

**BUKTI KORESPOND ENSI**  
**ARTIKEL JURNAL INTERNASIONAL BEREPUTASI**

Judul artikel : Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency

Jurnal : The Seybold Report

Penulis : Zetria Erma, Muhammad Nurohim

No.	Perihal	Tanggal
1.	Bukti konfirmasi submit artikel dan artikel yang disubmit	13 Jun 2023
2.	Bukti konfirmasi review dan hasil review pertama	25 Jul 2023
3.	Bukti konfirmasi submit revisi pertama, respon kepada reviewer, dan artikel yang diresubmit	23 Aug 2023
4.	Bukti konfirmasi review dan hasil review kedua	13 Sep 2023
5.	Bukti konfirmasi submit revisi kedua, respon kepada reviewer, dan artikel yang diresubmit	22 Okt 2023
6.	Bukti konfirmasi artikel accepted	29 Nov 2023
7.	Bukti konfirmasi artikel published online	7 Dec 2024

**1. Bukti Konfirmasi Submit Artikel  
dan Artikel yang Disubmit  
(13 Jun 2023)**



---

## Quality Access to Success- Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139

---

**The Seybold Report**<zetriaerma0@gmail.com>  
JPA@zetriaerma0@gmail.com  
To:

Jun 13, 2023 at 12:23 PM Reply-To:

13-Jun-2023

Dear Dr. :

Your manuscript entitled "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in Quality Access to Success.

Your manuscript ID is JPA-18-0139.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to

As part of our commitment to ensuring an ethical, transparent and fair peer review process SAGE is a supporting member of ORCID, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID . We encourage all authors and co-authors to use ORCID iDs during the peer review process. If you already have an ORCID iD you can link this to your account in ScholarOne just by logging in and editing your account information. If you do not already have an ORCID iD you may login to your ScholarOne account to create your unique identifier and automatically add it to your profile.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Quality Access to Success

Assessment. Sincerely,  
Quality Access to Success Assessment Editorial Office

**2. Bukti Konfirmasi Review dan  
Hasil Review Pertama  
(25 Jul 2023)**



---

## The Seybold Report - Decision on Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139

---

The Seybold Report <zetriaerma0@gmail.com>

Sun, Jul 25, 2023 at 2:08 AM

Reply-

To:

Cc:

25-Jul-2023

Dear **Dr.** :

Manuscript ID PA-18-0139 entitled : "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" which you submitted to The Seybold Report, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter. appreciate your patience with the review process.

When a manuscript is submitted to the journal, it is assessed to determine if it meets the submission criteria. If yes, the editorial team will select potential peer reviewers in the research field to review the manuscript and provide recommendations. The Seybold Report uses four types of peer review: Single-blind: Reviewers are aware of the authors' names, but authors are unaware of who is reviewing their manuscript unless the reviewers choose to sign their reports. Double-blind: Reviewers are unaware of the authors' names, and authors are unaware of who is reviewing their manuscript. Open peer: Authors know the identities of the reviewers, and reviewers know the authors' identities. If the manuscript is accepted, named review reports are published alongside the article. Transparent: Reviewers are aware of the authors' names, but authors are unaware of who is reviewing their manuscript unless the reviewers choose to sign their reports. If the manuscript is accepted, anonymous reviewer reports are published alongside the article.

To revise your manuscript, log into and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Quality Access to Success, your revised manuscript should be submitted within 30 days from receipt of this letter. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in this amount of time, please advise the Associate Editor before the 30 day period as the link to you article will expire and you will not be able to re-submit your paper without making a specific request. Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to The Seybold Report and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Renée Tobin  
Associate Editor, The Seybold Report

Editor

**Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:**

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript (JPA-18-0139). This article described the development and validation of the Perceived Research Environment Scale (PRES), a faculty-report measure for use in higher education institutions. I hope the following comments will assist the authors in revising their manuscript.

1.) This study seems to lack of a cohesive, unifying theoretical framework. The authors vaguely reference potential applications of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory, but it is unclear how this theory guided instrument development and the analyses. The authors also reference several studies exploring various aspects of research environments, but these variables do not seem to be united in any particular framework. It would have been more compelling for the authors to apply a specific theoretical framework to guide the development of the measure.

2.) On page 7, the authors describe a method for randomly assigning participants to Samples A and B. They contend that the groups were comparable with respect to several demographic variables; however, I am most interested in knowing whether the groups were comparable with respect to institution. Participants came from only four institutions, and it is likely that participants from the same university would rate their research environments similarly (given that they are likely experiencing similar pressures). Is it possible that either Samples A or B consisted of a disproportionately large or small number of faculty from any one of the four institutions? This might impact the results. Ideally, the sample would have comprised faculty from a variety of different institutions.

On a related note, it might be interesting to see whether faculty from the same institution had similar ratings of their research environments. I suppose the ratings might be similar for some items (availability of funding) but less similar for items that vary more across individuals (e.g., access to informal mentoring).

3.) The authors note that there were no significant differences between Sample A and Sample B with respect to age. I'm not sure how meaningful this assertion is, given that approximately 50% of participants in both samples did not report their ages. This constitutes a fairly large amount of missing data.

In general, how were missing data handled in this study? This is important to discuss in the manuscript.

4.) I would have liked to have had some more information about the 42 academics included in the focus groups as well as the four independent reviewers who rated the suitability of the items (p. 6). For example, who were the reviewers and what qualified them for this task?

5.) The authors administered a measure of research involvement (i.e., the Research Involvement Scale). I would be curious to know if Samples A and B differed with respect to scores on this measure. If one group were more involved in research than the other, the two samples would not be comparable on a very important dimension (especially given the nature of the instrument the authors are developing).

6.) The authors sampled participants with a wide range of academic roles, including professors and lecturers. I can imagine that some of these positions are not inherently or contractually research roles. Would respondents with positions that were non-research oriented be the best respondents for this type of measure?

7.) The sample included very few full professors (i.e., approximately 1% of each subsample), which seems problematic for a couple of reasons. First, how might this have impacted the authors' attempts to determine whether items were responded to differently by faculty in various positions? Were subsamples for each position (e.g., full professor, associate professor, assistant professor) large enough (and comparable enough in size) to detect response differences across groups? Second, full professors may have more institutional knowledge and research experience than associate and assistant professors. To have so few in the sample appears to be a notable limitation of this study.

8.) I would have also recommended that the authors collect data regarding the length of time participants had been at their respective institutions. Newer faculty might not have had enough time to form opinions about their respective research environments.

9.) I would have been interested to see the internal consistency values for the PRES total score and subscale scores in Sample B. I would recommend the authors report these values.

10.) For the CFA, the authors suggest that three of the four models (i.e., 2nd order model, 5-factor model, and bifactor model) had satisfactory fit statistics. However, CFI values for the 5-factor and 2nd order models were below .95. Some research has suggested that a more appropriate criterion for CFI values is .95 or greater (rather than .90).

or greater). The authors may wish to revise their language accordingly. (Please see Hu and Bentler, 1999; reference provided below.)

11.) Minor comments:

- a. On page 3, the authors write, "Duffy et al. (2013) interview 17 of the most research-productive counselling psychologists within the American Psychological Association accredited counselling program." Did the authors mean 17 faculty across a variety of APA-accredited programs?
- b. In the implications section, I would further emphasize the potential value of the PRES for informing organizational change. This point is a good one and should be further developed. For example, more detail about the specific uses of the instrument for facilitating organizational improvement would be interesting (and would ultimately make the paper more compelling).

#### Reference

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis. Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.

Reviewer: 2

#### Comments to the Author

This manuscript reports on the development and psychometric evolution of a measure of perceived research environment. Specifically, the measure is designed to tap into a construct comprised of a number of dimensions related to an individual's perception of the availability of resources, support, and appreciation of research efforts within the institution in which the individual is employed. I found the manuscript to be clear and well-written. The authors did a nice job explaining the concept of the perceived research environment and why it is important, as well as the previous attempts to at psychometric instruments to capture the construct. As illustrated in the introduction, previous measures have been quite specific to either certain fields (e.g., nursing), or populations (e.g., graduate students). Thus, the authors make a good case for a general perceived research environment scale that could be applicable to Universities or other research institutions, regardless of the specific discipline. However, I would recommend the authors add a paragraph at the end of the introduction, before the "Present Study" section, summarizing this and making this rationale more explicit.

There are other strengths of this paper, including conducting item analyses, evaluation of the internal structure with EFA followed by a CFA in a random hold-out sample to confirm the factor structure. The factor analytic methods were appropriate and fit the theoretical conception of the construct, including use of principal axis factoring, direct oblimin rotation, which allows for correlations among the rotated factors, and the use of Velicer's MAP and parallel analysis to inform the decision on the number of factors to retain. With that said, there are also some areas that should be addressed to improve the paper and the contribution of the study.

