

# Voter Participation in the 2019 Concurrent General Elections in Indonesia

Husnul Isa Harahap<sup>a</sup>, T. Irmayani<sup>b</sup>, <sup>a,b</sup>Department of Political Science, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia, Email: <sup>a\*</sup>husnul.harahap@usu.ac.id

The background of this research is the general election that was held on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2019. This election was conducted to elect a president and vice-president as well as legislative members (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/DPD, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat/DPR, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/DPRD for Provincial and City/Regency). This study aims to describe the number of active voters (voters who participated in the voting) as a result of general elections in Indonesia, and also in Deli Serdang Regency. Data collection methods in this study include document study, observation, and in-depth interviews in which the informants in this study were election organisers. The findings of this study are that participation data in general elections in Indonesia reached more than 81 percent. In Deli Serdang District, the data on election participation is more than 68 percent. This data explains that the national voter turnout rate in general in the election does not necessarily reflect the election participation rate at the district/city level. This study recommends that mapping of election participation is needed nationally in Indonesia and at the city district level to obtain further tangible data on the 2019 simultaneous election participation rate.

**Keywords:** *General Election, Political Participation, Political Candidate, Political Behaviours.*

## Introduction

General elections have never been held simultaneously in Indonesia. The first time a general election has been held simultaneously was in 2019. This general election was held on April 17, 2019. The simultaneous election means that on election day, voters elect the presidential and vice-presidential pairs, and also elect members of the legislature. Legislative members consist of candidates for the Regional Representative Council (DPD), the People's Representative



Council (DPR), and the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) at provincial and city/regency levels.

According to several studies, the 2019 simultaneous general election was complex (Ardipandanto 2019). Several institutions observing the election also expressed the same thing. For example, the Association for Elections and Democracy (Perludem) created an inventory of five problems that occurred in the 2019 elections. These problems included the circulation of hoaxes. In addition, implementing the presidential election (Pilpres) and the legislative election (Pileg) at the same time is a difficult task for election organisers. In fact, there are many election workers (like KPPS) who became sick and even died while on duty and after the election (Daud 2019) (pmg/sur 2019) (Redaksi 2019) (Ihsanuddin 2019).

The issue of political participation is a problem that has arisen in the implementation of general elections in Indonesia and is related to the number of voter turnout that is not on target. This problem is sometimes difficult to solve because many factors influence political participation, particularly voter participation, and has always been a national strategic issue.

The holding of the 2019 simultaneous elections represents a complex process, but some people believe that this election will produce a turnout that is on target. This can be seen from the comments of election organisers in the mass media. The General Election Commission has revealed a target of 77.5 percent voter turnout. According to KPU Commissioner Wahyu Setiawan, the 2019 simultaneous elections were projected to receive great public attention. Wahyu Setiawan was very optimistic about this prediction for two reasons: the elections were held simultaneously, and the observed elevated enthusiasm of the voters (Amana 2019).

Upon examination, the optimistic opinion of the election organisers was based on the assumption that the 2019 simultaneous general election would have a relationship with high voter turnout. This is a new cause-and-effect relationship as the 2019 elections were very different from the previous elections, where in the past, there were differences in the dates of the presidential/vice-presidential pair elections compared to the legislative elections. For example, in 2014, the presidential election was held after the legislative election. This (the 2019 election) is a condition that will give voters a different experience in exercising their voting rights in the election.

The participation of voters nationally did increase sharply in the 2019 election, namely by more than 81 percent. The participation rate exceeded the predetermined target; however, it is not the highest political participation in the history of elections in Indonesia, especially in the post-reform era. Participation can be a fairly high voter turnout, only when compared to the 2009 and 2014 elections.

Political participation theory explains that general elections can be interpreted as facilities for citizens to be involved in the political process, apart from the general policy-making process

(Budiardjo 1998) (Gaffar 1997) or by being active on social media (Triwibowo 2018). This method is the easiest, among others. The simultaneous election presents its own challenges for voters because it is a complex election. Would the more complex electoral process affect the increase in voter participation or vice versa? The data for more than 81 percent of voter participation nationwide provides a message that nationally, the 2019 simultaneous elections contributed to a positive impact on increasing voter participation. This study will describe and analyse the voting results from the 2019 simultaneous general election data in Indonesia, and in the Deli Serdang Regency in 2019.

