 2019).

Business Competition Law in Indonesia, primarily governed by Law No. 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition, aims to create a fair business environment by preventing anti-competitive behaviors. The law establishes the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU), which is responsible for overseeing and enforcing regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair competition. The primary objectives of this law are to protect consumer interests, ensure fair competition, and promote efficiency and innovation in the market. It addresses various anti-competitive practices, including price-fixing, market allocation, bid-rigging, and abuse of dominant market positions. Despite its comprehensive framework, challenges in effective implementation and enforcement remain, necessitating continuous improvement and adaptation to the evolving business landscape.

While existing literature provides substantial insights into the theoretical aspects of monopoly and its effects on market competition, there is a notable gap in comprehensive analyses focused on the civil implications of such practices within the Indonesian legal context (Indrajaya, 2021). Most studies emphasize economic outcomes or general regulatory frameworks, overlooking the nuanced impacts on civil rights and individual stakeholders (Yuliana, 2022). This gap underscores the need for a focused examination of how monopoly practices influence civil rights and the effectiveness of competition laws in Indonesia.

Addressing this research gap is crucial as Indonesia continues to refine its competition policies and enforcement mechanisms. The effectiveness of these policies in protecting consumers and ensuring fair market practices is critical for sustainable economic development and maintaining public trust (Kurniawan & Nugroho, 2023). With increasing instances of monopolistic behaviors reported, understanding their civil implications can aid in formulating more robust regulations and enforcement strategies (Wahyudi, 2023).

Previous research has explored various dimensions of monopoly practices, including economic impacts and regulatory responses. Studies by Ramadhani (2021) and Purnomo (2019) provide valuable insights into the economic consequences of monopolies and the role of regulatory bodies in addressing these issues. However, these studies often lack a focus on civil implications, particularly how monopolistic practices affect individual rights and access to fair competition (Sutanto, 2020).

This study introduces a novel perspective by integrating the examination of monopoly practices with their civil implications under Indonesian business competition law. By bridging the gap between economic analysis and civil impact, this research aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how monopolistic practices can undermine civil rights and the effectiveness of competition laws (Widodo, 2021). This approach provides a unique contribution to the field, enhancing both theoretical and practical insights.

The primary objective of this research is to analyze the civil implications of monopoly practices in Indonesia, focusing on how these practices affect individual rights and market fairness. By evaluating the effectiveness of current competition laws and their enforcement, the study aims to propose recommendations for improving regulatory measures (Susanto, 2022). The benefits of this research include informing policymakers and legal practitioners about potential reforms, enhancing consumer protection, and promoting fair competition in the market (Prabowo & Hendra, 2023).

2. Method

This research adopts a qualitative research approach to explore the civil implications of monopoly practices within the framework of business competition law in Indonesia. Qualitative research is particularly suited for this study as it allows for an in-depth examination of complex legal and civil issues that quantitative methods may not fully capture (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The qualitative approach provides insights into the subjective experiences of stakeholders affected by monopoly practices and evaluates how current legal frameworks address these impacts (Maxwell, 2013).

The study utilizes a range of primary and secondary data sources to ensure a comprehensive analysis. Primary data is obtained through semi-structured interviews with key informants, including legal experts, competition law practitioners, and representatives from regulatory bodies. These interviews offer firsthand perspectives on the effectiveness of competition laws and the civil implications of monopolistic practices (Yin, 2018). Secondary data is gathered from a review of relevant literature, including academic journal articles, legal case studies, regulatory reports, and policy documents. This secondary data provides a broad context for understanding the theoretical and practical aspects of competition law and its impacts (Hart, 1998).

Data collection involves multiple techniques to capture a holistic view of the issue. Semi-structured interviews are conducted to explore the experiences and viewpoints of stakeholders, allowing for flexibility and depth in responses (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001). These interviews are guided by a set of open-ended questions designed to elicit detailed information about the challenges and impacts of monopoly practices. Additionally, a comprehensive literature review is performed to identify and analyze existing research on monopoly practices, competition law, and their civil implications. This review includes analyzing case law, regulatory frameworks, and previous studies relevant to the research topic (Boote & Beile, 2005).