I appreciate the fact that the authors conducted focus groups as one of the methods for identifying the important domains of the construct. It would probably be useful if the authors provided a bit more detail about how the information from the focus groups was analyzed, and what dimensions they identified, independent of the dimensions that the identified from the literature review.

The conduct of the item analyses, including evaluation of item response distributions, item-total correlations, and inter-item correlations was appropriate, and an often over-looked step in the process of test development. Although the authors indicated that none of the items were eliminated based upon the item analyses, it would still be useful information to present the results of the item analyses in a table, including mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and item-total correlation of each item, as well as the mean item-total correlation, if not for the original set of items, at least for the final set of items after eliminating items due to factor loading issues.

For the EFA, the authors indicate that both the minimum average partial (MAP) and parallel analysis procedures indicated 5 factors, but they do not present the results of the analysis. It is good practice to provide the numbers generated from these procedures that lead to the conclusion. So, for the parallel analysis, the first 6 actual and random eigenvalues can be presented.

Regarding the CFA, the procedures were reasonable, and the fit statistics were appropriate. The computation of Omega's was also useful. My one suggestion here would be to present a table or figure showing the loadings of the bifactor model, which was determined to be the best fitting model.

The validity analyses were fairly limited in scope, but the measures used were reasonable and the correlations found were supportive of construct validity.

The Discussion section was a bit lacking in content. Given that construct validation requires a multitude of evidence from different methods and perspectives, what is especially needed in the discussion section is suggestions for further developments, such as other constructs, measures, and criterion variables would be useful to further establish the nomological network and construct validity of scores from this measure. I found the statement that the measure

25/7/2023

Gmail - The Seybold Report - Decision on Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139

would be useful for “Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency“research environment” are they reporting on. In addition, it is premature to recommend a measure for applied use after one development study.



**3. Bukti Konfirmasi Submit Revisi Pertama,  
Respon kepada Reviewer,  
dan Artikel yang Diresubmit  
(23 Aug 2023)**



---

**The Seybold Report - Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139.R1**

---

The Seybold Report&lt;zetriaerma0@gmail.com&gt;

Sat, Aug 23, 2023 at 8:08 PM

Reply-To: JPA@sagepub.com

To:

23-Augt-2023

Dear **Dr.** :

Your manuscript entitled "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in Quality Access to Success

Your manuscript ID is JPA-18-0139.R1.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at [and](#) edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in

As part of our commitment to ensuring an ethical, transparent and fair peer review process SAGE is a supporting member of ORCID, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID. We encourage all authors and co- authors to use ORCID iDs during the peer review process. If you already have an ORCID iD you can link this to your account in ScholarOne just by logging in and editing your account information. If you do not already have an ORCID iD you may login to your ScholarOne account to create your unique identifier and automatically add it to your profile.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to The Seybold Report

Sincerely,  
The Seybold Report Editorial Office

**JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
PAWNING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM THE  
PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN PARBULUAN  
DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY**

**MANUSCRIPT ID: JPA – 18 – 0139**

**Reviewer: 1**

Comments to the Author

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript (JPA-18-0139). This article described the development and validation of the Perceived Research Environment Scale (PRES), a faculty-report measure for use in higher education institutions. I hope the following comments will assist the authors in revising their manuscript.

1.) This study seems to lack of a cohesive, unifying theoretical framework. The authors vaguely reference potential applications of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory, but it is unclear how this theory guided instrument development and the analyses. The authors also reference several studies exploring various aspects of research environments, but these variables do not seem to be united in any particular framework. It would have been more compelling for the authors to apply a specific theoretical framework to guide the development of the measure.

**Response:**

*We updated our previous explanations regarding Bronfenbrenner's theory and this section on pages 2-3:*

The important role of the research environment for academics is consistent with Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1986) ecological systems theory. This perspective emphasises that, compared to the objective environment, perceptions of the environment are of primary significance, because it is these that affect and guide behaviour. Bronfenbrenner argued that developing individuals are surrounded by interrelated systems. The inner circle, or microsystem, is where academics have direct, face-to-face contact with significant others, primarily their colleagues. Clusters of microsystems are called mesosystems (e.g., academics talking to colleagues from other departments constitutes a linkage between two systems). Beyond this are settings (i.e., exosystems) that are not experienced directly by the academics, but nonetheless influence their microsystem through links such as communications from management. Bronfenbrenner also described a macrosystem, which incorporated the wider society and culture. The influences here come via policy and reward systems in the university. Bronfenbrenner further proposed a chronosystem, which captures change over time in the characteristics of the individual (e.g., career-related transitions) and environmental change (e.g., national pressure to increase scientific publications and social conditions).

For the individual academic in the research-focused environment, a relational viewpoint, which focuses on the developing individual in a changing context, is considered a useful perspective from which to comprehensively understand occupational and career behaviours (Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986). These theorists argued that due to the continually changing nature of the individual and the context, a dynamic interactional approach, or a developmental contextual perspective, should be applied to understand occupational and career development. A developmental contextual point of view proposes that the context is not only continually changing, but also that the changes are influenced by the individuals and their characteristics. When considered from this perspective, occupation and career development reflect an interactive process where individuals both affect and are

affected by the features of their environment, including social, cultural, and physical conditions.

In line with Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1986) ecological systems theory and Vondracek et al.'s (1986) person-context relationships proposition, individuals will function better, demonstrate adapted outcomes, and be more satisfied when their characteristics fit the demands of the environment. Individuals with a good person-environment fit are also likely to receive favourable feedback and input from the surroundings. Conversely, mismatched individuals will tend to demonstrate poorer outcomes and receive less positive feedback.

Person factors (e.g., personality) and background contextual variables (e.g., socio-economic status) also shape learning experiences and thus affect occupational and career behaviours. From a social cognitive perspective (Bandura, 1991; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), individual interpretations of these experiences shape the development of self-efficacy (beliefs about one's ability to successfully manage and perform courses of action) and outcome expectations (beliefs about the consequences of given actions). Further, self-efficacy fosters favourable outcome expectations, and both self-efficacy and outcome expectations, independently and jointly, foster interests (e.g., research interests and activity) and the development of goals (e.g., intentions to engage in research activities), which, in turn, motivate research-related actions (e.g., research involvement). The success or failure that follows these actions promotes further learning, which then prompts individuals to revise their self-efficacy and outcome expectations, and, in turn, leads to a change in interests and goals. Thus, providing direct and vicarious research-related experiences, giving the opportunity to engage in various research tasks, and opening up research possibilities, should lead to differentiated beliefs about the academic's own capabilities and consequences of performing a particular behaviour, which, in turn, should cultivate research-focused interests and goals that will become more crystallised over time.

2.) On page 7, the authors describe a method for randomly assigning participants to Samples A and B. They contend that the groups were comparable with respect to several demographic variables; however, I am most interested in knowing whether the groups were comparable with respect to institution. Participants came from only four institutions, and it is likely that participants from the same university would rate their research environments similarly (given that they are likely experiencing similar pressures). Is it possible that either Samples A or B consisted of a disproportionately large or small number of faculty from any one of the four institutions? This might impact the results. Ideally, the sample would have comprised faculty from a variety of different institutions.

On a related note, it might be interesting to see whether faculty from the same institution had similar ratings of their research environments. I suppose the ratings might be similar for some items (availability of funding) but less similar for items that vary more across individuals (e.g., access to informal mentoring).

**Response:**

*The composition of academics from the four institutions did not differ significantly across Sample A and Sample B,  $\chi^2(3) = 6.31, p = .10$ . We added information regarding this on pages 10 and 17.*

*With respect to the related note on whether academics from the same university reported similar ratings of their research environment, we did not calculate this, for while it might be interesting, we considered it more relevant for future studies, for example, related to whether different research environments were related to different levels of research output.*

3.) The authors note that there were no significant differences between Sample A and Sample B with respect to age. I'm not sure how meaningful this assertion is, given that approximately 50% of participants in both samples did not report their ages. This constitutes a fairly large amount of missing data.

In general, how were missing data handled in this study? This is important to discuss in the manuscript.

**Response:**

*We retained all cases from participants who completed all of the questionnaire items, as all participants were academics. Only a small number of responses (24 survey booklets) had missing scale data, and these were omitted from the analyses.*

*Some participants did not complete some of their demographic variables. We did not delete these cases or estimate any of the demographic data, as these data were used primarily to describe the sample. We added a statement to this effect in the Limitations section:*

*“We showed that the scale was unrelated to several demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, tenure, level of education, and institutions), suggesting no inherent bias based on these characteristics; however, we had missing demographic data, and future studies need to confirm this, and examine structural invariance on these and other variables to support the usefulness of the scale.”*

4.) I would have liked to have had some more information about the 42 academics included in the focus groups as well as the four independent reviewers who rated the suitability of the items (p. 6). For example, who were the reviewers and what qualified them for this task?