There are three reasons why the focus of this study is the Deli Serdang District. First, the Deli Serdang Regency has had low participation in local elections (Regent/Deputy Regent). Second, the area has unique regional characteristics that include mountains, beaches, and land. Third, this region has diverse community characteristics in terms of ethnicity, religion, economic background, and education.

## Literature Review

The main concept in this study is political participation, especially voter participation. Participation is defined as voluntary activities in the electoral process, as well as the formation of public policy (Budiardjo, 1998, hal. 5). This is the opposite concept of apathy, which is the attitude of not caring, disinterest, or lack of understanding about politics. Apathy also correlates to the motivation of voters in general elections.

In Ivan Siber's study regarding Croatia (Ivan 2004), he explained that four factors influence participation in elections. First, the electoral law factor. The electoral system is determined by the electoral law, as are other technical means such as election methods. Second, the characteristics of the social situation. Third, the factor of voter motivation. Fourth, political mobilisation factors, including the election campaign.

Winengan (Winengan 2018), in his study on political participation in local elections in Indonesia, explains that voter participation is still low even though the objective of the election is to elect regional leaders. Voter participation in some regions only reaches 64 percent. However, it cannot be denied that in other regions, there is also a percentage of voter participation that is more than 80 percent. Table 1 shows that voter participation data is below 60 percent. This data illustrates that the existence of elections at the local level does not automatically increase voter participation in the regions. Community motivation does not automatically increase because people directly elect local leaders for their area.

**Table 1:** Participation in Indonesia Regional Head Elections 2015

Number	Identification	Years	Percentage
1	Medan	2015	26.88
2	Serang	2015	50.84
3	Surabaya	2015	52.18
4	Jember	2015	52.19
5	Tuban	2015	52.25
6	Mataram	2015	56.94

Source: (Winengan 2018).

Winengan (Winengan 2018), in his conclusion, explained that participation is not only connected to the existence of a direct election system that provides access to the community to determine leaders in their region. More than that, voter participation is related to other matters, such as the availability of qualified candidates from a public perspective. Moreover, there are also issues of socialisation and the ability of election administrators, including candidates, to mobilise (Winengan 2018). Candidates or their teams usually carry out mobilisation.

Zamhasari's (Zamhasari 2017) study identifies issues of primary concern to young voters in general elections. The conclusion is that certain issues become the focus of young voters in the election. Among them are issues concerning employment, education, transportation (mobility), and the issue of eradicating corruption. The existence of this issue can generate motivation for political participation among young voters. Increasing the political participation of young voters means reducing the amount of voter apathy because novice voters are a group who continually follow political information updates, including in elections.

Muryanto Amin and Arifin Nasution's (Amin and Nasution 2020) study describes that religious organisations are involved in increasing political participation. In the case of North Sumatra, political mobilisation occurred as a result of groups using the political identity of the community in an attempt to win the general election.

## Method

The scientific research method used in this research is descriptive qualitative. The research was conducted from February to September 2020. This method is used to obtain information about voter participation in the 2019 simultaneous general election. Information that is expected reveals facts about voter participation in the 2019 simultaneous general election in Indonesia and, in particular, Deli Serdang Regency. The advantage of this method is that it allows the researcher to get closer to political facts. This method is expected to be able to answer the problem of this study regarding voter participation in the general election in Indonesia and specifically in the Deli Serdang Regency.

This study used informants as a purposive technique based on research needs (Purwanto 2017:47). The main informants of this research are the organisers of the general election. Informants were interviewed using in-depth interview techniques, which were directed by the interview guide research instrument. Other informants are people in the area.

This study uses an instrument in the form of an observation guide. Furthermore, document study guides, as well as interview guides, are used. The purpose of using this research guide is to simplify the research process. Another objective is to adapt the instrument to field conditions, avoiding repetition of the data collection process (Purwanto 2017:70). The next stage is data organising, data analysis, and formulating conclusions. Data analysis uses qualitative analysis.