The data analysis process involves thematic analysis and comparative analysis to interpret and integrate the findings. Thematic analysis is used to identify and analyze patterns and themes emerging from the interview data and literature review (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method helps in understanding the recurring issues related to civil implications and the effectiveness of competition laws. Comparative analysis is employed to contrast findings from different sources and identify consistencies and discrepancies in how monopoly practices affect civil rights across various contexts (Ritchie & Spencer, 2002). The combination of these methods provides a nuanced understanding of the topic and contributes to developing well-rounded conclusions and recommendations.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Civil Rights Violations Resulting from Monopolistic Practices

Monopolistic practices often lead to significant civil rights violations, impacting consumer welfare and market fairness. When a single entity dominates a market, it typically reduces consumer choice, increases prices, and lowers the quality of goods or services (Stigler, 1964). Such monopolies can stifle competition, leading to an unfair market where consumer rights are compromised. This effect is exacerbated in developing countries like Indonesia, where regulatory frameworks may be less robust (Khan, 2017).

In Indonesia, the lack of effective competition can lead to inflated prices and limited access to essential services, such as healthcare and telecommunications (World Bank, 2021). For instance, monopolistic practices in the telecommunications sector have resulted in high service costs and inadequate service quality for consumers (Harris & Moffat, 2018). This situation highlights a critical need for stricter enforcement of competition laws to protect consumer rights and ensure fair market conditions.

The impact on civil rights extends beyond economic aspects to include social consequences. Monopolistic practices can exacerbate income inequality by disproportionately affecting low-income households who are less able to absorb higher costs (Peltzman, 1976). Thus, the civil implications of monopolistic practices in Indonesia involve both economic and social dimensions that require comprehensive policy interventions. Monopolistic practices pose significant threats to civil rights, particularly by undermining consumer welfare and market fairness. When a single entity controls a market, it inherently reduces consumer choice and increases prices. This lack of competition results in a market where the rights of consumers are significantly compromised, as they are forced to accept higher costs and lower-quality products or services (Stigler, 1964). This issue is particularly severe in Indonesia, where monopolistic behaviors in key sectors like telecommunications and utilities have led to inflated costs and diminished service quality for consumers (Harris & Moffat, 2018).

In Indonesia, the impact of monopolistic practices extends beyond economic aspects to affect social equality. For instance, high prices and limited options in essential services such as healthcare and education disproportionately affect lower-income households, exacerbating existing inequalities (World Bank, 2021). The lack of competition in these critical areas not only strains household budgets but also limits access to essential services, thereby infringing upon fundamental rights such as access to quality healthcare and education (Peltzman, 1976). This scenario highlights the broader implications of monopolistic practices on social justice and consumer protection.

Moreover, monopolistic practices often lead to reduced market dynamism and innovation. When a single firm dominates, there is little incentive to innovate or improve services, resulting in stagnation in service delivery and technological advancement (Khan, 2017). This stagnation can negatively impact consumer rights by depriving them of improved products and services that would be expected in a competitive market environment. Additionally, the absence of competition often leads to diminished consumer bargaining power, further eroding their rights and interests (Stigler, 1964).

Addressing these civil rights violations requires robust regulatory frameworks and active enforcement of competition laws. Effective regulation should focus on preventing monopolistic practices before they become entrenched and ensuring that market conditions remain fair and competitive (Posner, 2001). In Indonesia, enhancing the enforcement capabilities of regulatory bodies such as the Competition Commission of Indonesia (KPPU) and strengthening consumer protection laws are crucial steps towards safeguarding consumer rights and promoting market fairness (Arief, 2022). By addressing these issues, policymakers can better protect consumers and ensure that their rights are upheld in a competitive market landscape.

3.2. Legal Framework and Its Effectiveness

Indonesia's legal framework for regulating monopolistic practices is grounded in the Law No. 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Indonesian Competition Commission, 2019). However, the effectiveness of this framework is often questioned due to challenges in enforcement and limitations in legal provisions (Sutrisno, 2020). The Competition Commission of Indonesia (KPPU) is tasked with monitoring and enforcing competition laws, but its capacity to address complex monopolistic practices remains limited (Tarigan, 2021).

The legal framework has faced criticism for being reactive rather than proactive. Effective competition law should anticipate and address potential monopolistic practices before they become entrenched (Posner, 2001). In Indonesia, there are gaps in the regulatory approach, such as insufficient resources for the KPPU and limited coordination with other regulatory bodies (Arief, 2022). These issues hinder the ability of the legal framework to effectively combat monopolistic practices and protect consumer interests.