**Response:**

*We added these statements on page 6: “The independent reviewers who rated the suitability of the items consisted of 1 professor in psychology who had expertise in career development and test development and 3 doctoral-level psychology academics who had expertise in test development.”*

*We also added these statements on page 7: “The 42 academics included in the focus groups consisted of 6 professors, 12 associate professors, 12 assistant professor, 6 lecturers, and 6 junior lecturers.....”*

5.) The authors administered a measure of research involvement (i.e., the Research Involvement Scale). I would be curious to know if Samples A and B differed with respect to scores on this measure. If one group were more involved in research than the other, the two samples would not be comparable on a very important dimension (especially given the nature of the instrument the authors are developing).

**Response:**

*The scores of the Research Involvement Scale for Sample A and Sample B did not differ significantly,  $t(596) = -.33$  ( $p = .74$ ). We added this information on page 10.*

6.) The authors sampled participants with a wide range of academic roles, including professors and lecturers. I can imagine that some of these positions are not inherently or contractually research roles. Would respondents with positions that were non-research oriented be the best respondents for this type of measure?

**Response:**

*All academics sampled had a research component to their role. The practice of employing academics who are teaching-only or administration-only is rarely employed in Indonesia, unlike in some Western countries.*

7.) The sample included very few full professors (i.e., approximately 1% of each subsample), which seems problematic for a couple of reasons. First, how might this have impacted the authors attempts to determine whether items were responded to differently by faculty in various positions? Were subsamples for each position (e.g., full professor, associate professor, assistant professor) large enough (and comparable enough in size) to detect response differences across groups? Second, full professors may have more institutional knowledge and research experience than associate and assistant professors. To have so few in the sample appears to be a notable limitation of this study.

**Response:**

*We added this comment to the Limitation section on page 16:*

*“We only had a very small number of professors in the samples, and the number of associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers were not proportional. Future studies need to consider the proportion of their sample when collecting data in academics, as this will affect the response regarding perceived research environment.”*

8.) I would have also recommended that the authors collect data regarding the length of time participants had been at their respective institutions. Newer faculty might not have had enough time to form opinions about their respective research environments.

**Response:**

*We did have these data, but originally did not consider it as a way to describe the sample. We have now reported these details in the Participants section on page 9-10.*

9.) I would have been interested to see the internal consistency values for the PRES total score and subscale scores in Sample B. I would recommend the authors report these values.

**Response:**

*We added this ~~ese~~ statements on page 13: “In Sample B, Alpha for the full scale was .93 ( $M = 112$ ,  $SD = 16.65$ ), Factor 1 ( $\alpha = .90$ ,  $M = 22.87$ ,  $SD = 4.29$ ), Factor 2 ( $\alpha = .94$ ,  $M = 20.36$ ,  $SD = 6.22$ ), Factor 3 ( $\alpha = .87$ ,  $M = 24.44$ ,  $SD = 3.70$ ), Factor 4 ( $\alpha = .91$ ,  $M = 22.53$ ,  $SD = 4.80$ ), and Factor 5 ( $\alpha = .89$ ,  $M = 21.79$ ,  $SD = 4.59$ ).”*

10.) For the CFA, the authors suggest that three of the four models (i.e., 2nd order model, 5-factor model, and bifactor model) had satisfactory fit statistics. However, CFI values for the 5-factor and 2nd order models were below .95. Some research has suggested that a more appropriate criterion for CFI values is .95 or greater (rather than .90 or greater). The authors may wish to revise their language accordingly. (Please see Hu and Bentler, 1999; reference provided below.)

**Response:**

*Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010) provide fit statistics recommendations that are sensitive to sample size and the number of observed variables to be estimated. For example, a significant  $\chi^2$ ,  $\chi^2/df < 3.0$ , CFI and TLI values  $> .92$ , and RMSEA  $< .08$  indicate satisfactory fit when sample size  $> 250$  and observed variables number between 12 and 30. The CFI*

values should be greater than .95 when sample size > 250 and observed variables number below 12.

Our sample size was 292 and the number of observed variables were 15.

11.) Minor comments:

a. On page 3, the authors write, “Duffy et al. (2013) interview 17 of the most research-productive counselling psychologists within the American Psychological Association accredited counselling program.” Did the authors mean 17 faculty across a variety of APA-accredited programs?

**Response:**

*The sample was comprised of counseling psychology faculty who were the most cumulatively productive. Duffy et al. 's (2013) study focused on a very specific group of psychologists within one subfield of psychology, i.e., counseling psychology. We clarified this statement in the text on page 4.*

b. In the implications section, I would further emphasize the potential value of the PRES for informing organizational change. This point is a good one and should be further developed. For example, more detail about the specific uses of the instrument for facilitating organizational improvement would be interesting (and would ultimately make the paper more compelling).

**Response:**

*We accepted your advice. We added the uses of the instrument for facilitating organizational improvement in the implication section.*

Reference

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis. Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.

**References:**

Duffy, R. D., Torrey, C. L., Bott, E. M., Allan, B. A., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2013). Time management, passion, and collaboration: A qualitative study of highly research productive counseling psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 41, 881-917. doi: 10.1177/0011000012457994

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis. A global perspective*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall.

**Reviewer: 2**

Comments to the Author

This manuscript reports on the development and psychometric evolution of a measure of perceived research environment. Specifically, the measure is designed to tap into a construct comprised of a number of dimensions related to an individual's perception of the availability of resources, support, and appreciation of research efforts within the institution in which the individual is employed. I found the manuscript to be clear and well-written. The authors did a nice job explaining the concept of the perceived research environment and why it is important, as well as the previous attempts to at psychometric instruments to capture the

construct. As illustrated in the introduction, previous measures have been quite specific to either certain fields (e.g., nursing), or populations (e.g., graduate students). Thus, the authors make a good case for a general perceived research environment scale that could be applicable to Universities or other research institutions, regardless of the specific discipline. However, I would recommend the authors add a paragraph at the end of the introduction, before the “Present Study” section, summarizing this and making this rationale more explicit.

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestion. We added these statements on page 6: “It is obvious that there is no general perceived research environment scale suitable for academics. We address this gap by designing a brief, multidimensional, and psychometrically sound instrument that could be applicable to universities and other research institutions regardless of specific disciplines.”*

There are other strengths of this paper, including conducting item analyses, evaluation of the internal structure with EFA followed by a CFA in a random hold-out sample to confirm the factor structure. The factor analytic methods were appropriate and fit the theoretical conception of the construct, including use of principal axis factoring, direct oblimin rotation, which allows for correlations among the rotated factors, and the use of Velicer’s MAP and parallel analysis to inform the decision on the number of factors to retain. With that said, there are also some areas that should be addressed to improve the paper and the contribution of the study.

I appreciate the fact that the authors conducted focus groups as one of the methods for identifying the important domains of the construct. It would probably be useful if the authors provided a bit more detail about how the information from the focus groups was analyzed, and what dimensions they identified, independent of the dimensions that the identified from the literature review.

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestion. We added these statements on page 7: “The independent reviewers who rated the suitability of the items consisted of 1 professor in psychology who had expertise in career development and test development and 3 doctoral-level psychology academics who had expertise in test development. They independently reviewed the discussions and determined the core ideas, and the team met to synthesise the results. The team identified five salient aspects: of beneficial social relationships, positive reinforcement, support, encouragement, and role modelling.”*

The conduct of the item analyses, including evaluation of item response distributions, item-total correlations, and inter-item correlations was appropriate, and an often over-looked step in the process of test development. Although the authors indicated that none of the items were eliminated based upon the item analyses, it would still be useful information to present the results of the item analyses in a table, including mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and item-total correlation of each item, as well as the mean item-total correlation, if not for the original set of items, at least for the final set of items after eliminating items due to factor loading issues.

**Responses:**

We accepted your suggestion and added this table:



Table 2  
*Results of the item analyses*

Item	Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean	SD	Item-total correlation
1.	-1.18	2.00	4.57	.93	.62
2.	-1.20	2.43	4.61	.97	.64
3.	-1.05	1.48	4.56	.97	.51
4.	-.73	1.17	4.61	.83	.63
5.	-.97	1.16	4.66	.97	.62
6.	-.90	.14	4.2	1.35	.63
7.	-.81	.10	4.05	1.36	.55
8.	-1.17	.63	4.28	1.32	.56
9.	-.99	.29	4.21	1.34	.52
10.	-.55	-.43	3.88	1.34	.65
11.	-.69	.93	4.96	.78	.41
12.	-.80	1.17	5.15	.73	.37
13.	-.78	.38	4.96	.92	.39
14.	-.68	.70	4.90	.83	.50
15.	-.58	.79	4.87	.76	.39
16.	-1.08	1.32	4.52	1.03	.73
17.	-.83	1.10	4.44	1.02	.72
18.	-1.08	1.38	4.67	1.08	.65
19.	-.81	.71	4.41	1.03	.69
20.	-1.08	1.14	4.53	1.08	.74
21.	-.34	.03	4.08	1.02	.41
22.	-.35	-.46	4.20	1.20	.33
23.	-.55	.15	4.35	1.06	.56
24.	-.61	.22	4.52	1.01	.58
25.	-.69	.91	4.66	.92	.51

For the EFA, the authors indicate that both the minimum average partial (MAP) and parallel analysis procedures indicated 5 factors, but they do not present the results of the analysis. It is good practice to provide the numbers generated from these procedures that lead to the conclusion. So, for the parallel analysis, the first actual and random eigenvalues can be presented.