## Result and Discussion

The discussion in this study is divided into three main categories. The first is the description of voter participation in Indonesia from the 1955 election to the 2019 election. Second, it describes the factors that affect the election participation rate, especially the 2019 election. Third, it describes the voter participation data in the Deli Serdang Regency. The discussion section analyses trends in voter participation data based on data and theory.

### *Fluctuating Voter Participation*

The first general election in Indonesia was held in 1955. This election was held approximately ten years after Indonesia's independence. This first election had a voter turnout of 91.41 percent (see Table 2). At that time, general elections were held to elect members of the legislature through political parties as election participants (proportional). Some of the politically competing parties were the Indonesian National Party (PNI), the Masyumi Party, the Nahdlatul Ulama Party (NU), the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), the Indonesian Islamic Syarikat Party (PSII), and the Indonesian Christian Party (Parkindo) (Feith 1999). The 1955 general election is often called the Old Order era general election from the perspective of Indonesian politics.

**Table 2:** Participation in Indonesia General Election (1955–2019)

Number	Identification	Years	Percentage
1	Legislative	1955	91.41
2	Legislative	1971	96.6
3	Legislative	1977	96.5
4	Legislative	1982	96.5
5	Legislative	1987	96.4
6	Legislative	1992	95.1
7	Legislative	1997	93.6

8	Legislative	1999	92.6
9	Legislative	2004	84.1
10	Executive (Round 1)	2004	78.2
11	Executive (Round 2)	2004	76.6
12	Legislative	2009	70.9
13	Executive	2009	71.7
14	Legislative	2014	72.0
15	Executive	2014	69.58
16	Legislative & Executive	2019	81.69*

Sources: (Sulistyo 2019) (Mohammad 2019) \*(Rahadian 2019).

General elections in the post-Old Order era have voter turnout rates that are higher than the voter turnout rates in the first general elections in Indonesia. These elections are often called the New Order Elections (Liddle 1992), that is 1971, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997 general elections, resulting in voter turnout rates of 96.6 percent, 96.5 percent, 96.5 percent, 96.4 percent, 95.1 percent, and 93.6 percent (See Table 2). This high percentage of participation implies a hidden meaning that elections at this time have problems that are contrary to democracy. The 1998 political reform group believed that the New Order elections were frequently seen as an instrument of perpetuating the power of the New Order regime. During the New Order era, since the 1977 election, there were only three parties that could participate in the election: the *Karya* Group or GOLKAR (which was not called a political party), the United Development Party (PPP), and the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI).

The 1999 election was the first election after the political reforms in 1998. This general election was marked by a high voter turnout rate of 92.6 percent (See Table 2). The participation rate was high and nearly similar to the participation rate in the 1955 election but was still below the voter turnout rate during the New Order era.

The 2004, 2009, and 2014 elections were a period of direct elections in which the executive (president and vice president) was elected through elections after several months of legislative elections (in the same year). The 2004 Legislative Election resulted in a voter turnout of 84.1 percent. The Executive Election (Round 1) resulted in a turnout rate of 78.2 percent. The Executive Election (Round 2) resulted in a 76.6 percent turnout (See Table 2). The Executive Election (Round 2) was held because, in the Executive Election (Round 1), the total vote count of all candidate pairs was less than 50 percent.

The 2009 legislative elections and 2009 executive elections resulted in participation rates of 70.9 percent and 71.7 percent. The 2014 legislative elections and 2014 executive elections resulted in participation rates of 72.0 percent and 69.58 percent. If we look at the participation rate in the elections for the Reform era, namely 1999–2014, the participation rate seems to have

decreased. The highest was in 1999, and the lowest was in 2014 in the executive elections (president and vice-president).

In the 2019 elections, which can be called the era of simultaneous elections, the voter turnout rate was 81.69 percent. So, the change in the election era changed from separate legislative and executive elections to simultaneous elections (legislative and executive elections in an election), which had an impact on changing voter turnout rates. This data (Table 2) illustrates that the graph of election participation in Indonesia is rising then falling (the lowest is 69 percent), and then it increases again to 81.69 percent.