Reforming the legal framework to enhance its effectiveness involves addressing these challenges. Recommendations include increasing the KPPU's resources, improving coordination between regulatory agencies, and updating legal provisions to better address the complexities of modern monopolistic practices (Shapiro, 2019). Such reforms are crucial for ensuring that competition laws adequately protect consumers and promote fair market practices. The legal framework for addressing monopolistic practices typically encompasses a set of regulations and laws designed to promote competition and prevent anti-competitive behavior. This framework includes competition laws, antitrust regulations, and consumer protection statutes. In Indonesia, the primary legislation addressing monopolistic practices is the Law No. 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (the Antimonopoly Law) (Indonesia, 1999). This law aims to prevent monopolistic practices, ensure fair competition, and protect consumer welfare. It is enforced by the Competition Commission of Indonesia (Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha, KPPU), which is tasked with investigating and adjudicating cases of anti-competitive behavior.

Key Provisions of the Antimonopoly Law

The Antimonopoly Law outlines several key provisions aimed at curbing monopolistic practices. These include prohibitions on monopolistic practices, such as price-fixing, market sharing, and abuse of market dominance. The law also addresses unfair business practices, including predatory pricing and exclusive agreements that hinder competition (Indonesia, 1999). Additionally, the law provides for the establishment of merger and acquisition regulations to prevent market concentration that could lead to monopolistic behavior (KPPU, 2021). The effectiveness of these provisions relies on their comprehensive nature and the ability of enforcement bodies to apply them rigorously.

Effectiveness of the Legal Framework

The effectiveness of the legal framework in combating monopolistic practices depends on several factors. Firstly, the strength of the regulatory body plays a crucial role. The KPPU is responsible for enforcing the Antimonopoly Law, and its effectiveness is linked to its capacity for investigation, adjudication, and enforcement. Despite its mandate, challenges such as limited resources and political interference can impact its ability to act decisively (Arief, 2022).

Secondly, the legal framework's effectiveness is influenced by the clarity and adaptability of the regulations. The Antimonopoly Law provides a broad legal basis for addressing various anti-competitive practices. However, the dynamic nature of markets and evolving business practices require that the law be periodically updated to address new forms of monopolistic behavior and technological advancements (Khan, 2017).

Lastly, the legal framework's success in addressing monopolistic practices also depends on the level of compliance and the severity of penalties imposed on violators. Effective enforcement requires not only monitoring and detection of anti-competitive behavior but also a credible system of sanctions that deter companies from engaging in such practices (Posner, 2001).

The legal framework must strike a balance between stringent enforcement and fostering a business environment conducive to competition and innovation.

Recommendations for Improvement

To enhance the effectiveness of the legal framework in combating monopolistic practices, several measures can be recommended. Strengthening the KPPU's capacity through increased funding, better training, and enhanced independence can improve its enforcement capabilities (Arief, 2022). Additionally, periodic reviews and updates to the Antimonopoly Law are essential to address emerging challenges in the market and ensure that the legal framework remains relevant (Khan, 2017). Implementing a robust monitoring system and ensuring that penalties for anti-competitive behavior are substantial enough to act as deterrents can further enhance the framework's effectiveness (Posner, 2001).

3.3. Economic Implications of Monopoly Practices

Monopoly practices have profound economic implications, including market inefficiencies and reduced economic growth. Monopolies can lead to market distortions, such as reduced innovation and inefficient resource allocation (Kreps, 1990). In Indonesia, sectors dominated by monopolies often experience lower levels of competition, resulting in stagnated technological advancements and decreased overall economic dynamism (Putra, 2020).

One significant economic consequence is the impact on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which struggle to compete with monopolistic giants (Harrison, 2016). The dominance of large firms can lead to market entry barriers for SMEs, stifling entrepreneurship and limiting economic diversification (OECD, 2018). Additionally, monopolistic practices can deter foreign investment by creating an unstable and non-competitive market environment (Dunning, 2001).

Addressing the economic implications of monopolistic practices requires comprehensive strategies to foster competition and support SMEs. Policies that encourage market entry, support innovation, and promote competitive practices are essential for mitigating the adverse economic effects of monopolies (Klapper & Love, 2011). Implementing such policies can help create a more dynamic and inclusive economic environment in Indonesia. Monopoly practices occur when a single firm or a group of firms dominate a market to the extent that they can control prices, exclude competitors, and limit consumer choices. This dominance can be achieved through various means, such as acquiring competitors, engaging in predatory pricing, or exploiting economies of scale to undermine smaller rivals (Stiglitz, 2008). The economic implications of monopolistic practices are profound and multifaceted, affecting both market dynamics and broader economic welfare.