**Responses:**

*We added this statement on page 11: “The first eigenvalues are: 14.93, 5.20, 2.38, 1.83, and 1.61.”*

Regarding the CFA, the procedures were reasonable, and the fit statistics were appropriate. The computation of Omega’s was also useful. My one suggestion here would be to present a table or figure showing the loadings of the bifactor model, which was determined to be the best fitting model.

**Response:**

*We added these statements on page 14: “Item loadings for factor 1 ranged from .28 to .62, factor 2 from .80 to .89, factor 3 from .30 to .80, factor 4 from .53 to .80, factor 5 from .32 to .55. Item loading for perceived research environment ranged from .35 to .77.”*

The validity analyses were fairly limited in scope, but the measures used were reasonable and the correlations found were supportive of construct validity.

The Discussion section was a bit lacking in content. Given that construct validation requires a multitude of evidence from different methods and perspectives, what is especially needed in

the discussion section is suggestions for further developments, such as other constructs, measures, and criterion variables would be useful to further establish the nomological network and construct validity of scores from this measure. I found the statement that the measure would be useful for “early stages of career counseling” to be perplexing. Perhaps I am missing something, but it seems this measure would only be applicable to someone who is already working in an institution with some kind of research focus. Otherwise, what “research environment” are they reporting on. In addition, it is premature to recommend a measure for applied use after one development study.

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestions and revised our statements on page 17:*

*“Practitioners can use the scale as a diagnostic tool at an early stage of individual’s career stage as academics, as well as an evaluation instrument in the next career stages.”*

*And also added these statements on page 17:*

*“Finally, further developments, such as testing the relationships with other constructs, measures, and criterion variables would be useful to establish the nomological network and construct validity of scores from this measure.”*

\*\*\*

**JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
PAWNING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM  
THE PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN  
PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY**

Journal:	The Seybold Report
Manuscript ID	JPA-18-0139.R1
Manuscript Type:	Regular Article
Keyword :	Agriculture, Land Pawning, Customary Law, Agrarian Law no. 5 of 1960.
Abstract:	<p>Objectives study This is Juridical Studies Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Viewed from the Perspective of Customary Law in the District Parbuluan. Pawn land agriculture in Sigalingging Village, DistrictParbuluan, Regency Dairy Still considered as local wisdom society that has accomplished in a way hereditary in a way custom. So that form its implementation Still done in a way custom and considered as form attitude each other Help when in circumstances pressed. Legal society custom in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan,Regency Dairy Already used to with pawn process land agriculture there, and considered the process more makes it easier than rule law national. Process implementation pawn land agriculture in matter This redemption pawn Agricultural land still contains elements of extortion due to the implementation of mortgaging agricultural land for the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi practices customary law as binding law. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi goes through several stages including the division of territory, the contents of the agreement, the rights and obligations of the pawnee recipient. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi has obstacles in carrying out agricultural land pawning transactions. These obstacles come from the first, the party giving the pledge, the second, the party receiving the pledge, while the third is custom as the holder of agrarian law customs.</p>

# JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PAWNING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY

## Introduction

Education, research, and services are the three key functions characterizing the academic profession in modern-day, higher education systems (Eam, 2015), although academic research and publications have been increasingly emphasised at most universities around the world, as involvement in research-related activities is recognised as an effective means to upgrade a university's profile (Nguyen, Klopper, & Smith, 2016). Previous studies have demonstrated that engagement in research potentially improves teaching quality and enhances knowledge and competence, and this contributes to high quality research supervision, which is critical for developing graduate students as independent researchers (Lindsay, Breen, & Jenkins, 2002).

Reflecting this, there has been a continuing trend for universities in developed countries to increase their focus on research, and this tendency has spread to developing countries, where research is increasingly viewed as a high priority (Nguyen et al., 2016). Consequently, research has become an important function for academics everywhere, as research productivity is now a primary consideration in several important organisational decisions, such as hiring, maintenance of tenure, promotions, and salary increases for academics (Chen, Gupta, & Hoshower, 2006). As academics are required to publish their research results nationally and internationally in high quality, peer-refereed journals (Nguyen et al., 2016), researchers have been interested in identifying the predictors of research involvement and performance in academics (e.g., Whelan & Markless, 2013).

This research has shown that, among the factors that influence research productivity, environmental factors are some of the most powerful ones (Bland & Ruffin, 1992), which has led researchers to identify the elements that characterise a good research environment

## PERCEIVED RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Table 4

Summary Data for Sample B (N = 292; correlations above diagonal)

Indonesian												
Scale	M	SD	Range	$\alpha$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Full scale	112.00	16.65	28-145	.93	-	.81***	.65***	.63***	.80***	.64***	.47***	.49***
2. Subscale 1 (beneficial social relationship)	22.87	4.29	5-30	.90		-	.40***	.48***	.52***	.54***	.30***	.35***
3. Subscale 2 (positive reinforcement)	20.36	6.22	5-30	.94			-	.12*	.49***	.10*	.14*	.24**
4. Subscale 3 (support and expectations)	24.44	3.70	6-30	.87				-	.38***	.49***	.38***	.32***
5. Subscale 4 (focus on research)	22.53	4.80	5-30	.91					-	.39***	.54***	.58***
6. Subscale 5 (positive role models)	21.79	4.59	5-30	.89						-	.35***	.27**
7. Organisational culture/ support for research	67.24	15.40	24-144	.93							-	.54***
8. Research involvement	100.82	21.12	18-108	.97								-

Note. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

**4. Bukti Konfirmasi Review dan  
Hasil Review Kedua  
(13 Sep 2023)**



---

## The Seybold Report - Decision on Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139.R1

---

**The Seybold Report** <zetriaerma0@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 13, 2023 at 12:51 AM

Reply-To: tobin@temple.edu

To:

Cc: dsaklofs@uwo.ca

13-Sep-2023

Dear **Dr.** :

**Thank you for submitting a revision** of the Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139.R1 entitled "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" to Quality Access to Success. I have now received a review from one of the experts in the field who reviewed your initial submission and has examined your revised manuscript and cover letter. This review is included below for your reference. I have also carefully read the manuscript and your cover letter in response to reviewers' comments.

After reviewing these materials, the reviewer and I noted significant improvement over the last version. As you will see in the review, the reviewer identifies several minor issues. Rather than restating the reviewers' comments here, I will simply ask that you carefully read these comments and adjust the manuscript to address them. Once you do so, I would be pleased to recommend to the Editor, Don Saklofske, that the manuscript be published in JPA.

To revise your manuscript, log into enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, your revised manuscript should be submitted within 30 days from receipt of this letter. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in this amount of time, please advise the Associate Editor before the 30 day period as the link to you article will expire and you will not be able to re-submit your paper without making a specific request.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to The Seybold Report and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Renée Tobin

Associate Editor, The Seybold Report  
[tobin@temple.edu](mailto:tobin@temple.edu)

Editor

#### Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

#### Comments to the Author

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript (JPA-18-0139.R1). Overall, I appreciate the authors' responsiveness to reviewer feedback and believe their edits have much improved the manuscript. I hope the authors will find the following comments helpful as they continue to revise their manuscript.

1. I greatly appreciated the authors' expansion of their theoretical rationale in the introduction. However, I would recommend removing the paragraph on the social cognitive perspective (p. 3-4). The study is already situated in the work of Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Vondracek et al. (1986), and applying too many theoretical perspectives makes it hard to distill the study's rationale. Moreover, the social cognitive perspective's emphasis on self-efficacy and other specific individual variables seems less relevant to this study, given that the PRE is intended to measure characteristics of the research environment (and not of the individual academic).
2. In their response to reviewers, the authors noted that all academics in this setting had research components to their roles. I would recommend stating this in the manuscript.
3. I appreciated your analysis of potential differences in institutional affiliation between Samples A and B. I also appreciated your reporting internal consistency values in Sample B.
4. On page 16, the authors state that practitioners can use the PRE as a diagnostic tool for individuals. I am unclear as to why and how this would be useful. Many academics have little control over their research environments. It seems to me that this scale would be much more useful for conducting systems-level needs assessments and planning for departmental/organizational change. I would emphasize these potential applications (rather than emphasizing potential applications for individual academics).
5. Minor comments
  - a. While the manuscript is generally well-written, its first two sentences are "run-on" sentences. I would recommend revising them.
  - b. On page 6 (line 43), the sentence beginning with "it is obvious that" could be revised as follows: "To the authors' knowledge, a perceived research environment scale suitable for academics has yet to be published in the peer-reviewed literature."
  - c. When referring to internal consistency values, please write "Cronbach's alpha" rather than just "alpha."
  - d. On page 4 (line 52), the phrase "or at hobbies" should read "or engaged in hobbies."
  - e. In describing the OCSR and the RI measures (p. 10), please use complete sentences (e.g., "A sample item from this measure is...")