### ***General Analysis: Multifactor Effect***

The voter turnout in elections in Indonesia exemplifies that legislative elections are more attractive than executive elections (president and vice-president). However, when the two general elections were combined at one time, voter participation (legislative vs. executive) could no longer be compared. The 2019 simultaneous elections have become mixed elections (legislative and executive elections). The voter turnout rate is the result of this mixed effect.

Legislative elections are always interesting since they are followed by political parties that have legislative candidates competing for the most votes. Competition between candidates arises as a consequence of an open proportional system where voters can directly elect the candidate they like. The candidates do things that are thought to influence their voters. As a result, the candidate seeks to create strong ties with the voters who are considered to be choosing the candidate. Voters are then persuaded to vote for the candidate, even for those in the same party. Candidates become a magnet or a positive element to increase voter participation.

Socialisation by general election organisers (General Election Commission) and various parties from government and non-government elements is an important factor in increasing general election participation. The socialisation methods carried out in the 2019 election include citizen forums, face-to-face communication, mass media, socialisation materials, socialisation props, social mobilisation, utilisation of popular culture, utilisation of local/traditional culture, KPU/KPUD pages, KPU/KPUD announcement boards, social media, creative media, and other media.

Election facilities are vital in supporting election participation. Good facilities will make it easier for people to exercise their voting rights, especially the distribution of polling stations close to voter settlements. General elections are held at 07.00-13.00 WIB. The number of voters in a TPS is 300 (Maharani 2019). This is because voters will cast five ballot papers in the general election.

The 2019 general election is supported by a sizeable state budget (APBN) (IDR 25.59 trillion) (Humas 2019). This budget was for financing the entire 2019 general election process. The number of polling stations was 810,329. The total number of voters was 190,779,969 (Roosyana 2019). The number of election administrators was also large. At the level of the District Election Committee (PPK) there were 36,005. At the PPS level (Voting Committee), as many as 250,212 people. At the KPPS (Voting Organising Group) level, there were 7,385,500 people (Ikanubun 2019).

### *The Unique GE 2019: Sharp Competition Generates Participation?*

The characteristics of the 2019 election are legislative candidates competing to get votes in their constituencies, but at the same time, several coalition political parties support the president and vice president. In Deli Serdang Regency, the results of the 2019 general election showed a voter turnout rate of 68.59 percent (see Table 3). This figure is lower than that of the Serdang Bedagai Regency, which is administratively a neighbouring area. In Serdang Bedagai Regency, the voter turnout rate was 82.82 percent.

**Table 3:** Participation in Indonesia General Election 2019

Number	District (Kecamatan)	Percentage
1	Gunung Meriah	84.12
2	Tanjung Morawa	75.38
3	Sibolangit	83.42
4	Kutilambaru	80.19
5	Pancurbatu	70.91
6	Namorambe	70.27
7	Sibiru-biru	79.43
8	STM Hilir	76.36
9	Bangun Purba	83.55
10	Galang	72.37
11	STM Hulu	83.19
12	Patumbak	63.82
13	Deli Tua	68.13
14	Sunggal	58.61
15	Hamparan Perak	75.30
16	Labuhan Deli	71.49
17	Percut Sei Tuan	62.39
18	Batang Kuis	74.69
19	Lubuk Pakam	65.77
20	Pagar Merbau	79.66
21	Pantai Labu	71.44
22	Beringin	72.85
	Total	68.59

Sources: KPUD Deli Serdang (Document Model DB1 DPR)

Deli Serdang Regency has 22 subdistricts, namely Gunung Meriah, Tanjung Morawa, Sibolangit, Kutilambaru, Pancurbatu, Namorambe, Sibiru-blue, STM Hilir, Bangun Purba, Galang, STM Hulu, Patumbak, Deli Tua, Sunggal, Hamparan Perak, Labuhan Deli, Percut Sei Tuan, Batang Quiz, Lubuk Pakam, Pagar Merbau, Labu Beach, and Beringin District. The voter turnout rate in each district is different. The highest voter participation was in Gunung Meriah subdistrict, amounting to 84.12 percent, Sibolangit Subdistrict at 83.42 percent, Kutilambaru District at 80.19 percent, and STM Hulu at 83.19 percent (see Table 3).