Impact on Market Efficiency

Monopolistic practices lead to a reduction in market efficiency by distorting the allocation of resources. In a competitive market, prices typically reflect the cost of production and consumer demand, which ensures that resources are allocated efficiently. However, in a monopolistic market, a single firm or a group of firms with significant market power can set prices above competitive levels, leading to a loss of consumer surplus and an inefficient allocation of resources (Tirole, 2017). This price distortion reduces the overall welfare of society by creating deadweight loss, where the benefits that consumers would have received at competitive prices are not realized.

Effect on Consumer Welfare

Monopolistic practices have a direct negative impact on consumer welfare. When a firm controls a market, it can reduce the quality of goods and services, as there is less incentive to innovate or improve offerings due to the lack of competition. Furthermore, monopolists often charge higher prices than would be possible in a competitive market, reducing consumers' purchasing power and limiting their access to essential goods and services (Baker & Salop, 2015). The lack of competition also reduces consumer choice, as monopolists are less likely to offer diverse products or services.

Barriers to Entry and Market Dynamics

Monopolistic practices can create significant barriers to entry for potential competitors. High entry barriers discourage new firms from entering the market, which reduces competition and perpetuates the monopolist's market power. These barriers can include high startup costs, exclusive contracts, and control over critical resources or distribution channels (Porter, 1980).

As a result, the monopolistic firm can maintain its market dominance and prevent innovation that could otherwise drive down prices and improve product quality (Schumpeter, 1942).

Long-Term Economic Consequences

In the long term, monopolistic practices can lead to broader economic inefficiencies and stagnation. The lack of competition reduces incentives for firms to innovate, invest in new technologies, and improve productivity. This stagnation can result in slower economic growth and reduced overall economic dynamism (Jovanovic & Rousseau, 2005). Moreover, monopolists may engage in rent-seeking behavior, where they invest resources in maintaining their market position rather than in productive activities, further exacerbating economic inefficiencies.

3.4. Future Directions and Policy Recommendations

To effectively address the civil and economic implications of monopolistic practices, future directions must include comprehensive policy reforms and strategic interventions. Strengthening the enforcement capacity of the KPPU is a critical step, as it will enhance the ability to address monopolistic practices more effectively (Miller, 2020). This includes increasing the KPPU's budget, expanding its staff, and enhancing its investigative capabilities.

Additionally, adopting a more proactive regulatory approach is essential. This involves implementing early-warning systems to detect potential monopolistic behaviors and addressing them before they become systemic issues (Kaplow, 2006). Collaboration with international regulatory bodies and adopting best practices from other jurisdictions can also provide valuable insights and strategies for improving Indonesia's competition law framework (Gerber, 2010).

Furthermore, public awareness and education on the effects of monopolistic practices are important for garnering support for regulatory reforms and ensuring that consumer interests are adequately represented (Baker, 2015). Engaging stakeholders, including businesses, consumers, and policymakers, in dialogue about the benefits of competition and the costs of monopolies can facilitate more effective and sustained reform efforts.

4. Conclusion

Monopoly practices pose significant challenges to civil rights and economic fairness in Indonesia, manifesting in various forms of market distortions and consumer disadvantages. The analysis reveals that monopolistic behaviors not only undermine competitive market dynamics but also exacerbate issues of market access and fairness. By concentrating market power in the hands of a few, monopolies limit consumer choices, inflate prices, and reduce the quality of goods and services. These consequences directly affect the civil rights of individuals, particularly by diminishing their ability to make free and informed choices in the marketplace.

The legal framework addressing monopolistic practices in Indonesia requires substantial strengthening to effectively safeguard against these civil implications. Current regulations, while foundational, often fall short in addressing the complexities and dynamic nature of modern monopolistic strategies. To improve the enforcement and effectiveness of competition law, there is a need for more comprehensive policies and enhanced regulatory mechanisms. These measures should focus on not only curbing monopolistic practices but also ensuring fair market conditions that uphold the rights of consumers and promote equitable economic opportunities for all participants.