**5. Bukti Konfirmasi Submit Revisi Kedua,  
Respon kepada Reviewer,  
dan Artikel yang Diresubmit  
( 22 Okt 2023 )**



---

## The Seybold Report - Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139.R2

---

**The Seybold Report** <zetriaerma0@gmail.com>

Wed, Okt 22, 2023 at 3:24 PM

Reply-To: JPA@sagepub.com

To:

22-Okt-2023

Dear **Dr.** :

Your manuscript entitled "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in The Seybold Report. Your manuscript ID is JPA-18-0139.R2.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to

As part of our commitment to ensuring an ethical, transparent and fair peer review process SAGE is a supporting member of ORCID, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID. We encourage all authors and co-authors to use ORCID iDs during the peer review process. If you already have an ORCID iD you can link this to your account in ScholarOne just by logging in and editing your account information. If you do not already have an ORCID iD you may login to your ScholarOne account to create your unique identifier and automatically add it to your profile.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to The Seybold Report.

Sincerely,  
The Seybold Report

**JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
PAWNING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM  
THE PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN  
PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY**

**MANUSCRIPT ID: JPA – 18 – 0139. R1**

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript (JPA-18-0139.R1). Overall, I appreciate the authors' responsiveness to reviewer feedback and believe their edits have much improved the manuscript. I hope the authors will find the following comments helpful as they continue to revise their manuscript.

1. I greatly appreciated the authors' expansion of their theoretical rationale in the introduction. However, I would recommend removing the paragraph on the social cognitive perspective (p. 3-4). The study is already situated in the work of Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Vondracek et al. (1986), and applying too many theoretical perspectives makes it hard to distill the study's rationale. Moreover, the social cognitive perspective's emphasis on self-efficacy and other specific individual variables seems less relevant to this study, given that the PRE is intended to measure characteristics of the research environment (and not of the individual academic).

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestion. We removed the paragraph on the social cognitive perspective (p. 3-4)*

2. In their response to reviewers, the authors noted that all academics in this setting had research components to their roles. I would recommend stating this in the manuscript.

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestion. We stated it in the Participants section on page 9.*

3. I appreciated your analysis of potential differences in institutional affiliation between Samples A and B. I also appreciated your reporting internal consistency values in Sample B.

**Response:**

*Thank you for your previous suggestion.*

4. On page 16, the authors state that practitioners can use the PRE as a diagnostic tool for individuals. I am unclear as to why and how this would be useful. Many academics have little control over their research environments. It seems to me that this scale would be much more useful for conducting systems-level needs assessments and planning for departmental/organizational change. I would emphasize these potential applications (rather than emphasizing potential applications for individual academics).

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestion. On page 16, we revised our statement: “Practitioners can use the scale for conducting systems-level needs assessments and planning for departmental/organisational change.”*

5. Minor comments

- a. While the manuscript is generally well-written, its first two sentences are “run-on” sentences. I would recommend revising them.
- b. On page 6 (line 43), the sentence beginning with “it is obvious that” could be revised as follows: “To the authors’ knowledge, a perceived research environment scale suitable for academics has yet to be published in the peer-reviewed literature.”
- c. When referring to internal consistency values, please write “Cronbach’s alpha” rather than just “alpha.”
- d. On page 4 (line 52), the phrase “or at hobbies” should read “or engaged in hobbies.”
- e. In describing the OCSR and the RI measures (p. 10), please use complete sentences (e.g., “A sample item from this measure is...”)

**Response:**

*We accepted your suggestions.*

- a. *We revised the first two sentences: “Education, research, and services are the three key functions characterising the academic profession in modern-day, higher education systems (Eam, 2015). However, academic research and publications have been increasingly emphasised at most universities around the world, as involvement in research-related activities is recognised as an effective means to upgrade a university’s profile (Nguyen, Klopper, & Smith, 2016).”*
- b. *We revised the sentence on page 6 (line 43): “To the authors’ knowledge, a perceived research environment scale suitable for academics has yet to be published in the peer-reviewed literature.”*
- c. *We revised “alpha” to “Cronbach’s alpha” when referring to internal consistency values on page 10, 12, and 13.*
- d. *On page 4 (line 52), we revised “or at hobbies” to “or engaged in hobbies.”*
- e. *In describing the OCSR and the RI measures on page 10, we revised our previous sentences to complete sentences: “A sample item from this measure is...”*

\*\*\*

**JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF PAWNING OF  
AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM THE  
PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN  
PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI  
REGENCY**

Journal:	The Seybold Report
Manuscript ID	JPA-18-0139.R2
Manuscript Type:	Regular Article
Keywords:	Agriculture, Land Pawning, Customary Law, Agrarian Law no. 5 of 1960
Abstract:	<p>Objectives study This is Juridical Studies Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Viewed from the Perspective of Customary Law in the District Parbuluan. Pawn land agriculture in Sigalingging Village District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy Still considered as local wisdom society that has accomplished in a way hereditary in a way custom. So that form its implementation Still done in a way custom and considered as form attitude each other Help when in circumstances pressed. Legal society custom in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy Already used to with pawn process land agriculture there, and considered the process more makes it easier than rule law national. Process implementation pawn land agriculture in matter This redemption pawn Agricultural land still contains elements of extortion due to the implementation of mortgaging agricultural land for the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi practices customary law as binding law. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi goes through several stages including the division of territory, the contents of the agreement, the rights and obligations of the pawnee recipient. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi has obstacles in carrying out agricultural land pawning transactions. These obstacles come from the first the party giving the pledge, the second, the party receiving the pledge, while the third is custom as the holder of agrarian law customs.</p>

JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PAWNING OF  
AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF  
CUSTOMARY LAW IN PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY

## Introduction

Education, research, and service are the three key functions characterising the academic profession in modern-day, higher education systems (Eam, 2015). However, academic research and publications have been increasingly emphasised at most universities around the world, as involvement in research-related activities is recognised as an effective means to upgrade a university's profile (Nguyen, Klopper, & Smith, 2016). Previous studies have demonstrated that engagement in research potentially improves teaching quality and enhances knowledge and competence, and this contributes to high quality research supervision, which is critical for developing graduate students as independent researchers (Lindsay, Breen, & Jenkins, 2002).

Reflecting this, there has been a continuing trend for universities in developed countries to increase their focus on research, and this tendency has spread to developing countries, where research is increasingly viewed as a high priority (Nguyen et al., 2016). Consequently, research has become an important function for academics everywhere, as research productivity is now a primary consideration in several important organisational decisions, such as hiring, maintenance of tenure, promotions, and salary increases for academics (Chen, Gupta, & Hoshower, 2006). As academics are required to publish their research results nationally and internationally in high quality, peer-refereed journals (Nguyen et al., 2016), researchers and administrators have been interested in identifying the predictors of research involvement and performance in academics (e.g., Whelan & Markless, 2013).

This research has shown that, among the factors that influence research productivity, environmental factors are some of the most powerful ones (Bland & Ruffin, 1992), which has led researchers to identify the elements that characterise a good research environment

## PERCEIVED RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Table 4

Summary Data for Sample B (N = 292; correlations above diagonal)

Indonesian												
Scale	M	SD	Range	$\alpha$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Full scale	112.00	16.65	28-145	.93	-	.81***	.65***	.63***	.80***	.64***	.47***	.49***
2. Subscale 1 (beneficial social relationship)	22.87	4.29	5-30	.90		-	.40***	.48***	.52***	.54***	.30***	.35***
3. Subscale 2 (positive reinforcement)	20.36	6.22	5-30	.94			-	.12*	.49***	.10*	.14*	.24**
4. Subscale 3 (support and expectations)	24.44	3.70	6-30	.87				-	.38***	.49***	.38***	.32***
5. Subscale 4 (focus on research)	22.53	4.80	5-30	.91					-	.39***	.54***	.58***
6. Subscale 5 (positive role models)	21.79	4.59	5-30	.89						-	.35***	.27**
7. Organisational culture/ support for research	67.24	15.40	24-144	.93							-	.54***
8. Research involvement	100.82	21.12	18-108	.97								-

Note. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

**6. Bukti Konfirmasi Artikel Accepted  
(29 Nov 2023)**





---

## The Seybold Report - Decision on Manuscript ID JPA-18-0139.R2

---

**The Seybold Report** <zuraidah@unmuha.ac.id>

Wed, Nov 29, 2023 at 3:28 AM

Reply-To: tobin@temple.edu

To:

Cc:

29-Nov-2023

Dear **Dr. :**

I have now carefully read the revised manuscript and your cover letter in response to reviewer comments. After reviewing these materials, I noted that you addressed all issues raised in the last round of reviews. Thus, **it is a pleasure to accept your manuscript** entitled "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" in its current form for publication in The Seybold Report.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors The Seybold Report, we look forward to your continued contributions to the The Seybold Report.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Renée Tobin  
Associate Editor, The Seybold Report  
[tobin@temple.edu](mailto:tobin@temple.edu)

Don Saklofske  
Editor

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

**7. Bukti Konfirmasi Artikel Published Online  
( 7 Dec 2023)**



---

## Your article is now published online

---

**The Seybold Report** <zetriaerma0@gmail.com>

Dec 7, 2023 at 1:50 PM

Reply-To: zetriaerma0@gmail.com

To:

Cc: sage.eprints@sagepub.com

Dear :

Thank you for publishing your article with SAGE Publishing and The Seybold Report. Your article "Juridical Study Of The Implementation Of Pawning Of Agricultural Land Seen From The Perspective Of Customary Law In Parbuluan District, Dairi Regency" is now published and your complimentary e-copy is available "

The above link and final published PDF are only for your personal use and non-profit teaching purposes and should not be posted online or otherwise distributed. If you wish to post your article on your personal website or institutional repository, you may use the accepted version. Please see the SAGE author sharing guidelines, linked below, for full details about appropriate use and version definitions.

The permanent link for your article is . Please also visit our online resources for more information:

- [SAGE author sharing guidelines](#),
- [Promoting your article](#), including [maximizing its impact via Kudos](#),
- [Post-publication corrections](#),
- [Author gateway](#).

Thank you again for publishing with SAGE and The Seybold Report. We value your feedback and encourage you to complete the brief Journal Author Survey you will receive shortly. Best wishes,  
SAGE Journals Author Services [authorproductionqueries@sagepub.co.uk](mailto:authorproductionqueries@sagepub.co.uk)

Note: Please do not reply to this message, as replies are routed to an unmonitored mailbox. If you experience difficulty with the provided links, please check that the full link transferred to your browser without any line breaks or errant characters such as < or >. You may receive this message twice, once for your article's initial OnlineFirst publication and a second time for your article's issue publication. Please direct any questions to [authorproductionqueries@sagepub.com](mailto:authorproductionqueries@sagepub.com), noting the article title and journal title.

# **JURIDICAL STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PAWNING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CUSTOMARY LAW IN PARBULUAN DISTRICT, DAIRI REGENCY**

**ZETRIA ERMA <sup>1\*</sup> and MUHAMMAD NUROHIM <sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author Email: zetriaerma0@gmail.com

## **Abstract**

Objectives study This is Juridical Studies Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Viewed from the Perspective of Customary Law in the District Parbuluan. Pawn land agriculture in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy Still considered as local wisdom society that has accomplished in a way hereditary in a way custom. So that form its implementation Still done in a way custom and considered as form attitude each other Help when in circumstances pressed. Legal society custom in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy Already used to with pawn process land agriculture there, and considered the process more makes it easier than rule law national. Process implementation pawn land agriculture in matter This redemption pawn Agricultural land still contains elements of extortion due to the implementation of mortgaging agricultural land for the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi practices customary law as binding law. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi goes through several stages including the division of territory, the contents of the agreement, the rights and obligations of the pawnee recipient. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi has obstacles in carrying out agricultural land pawning transactions. These obstacles come from the first, the party giving the pledge, the second, the party receiving the pledge, while the third is custom as the holder of agrarian law customs.

**Keywords:** Agriculture, Land Pawning, Customary Law, Agrarian Law no. 5 of 1960.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The ground is very tight connection with life human and is a very important factor for the Indonesian people, especially the people of Parbuluan District, where the majority of the population depends on land for their life and livelihood. Land also has high economic value because its value is always increasing. The existence of land is often used as an investment for the future by owning or cultivating it. The existence of land is so important for humans that it gives rise to many problems that arise because of it. Starting from the existence of a plot of land in an area or which is then followed by the granting of land rights by the authorities to the community.

Deep ground context economy is one of property type has value, even land is a factor of production. Because land is part of an asset, the ownership process also needs to be regulated within the corridors of customary law within the framework of solid land distribution surrounded by Muslims without prejudice, Ridwan (2010). Basically, the solid foundation that contains characteristic wealth is the wealth of government contained by a sovereign state. The

effectiveness of a sovereign state on a solid foundation is supported by the administration of government as a universal establishment to regulate the collective progress of its people. The meaning of sovereign state control rights is the implementation to influence all important procedures in the context of regulating, administering and supervising the use and use of land. The material meaning of remaining on the throne of a sovereign state on solid ground is the responsibility and responsibility of the sovereign state to implement and manipulate solid processes for the welfare of the people. This deed of agreement together means that a sovereign state has an administration in the form of unlimited restrictions accompanying the use and use of land.

In terms of conditions Constitution has arranged about right owned by is a hereditary right, the strongest and most fulfilled is that the buoy is owned by the general public on solid land so that the ownership rights to the buoy are transferred and transferred to the social gathering which is freely sold Sudaryo Soimin (1994). The sovereign state of Indonesia is an agrarian sovereign state whose solid foundation is very strong for the survival of the people. This buoy can be seen in article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution which reads: "Earth, inundation and expansion as well as the nature of the processes contained therein are accommodated by a sovereign and conscious state for the greatest prosperity of the people." The verse mentioned in the sky was the basis for the publication of Collection Number 5 of 1960 concerning the Introduction of Agricultural Modifications.

Pawn land is something the agreement that caused it matter the land is bimanual above to obtain a reliable share from the ordering officer with a will granting a will to collect solid land for himself in return for a suitable amount of money. Meanwhile, in the interpretation of figures from the 56 Prp group of 1960 which refers to the environmental constancy of agricultural land, the pawn boundary is communication between an individual and the relationship between solid land and another individual who has almighty money for him, Daud Muhammad Kata (2015). Pawning over land is a temporary land right, meaning that the pledge ends when redemption has been made by the land owner (pledger), the pawn right has lasted for 7 years or more, there is a court decision, the land is destroyed and/or the land is revoked for public interest, Urip Santoso (2012).

According to regulated provisions \_ exercise law custom, pawn land is one of form transaction land which can equalized with sell take it off and sell it annual. With thereby can said that pawn according to law custom is is agreement principal who is standing alone and not is addition from agreement borrowing money like case pawn according to the Law\_ Civil.

Pawn land is something deed transition right on land, to another party (namely an individual) which is done clearly and in cash in such a way that the party transferring the rights has the right to redeem the land. Thus, the transfer of land rights in a mortgage is temporary, although sometimes there is no definite standard regarding this temporary nature, Soerjono Soekanto (2015). Only freehold land can be mortgaged. Lien rights are not collateral rights or encumbrance rights as is the case in mortgages/credit verbands, because in a mortgage the mortgaged land changes in power, the delegated transfer passes to the pawnshop for a period of time before the land is fully redeemed, whereas in a mortgage the land remains enjoyed by

the original owner. Practice selling buy very diverse. Diversity used community to fulfill their needs in the field of buying and selling, one of which is land buying and selling carried out by indigenous peoples in Parbuluan District.

A phenomenon that is currently developing in a sovereign state is a mortgage transaction deed for agricultural land with basic legal authority, so that the deed refers more to the attention of the general public who can afford it. bodied Majuscule. The practice of land pawning which violates National Law is still common in Indonesia. For example, pawnshops are carried out in Parbuluan District. This deviation can be seen in the return period for land mortgages. The return depends on the pawnshop's ability to buy back the land. The people of Parbuluan District assess that the pawning they have carried out fulfills the elements of justice and is in accordance with the customary law rules that develop in the community.

Now in the District Parbuluan, researcher observe exists prohibitive provisions \_ owner land For own land not to sell their land to immigrants. There is no freedom for people to carry out buying and selling transactions. Meanwhile they have proof of land ownership. Freedom in terms of ownership has no restrictions as discussed above, that is, ownership is still individual with proof of ownership and freedom in transferring ownership rights is also permitted, one of which is by buying and selling. So in Parbuluan District, land ownership is only limited to regulations or transactions carried out by the government. This means that based on facts and theory it is as if the community does not have ownership of land, there is no freedom for the community to buy and sell land and it is contrary to the above rules and the need for ownership provisions for the community.

In connection with all of the above, actually mortgages the held with very detrimental symmetry creditor and very economical. With So, it's clear that mortgage the show practice blackmail, which is harsh head to custom customs Asian socialism. Therefore \_ that, deep Constitution Introduction Agriculture, rights pawn including in group "temporary" rights , which are mandatory For held endeavors to be eliminated in due course. Even though it cannot be abolished, the right of lien must be regulated so that elements of extortion can be eliminated (article 53). Lien rights can only be removed (meaning prohibited) if the credit provided is sufficient to meet the farmer's needs, Boedi Harsono (2014).