The lowest participation rate was in Sunggal Subdistrict, namely 58.61 percent. Other areas with low participation rates include Patumbak District at 63.82 percent, Percut Sei Tuan District at 62.39 percent, Lubuk Pakam District at 65.77, and Deli Tua District at 68.13 percent (See Table 3). The participation rate in these five subdistricts is below the average percentage of votes in the Deli Serdang Regency.

## Discussion

Voter participation in the 2019 simultaneous elections is generally a voluntary community activity. The concept of political participation in this study fits perfectly with what has been stated by Miriam Budiardjo (Budiardjo, 1998, hal. 5). Groups that do not wish to exercise their voting rights also exist. This group can also be referred to as the apathy group, as explained by Miriam Budiardjo and Ivan Siber (Ivan 2004).

General elections that have resulted in more than 81 percent of national participation cannot be separated from the factors mentioned by Ivan Siber (election law, characteristics of social situations, voter motivation, political mobilisation) (Ivan 2004). Voter motivation in the 2019 election increased influence by candidates on national political issues summarised in election issues. In the Winengan study (Winengan 2018), this phenomenon occurs because of problems with the quality of candidates and the influence of political mobilisation, which is the reason why elections always produce voters with critical views.

Millennials (young voters) read issues about employment, educational prospects, and transportation (mobility) in the form of infrastructure. The issue of eradicating corruption is an important issue that is reflected in the existence of candidates who are promoted by political parties. The 2019 elections are followed by corruptors who have been released because they have served time in prison. Interestingly, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) reminds the public not to vote for candidates who have been affected by the corruption case (Rolan 2019). The General Election Commission also disseminates information about legislative candidates who have experienced corruption. As explained by Zamhasari (Zamhasari 2017), young voters are watching this issue, and of course, in the 2019 elections, this has affected voter turnout. In the 2019 election, there was a phenomenon in which the use of online media did not automatically become an effective medium to influence millennial

groups or novice voters. Several videos about information related to the 2019 election on YouTube have a trivial number of viewers, especially those published by the General Election Commission (KPU). The recruitment of democratic volunteers as agents of political socialisation and the existence of an election smart house as a medium for political socialisation is still not effective.

Religious organisations, such as the study of Muryanto Amin and Muhammad Arifin Nasution (Amin and Nasution 2020), do indeed influence political participation. The role of religious organisations does not only occur in North Sumatra but also in almost every region in Indonesia. This happened because some candidates were political party figures who were also figures in religious organisations. This phenomenon has also occurred in elections in Indonesia for a substantial amount of time. Political science studies explain this as part of political mobilisation, as in the study of Ivan Siber (Ivan 2004) and Winengan (Winengan 2018).

## **Conclusion**

In the 2019 simultaneous general election, national voter participation increased. This can be concluded from the data published by the General Election Commission (KPU). Several factors influence increased participation. First, the 2019 general election involved a large number of resources of Rp. 25.59 trillion. This was a national program that has received the attention of the mass media. Second, this election saw many candidates competing for seats, including presidential and vice-presidential candidates, legislative candidates at the central, provincial, and city district levels. Third, the simultaneous general elections in 2019 were comprised of many organisers spread nationwide. In certain areas, the participation rate was not as high as the national percentage rate (81 percent more). In the Deli Serdang Regency, the voter turnout rate in the 2019 election was 68 percent, meaning there was approximately 32 percent of voters who do not utilise their voting rights. This situation has been influenced by the apathy factor (apathy). On the other hand, there is formal mobilisation that was open but less effective. The mobilisation was operative precisely through the informal political machine of the candidates. Social media was used to attract new voters to participate, but did not receive enough of a response from netizens.

## **Limitation of the Research**

There are several limitations to this study. First, this research was not conducted with quantitative techniques. Therefore, the selection of informants to the community will not fulfill the representative and proportional elements. The explanation of voter participation in simultaneous general elections does not automatically represent other regions in Indonesia, especially at the district/city level, which are very large in number with different regional characteristics. Future research needs to be conducted in order to examine the quantitative factors involving the survey method. It needs to be considered so the research period can be



carried out no later than six months after the election is held, so respondents or informants do not forget the information during the election. Additionally, it is necessary to consider whether multidisciplinary research is needed to determine the specific factors that shape voter participation patterns in general elections in Indonesia.