5. References

Arief, A. (2022). Regulatory challenges in Indonesian competition law enforcement. Indonesian Journal of Law and Society, 11(2), 45-59.

Baker, J. B. (2015). The case for antitrust enforcement. Harvard Law Review, 128(8), 2116-2147.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Sage Publications.

Dunning, J. H. (2001). The eclectic paradigm of international production: A restatement and some possible extensions. Journal of International Business Studies, 32(1), 135-157.

Gerber, D. J. (2010). Global competition law and economics. Oxford University Press.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2001). Handbook of interview research: Context and method. Sage Publications.

Harris, R., & Moffat, R. (2018). Competition and consumer protection in the telecommunications sector. Journal of Telecommunications and High Technology Law, 16(1), 25-47.

Harrison, A. (2016). The impact of monopolies on small and medium-sized enterprises. Small Business Economics, 47(2), 317-334.

Hart, C. (1998). Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination. Sage Publications.

Hidayat, T. (2019). Market dynamics and monopoly practices: A study on Indonesia. Journal of Business Competition, 12(3), 45-59.

Indonesia. (1999). Law No. 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition. Government of Indonesia.

Indonesian Competition Commission. (2019). Annual report. KPPU.

Indrajaya, S. (2021). Regulatory frameworks and monopoly practices in developing economies. Economic Law Review, 15(2), 112-130.

Jovanovic, B., & Rousseau, P. L. (2005). General purpose technologies. In Handbook of Economic Growth (Vol. 1, pp. 1181-1224). Elsevier.

Kaplow, L. (2006). Antitrust policy and the rule of law. Harvard Law Review, 119(8), 2903-2935.

Khan, L. M. (2017). Amazon's antitrust paradox. Yale Law Journal, 126(3), 710-805.

Klapper, L., & Love, I. (2011). The impact of competition on innovation. Journal of Economics and Business, 63(4), 283-303.

KPPU. (2021). Annual report 2021. Competition Commission of Indonesia.

Kreps, D. M. (1990). A course in microeconomic theory. Princeton University Press.

Kurniawan, A., & Nugroho, B. (2023). The role of competition policies in economic growth: An Indonesian perspective. Journal of Economic Policy, 18(1), 67-80.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Sage Publications.

Miller, N. (2020). Competition law in emerging markets: Challenges and opportunities. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2018). Promoting competition and innovation. OECD Publishing.

Peltzman, S. (1976). Toward a more general theory of regulation. Journal of Law and Economics, 19(2), 211-240.

Porter, M. E. (1980). Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors. Free Press.

Posner, R. A. (2001). Antitrust law. University of Chicago Press.

Prabowo, D., & Hendra, R. (2023). Recommendations for enhancing competition law enforcement. Law and Policy Review, 22(2), 89-105.

Purnomo, J. (2019). Economic consequences of monopolistic practices in Southeast Asia. Asian Economic Journal, 10(4), 34-50.

Putra, H. (2020). The economic impact of monopolistic practices in Indonesia. Journal of Indonesian Economy, 8(1), 45-60.

Ramadhani, E. (2021). Monopoly and market regulation: Insights from Indonesia. Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics, 14(3), 78-95.

Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (2002). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers (pp. 173-194). Sage Publications.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, socialism, and democracy. Harper & Brothers.

Shapiro, C. (2019). Competition policy in the digital age. University of Chicago Law Review, 86(3), 635-665.

Stigler, G. J. (1964). A theory of oligopoly. Journal of Political Economy, 72(1), 44-61.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2008). Economic foundations of intellectual property rights. Duke Law Journal, 57(6), 1693-1723.

Sutanto, H. (2020). Civil rights and competition law: A theoretical framework. Journal of Legal Studies, 11(2), 20-35.

Tirole, J. (2017). Economics for the common good. Princeton University Press.

Wahyudi, T. (2023). Challenges in enforcing competition laws in Indonesia. Journal of Regulatory Affairs, 17(4), 120-135.

Widodo, M. (2021). Civil implications of business competition laws in emerging markets. International Business Law Review, 9(1), 98-115.

World Bank. (2021). Indonesia: Improving access to essential services. World Bank Group.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods. Sage Publications.

Yuliana, L. (2022). The effectiveness of competition law enforcement in Indonesia: A critical analysis. Business Law Journal, 13(2), 43-61.