## **Theoretical Study**

### **1. Definition of Pawn**

Pawn is means of mutual cooperation to help Muslim community , without compensation for services, Nasrun Haroen (2007). Until Then agreement This pawn is categorized as a charity contract (tabarru), this is because what the rahin gives to the murtahin is not exchanged for anything. Meanwhile, what murtahin gives to rahin is a debt, not an exchange for pawned goods (marhun). Apart from that, rahn is also included in the ainiyah contract, which is a perfect contract after the delivery of the contracted goods. So then it is explained that all charity contracts are said to be perfect after they are made (al-qabdu), perfect tabarru, except after they are done), Rahmat Syafi'i (2001).

## 2. Agricultural Pawn

Suroyo Wignyodipuro (1973) stated that, law Customary law differentiates land transactions into two groups, namely land transactions which are unilateral legal acts and land transactions which are legal acts of two parties. Land transactions which are unilateral legal acts can be cited as an example of establishing a village and clearing land by a member of the community. A land transaction which is a legal act between two parties/reciprocity is a form of cash act which has a land object. The essence of this transaction is the transfer or delivery accompanied by cash payment from the other party at that time.

## 3. UU no. 5 of 1960

This law in effect official named Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Regulation The main points Agrarian management right on stagnant ground water and air. This also includes regulation introduction and refresher For control, ownership, implementation or use of agricultural processes government in Indonesia, registration strong soil, poor refreshment and provisions transition. Collection Number 5 of 1960 is something stated provisions that control and use land congested standing water and atmosphere need done elsewhere with \_\_ supported by custom customs constitutionality and success exploitation society that doesn't impartial and profitable. This is appropriate with Article 33 paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution which reads "Earth and standing water and the properties of the processes contained therein accommodated by a sovereign state and refined moreover first for the sake of big prosperity of the people."

## Approach Method

### 1. Types of research

Based on the problem studied writer, then method writing This use law normative. Writing method law normative or disposition evaluation literary collections constitute disposition or disposition euphemism that has previously in allowable assessments to be carried out with method examine ingredients existing collection. \_evaluation is permitted in a way prescriptive furthermore called permitted research in a way doctrinal. In the allowable assessment according to matter This is a collection always conceptualized as what 's behind \_\_ \_ regulations and modifications (law in book) or collection conceptualized as regulation or the average that becomes yardstick measuring behavior anthropoid suggested by the person concerned, Peter Mahmud Marzuki, (2013).

### 2. Research Approach

Approach problems used \_ in preparation study This is approach legislation (statute approach), approach This is approach taken with examine every regulations and related changes with continuation permitted emanations \_ handled. Approach this used for parse preparation bullet points existing dispute \_ with refers to principles substantial permitted. \_ Application approach this aim for make it easier psychoanalysis and seeing regulation as well as other accompanying modifications preparation the difficulties that accompany it, Peter Mahmud Marzuki, (2010).

### 3. Data source

Primary legal materials are material legal nature \_ binding and consisting above: norm or rule basics, rules basics, regulations legislation, substance law the main thing is that it doesn't codified, and jurisprudence. The permissible and influential substance practiced by the communicator is The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Regulation The main points Agrarian.

Legal materials secondary that is permitted substances that are not bandaged in other words , interpret permitted influential substances that is decision process corner look or experts ' thoughts or experts weigh in something environment specifically, especially those with wills accommodate instructions about where the investigator is lead will. What is meant is with substance not enough important here by the communicator is fill instructions contained in books, magazines collections, and cyberspace.

### 4. Research Data Analysis

Data analysis is semantics cognitive systematic from intelligent and organized transliteration \_ from notation environment conference press and substances sold freely collected Alone For increase compassion \_ love to substances this and for possible demonstration about what has \_ happen to others, Emzir (2014).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Agricultural Land Liens According to Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Regulation The main points Agrarian (UUPA)

Before the UUPA was formed, rights pawn on land agriculture Already exists and is used by society based on law No written that is law custom. Therefore no easy For delete custom customs that and do it right pawn on land in accordance with UUPA. UUPA abolishes difference between native Indonesian citizens and hereditary citizens \_ foreign in obtain right on land, so perhaps right This pawn can also be done owned by Indonesian citizens of descent foreign. Because, foreigners and legal entities No allowed own land with right pawn .

In the implementation of pawn Solid farming isn't it phenomenon that occurs is race proletarian or plants, but rather land. Because of the phenomenon the is solid ground so need resolved with awareness imagination cooperation or imagination village. This is moderate done For reach more certainty \_ strong. Pawns - pawns that are circumstances or circumstances his backhand No tense on burden consideration will for holder spleen, blessing lifebuoy pawnshop convey right on the solid ground continues \_ or pawn it return to congregation third before continuation in letter write end or giver pawn Not yet pay elsewhere dollars \_ \_ maha power that has promised to carrier spleen. Apart from that, it also gives rise to difficulty for giver pawn Because forever time pawn land agriculture and its ransom has agreed by both split party .

Period time right pawn what you can owned and available land \_ mastered determined in Article 7 Law Number 56 Prp 1960 about Determination of Agricultural Land Areas . Amplitude highest word of honor land congested is 7 seconds of childhood If spleen above \_



land congested agriculture has endure for 7 seconds of childhood businessman spleen will value For displays land congested to giver pawn without liberation anything inside period time individual next thing there is plant chalk has harvested Because correspondence has held . The hawthorn pawn shop controls, monitors and confiscates right owned by from land land mortgaged by pawnshops, especially despite the continuity limit letter write has finished, because pawnshop Not yet save land mortgaged land. \_

## **2. Legal Regulations Concerning Agricultural Land Pawn System in the District Parbuluan**

In the implementation of pawn land agriculture the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy tend affected by the provisions existing provisions become habit in the environment. The custom referred to by the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairy is the act carried out in a way over and over again followed by and accepted by society in a way open No accompanying habits with confidence will obligation law and existence penalty to violation obligation law the. That matter make public No know will its implementation law national ones arrange problem pawn land agriculture like Perppu Number 56 Prp 1960 .

Sigalingging Village Community, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi considers that the provisions of Article 7 paragraph (2) of Perppu Number 56 Prp of 1960 are not in accordance with existing habits in the community, the community considers that these provisions cause losses for the recipients of the pledge, this arises because they are not aware of the aims and objectives of If we examine the provisions of Article 7 paragraph (2) of Perppu Number 56 Prp of 1960, these provisions are actually intended to reduce the elements of extortion contained in agricultural land pawning transactions. For them, customary law is a rule that provides convenience and helps the implementation of mortgages on agricultural land. It is clear that this reason shows an existing understanding inherent, meaning that customary law is a law that helps the process of implementing agricultural land mortgages.

For them, this situation has been traditional and has been carried out for generations. So that is how the process of pledging agricultural land is carried out in accordance with the laws in force in the area. Therefore, here it is clear that the reason for not implementing government law in the process of pawning agricultural land is that the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi still practices customary law as an autonomous law that regulates the implementation of agricultural land pawning.

Apart from that, the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan, Regency Dairi considers that this is local wisdom, namely a tradition or community custom that has been going on for a long time, which has been preserved and has been attached to that tribe or community. So the local wisdom here is the custom of the people of Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi in connection with the mortgage of agricultural land. The people there use agricultural land as the quickest solution when a family is pressed with family economic problems.

When we look further at this community understanding, it becomes clear that the law governing the pawning of agricultural land in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi , namely customary law. Because there is a habit that has been well preserved and guarded by the people there. They are referred to as customary law communities. So the process of mortgaging agricultural land and implementing regulations have been maintained and are considered a custom that must be preserved. This habit is one of the reasons for not implementing the government law regulating agricultural land pawning, namely Article 7 paragraph (2) Perppu Number 56 Prp of 1960 in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy .

### **3. Lack of Understanding and Knowledge \_ \_ Public \_ Subdistrict Parbuluan to Rule of law NATIONAL , K esp Rule About G adai Land Existing Agriculture Perppu Number 56 Prp 1960 \_**

Lack of understanding the people of Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy to purpose and objectives from provision Article 7 paragraph (2) Perppu Number 56 Prp The year 1960 is because in general public traditional have limitations access For obtain all information , included too information about provision rule law national , as well experienced by the people of Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi , because in a way general public there tend is public traditional .

On average, research subjects who are pawns of agricultural land are facing economic difficulties, so it does not occur to them to seek and increase information or knowledge, especially those relating to national laws, especially laws relating to the issue of pledging agricultural land. They tend to think about making a lot of money to be able to redeem their mortgaged farmland. Likewise , recipients of agricultural land pledges are generally the same as those who pawn agricultural land. The recipient of the agricultural land pledge does not think about opening up legal insight, but rather thinks and tries to work on the pawned land optimally in order to get a lot of results from the agricultural land pawn.