### **Acknowledgment**

This research was financed by the University of Sumatera Utara, based on the Kontrak Penelitian Talenta (Talent Research Contract) USU 2020.

## REFERENCES

- Amana, Rizki. 2019. "KPU Optimis Lampau Target Partisipan Pemilih Pada Pemilu 2019." *Timesindonesia*, February 7.
- Amin, Muryanto, and Muhammad Arifin Nasution. 2020. "Identity Movements, Religious Organisations and Social Harmony in North Sumatra." *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change* 13(12):962–83.
- Ardipandanto, Aryojati. 2019. "Permasalahan Penyelenggaraan Pemilu Serentak Tahun 2019." *Jurnal Info Singkat* XI(11):25–30.
- Budiardjo, Miriam. 1998. *Partisipasi Dan Partai Politik: Sebuah Bunga Rampai*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Daud, Ameidy. 2019. "Perludem Identifikasi Lima Masalah Pemilu 2019." *Katadata.Co.Id*, April 24.
- Feith, Herbert. 1999. *Pemilihan Umum 1955 Di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Gaffar, Afan. 1997. "Menampung Partisipasi Politik Rakyat." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik* 1(1):8–26.
- Humas. 2019. "Naik 61% Dibanding 2014, Anggaran Penyelenggaraan Pemilu 2019 Capai Rp25,59 Triliun." *Sekretariat Kabinet Republik Indonesia*, March 26.
- Ihsanuddin, Sabrina. 2019. "Banyak Petugas Meninggal, Pemilu 2019 Dinilai Tak Terorganisir Dengan Baik." *Kompas.Com*, April 27.
- Ikanubun, Yoseph. 2019. "Berapa Pengeluaran KPU Untuk Penyelenggara PPK, PPS Dan KPPS?" *Liputan6.Com*, April 25.
- Ivan, Siber. 2004. "Interest in Elections and Electoral Participation." *Politička Misao* XLI(5):3–27.
- Liddle, R. William. 1992. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Penerangan Ekonomi dan Sosial.
- Maharani, Tsarina. 2019. "KPU: Satu TPS Paling Banyak 300 Pemilih." *DetikNews*, January 9.
- Mohammad, Mulyadi. 2019. "Membangun Demokrasi Dengan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Memilih Pada Pemilu 2019." *Jurnal Info Singkat* XI(9):13–18.
- pmg/sur. 2019. "Total 554 Orang KPPS, Panwas Dan Polisi Tewas Di Pemilu 2019." *CNN Indonesia*, July 5.
- Purwanto, Erwan Agus. 2017. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Gava Media.
- Rahadian, Lalu. 2019. "Tingkat Partisipasi Pemilu 2019 Naik : Positif Atau Negatif?" *Bisnis.Com*, June 14.
- Redaksi. 2019. "Pemilu 2019 Memakan Korban, Salah Siapa?" *Gatra.Com*, May 1.
- Rolan. 2019. "Pemilu Run, KPK: Jangan Pilih Bekas Koruptor Di Pemilu 2019." *DetikNews*, April 7.



- Roosyana, Rommy. 2019. "Pemilu 2019 Digelar Di 810.329 TPS." *Beritagar.Id*, April 9.
- Sulistyo, Eko. 2019. "Partisipasi Pemilih Dalam Pemilu." *Ksp.Go.Id*, May 3.
- Tamtomo, Akbar Bhayu. 2019. "INFOGRAFIK: Daftar 49 Caleg Eks Koruptor Dalam Pemilu 2019." *Kompas.Com*, January 31.
- Triwibowo, Whisnu. 2018. "Understanding Online Political Participation: Theory of Planned Behavior and Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effect to Predict Online Petition Behavior." *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia* VII(1):5–16.
- Winengan. 2018. "Local Political Democratisation Policy: Voter Participation in the Direct Regional Head Elections." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik* 22(1):61–73.
- Zamhasari. 2017. "Building Beginner Voter's Interest in Political Participation in Indonesia's Election." Pp. 54–57 in *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*. Vol. 163. Atlantis Press.