Low legal awareness of the people of Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi in the implementation of agricultural land pawning is proven by the possession of the agricultural land which is mortgaged to the pawnee recipient even though it has been more than 7 (seven) years as well as the redemption of the agricultural land pawn by the pawnbroker or land owner which does not comply with the formula in Article 7 paragraph (2) of Perppu Number 56 Prp of 1960. Low legal knowledge of the people of Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi is also reflected in the low level of education of the research subjects, most of the research subjects only have elementary, middle school and some other high school graduates, so their knowledge of the laws or regulations for pawning agricultural land is still very low. This can be clearly seen from the statements of the research subjects, all research subjects, in between answering questions regarding the applicability of Perppu Number 56 of 1960 which regulates time limits and methods for redemption of agricultural land mortgages, stated that they did not know anything about the Law. This is in connection with irregularities in land liens agriculture at a time limit of 7 (seven) years and the amount of the redemption of the agricultural land pawn they made.

#### **4. Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning in Subdistrict Parbuluan**

Post exit and enactment Constitution Tree Agrarian as law on September 24 1960, then Indonesia has have law agrarian national as one of the tool For make it happen Indonesian people \_ fair and prosperous . Since there were many at that time there is misinterpretation of \_ the country's newly implemented laws , as it were new law come For throw away and set aside law traditions that have been established meat in society .

Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi goes through several stages including the division of territory, the contents of the agreement, the rights and obligations of the pawnee recipient. Based on the results of interviews regarding the involvement of traditional institutions, local traditional institutions are not obliged to know about pawning transactions for agricultural land for low heritage, except for high heritage because the money owed in pawning must be clearly intended for the people because the land being pawned has belonged to the people for generations but is inheritance. which are controlled by the community personally do not have to be known by customary institutions. And the land that is the object of this research in the Parbuluan sub-district is low inheritance, which means that the land belongs to an individual or individual and does not belong to a group.

Pawn transactions are carried out in cash and clear. Cash means that the delivery of payment from the pawn holder (pawn buyer) is carried out in full, at the same time or simultaneously with the delivery of the land owned by the pawnbroker. In order for the pawn transaction to be carried out clearly, that is, guaranteed/protected in legal traffic, especially against the possibility of resistance/lawsuits from third parties, the transaction is carried out with the assistance/testimony of the head of the customary law association, such as the headman, village head and so on.

#### **5. Factors Inhibiting the Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Based on Law No. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy**

On implementation agreement mastery land agriculture with right pawn own obstacle in do transaction pawn land agriculture . Obstacle the originate from the first party giver second pawn \_ party recipient pawn whereas third that is custom as holder legal custom agrarian . Knowledge of the Parties Regarding the Application of Article 7 of the Law Number 56 Prp of 1960. Knowledge of the community in the research area regarding the implementation of Article 7 of Law Number 56 Prp of 1960 will be an important factor in the ability of community members to comply with the regulations in force. From the results of this research, it can be seen that none of the respondents in this research were aware of the provisions of Article 7 of Law Number 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determining the Area of Agricultural Land. Based on this, the researcher got answers from interviews with pawn givers from 3 (three) pawn giver respondents So far, I have never known about the rules in Article 7 of Law Number 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determining the Size of Agricultural Land, which states the maximum time

limit for Pawning of Agricultural Land.

In the research conducted by the researcher, one of the pawnbrokers agreed with the interview question regarding the attitude of the pawnbroker towards the agreement that had been made, with 3 respondents who gave the pledge answering with the same answer to the pawn agreement, both parties entered into the agreement voluntarily without any coercion, because the pledgor aims to ask for help because the pawnbroker needs money because of an urgent need, and that's when the pawnee helps by making an agreement to use the pledgor's land as collateral until redemption is made, and we should comply with that agreement.

In research conducted by researchers, one of the pawn recipients regarding the reasons why the pledge is still valid today, according to the pawn recipient's answer, which is the answer, all respondents who received the pledge gave the same answer, namely the value of the land object being pawned was the same as the selling value at that time. .

#### **6. How to Overcome Inhibiting Factors Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Based on Law No. 56 Prp 1960 About Determination Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy**

In the implementation of pawning in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy will be very difficult to implement because of the community's strong belief that customary law is more acceptable to society than state law. Most people pawn land for the reason that they do not know Law no. 56 of 1960 concerning Determining the Size of Agricultural Land. Many people still think that existing customary law is sufficient for this implementation.

For some people who understand the law, they think that the basic principle of customary law regarding land is that no land is owned by individuals, all land is owned by people, whereas in state law, especially in the basic Agrarian law, land is owned by individuals, the aim is good, namely so that land ownership for people guarantees their life and prosperity.

Implementation of Agricultural Land Pawning Based on Law No. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency In order for Dairy to be implemented as mandated by law, the socialization of this law in society must be further intensified. For pawn givers, they think that the government has not provided enough outreach regarding the existence of this law, so that givers Pawnbroker assumes that a written or oral agreement is sufficiently strong as long as it is accompanied by witnesses by both parties. Therefore, pawnbrokers expect intensive socialization by the government regarding the existence of this law.

Pawn recipients of agricultural land still think that apart from getting money from this land pawn transaction, they also think that this transaction brings benefits to the pawnbroker because they try to help the pawnbroker in solving their financial or economic problems. Pawn recipients do not fully know that Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determining the Size of Agricultural Land is at risk of losing their money if within 7 years the pledgor is unable to pay off, then the land that is pledged as collateral can return to the pledgor.

## CONCLUSION

Based on results research and discussion in chapter before , then can concluded as following :

1. Pawn land agriculture in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy Still considered as local wisdom society that has accomplished in a way hereditary in a way custom . So that form its implementation Still done in a way custom and considered as form attitude each other Help help when in circumstances pressed . Legal society custom in Sigalingging Village, District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy Already used to with pawn process land agriculture there , and considered the process more makes it easier than rule law national .
2. Apart from that, it 's lacking level education in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairy from school basic , advanced , until to college tall make public there No own sufficient education For understand A provision law. Process implementation pawn land agriculture in it is redemptive pawn Agricultural land still contains elements of extortion due to the implementation of mortgaging agricultural land for the people of Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi practices customary law as binding law.
3. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi goes through several stages including the division of territory, the contents of the agreement, the rights and obligations of the pawnee recipient.
4. Implementation of agricultural land pawning based on Law no. 56 Prp of 1960 concerning Determination of Agricultural Land Area in Sigalingging Village , District Parbuluan , Regency Dairi has obstacles in carrying out agricultural land pawning transactions. These obstacles come from the first, the party giving the pledge, the second, the party receiving the pledge, while the third is custom as the holder of agrarian law customs.

## Reference

- 1) B oedi Harsono , Indonesian Agrarian Law Association Land Law Regulations ( Cet.XIX ; Jakarta: Djatangan , 2008), p. 10.
- 2) David Muhammad Said, “ Overview Juridical Sawah/ Ta'gal Pawn System (Case Study in Rumpa Village, Polewali Mandar Regency)”, Thesis (Makassar: Faculty of Sharia and Law UIN Alauddin, 2015), p. 3.
- 3) Emzir , Methodology Study Qualitative For Data Analysis (Cet. IV; Jakarta: Rajawali Press 2014), p. 85.
- 4) *Haroen* , N. (2007). Fiqh Muamalah . Jakarta: Gaya Media Pratama Jakarta Publishers .
- 5) National Language Institute, Big Indonesian Dictionary (Cet. I; Publisher Difa 2016), p. 360.
- 6) Nasrun Haroen , Fiqh Muamalah , (Jakarta: Gaya Media Pratama , Cet. 2, 2007), p . 251.
- 7) Rahmat Syafi'i , Fiqh Muamalah , (Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia, Cet. 10, 2001) p . 160.
- 8) Ridwan, Community and State Ownership of Land According to Indonesian Land Law in Islamic Law Perspective (Cet. I; Jakarta: Research and Development Agency Ministry of Religion of the Republic of Indonesia 2010), p . 114.

- 9) Soerjono Soekanto , Indonesian Customary Law (Cet. XIIIV; Jakarta: Rajawali Press 2015 ), P. 192.
- 10) Sudaryo Soimin , Status of Rights and Land Acquisition (Cet. I; Jakarta: Sinar Graphic 1994), p. 1.
- 11) Surojo Wignjodipuro , Introduction and Principles of Customary Law, Jakarta: Gunung Agung, 1973.
- 12) Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Constitution Tree Agrarian .
- 13) Urip Santoso, Comprehensive Study of Agrarian Law (Cet. I; Jakarta: Kencana 2012), p. 142.
- 14) Peter Mahmud Marzuki, Legal Research Edition First , Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2010.
- 15) Peter Mahmud Marzuki, 2013, Legal Research ( Edition Revision ), Kencana , Jakarta.