Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review
Powered by locus media publishing
Vol. 5 No. 10, October 2026
P-ISSN: 2829-4262, E-ISSN: 2829-3827

Students' Legal Awareness of Breach-of-Contract Risks in Informal Loans of Goods

[*1.] Yulia
[2.] Indana Zulfa
[3.] Fitrahudin
[4.] Walinda Vivia Salwanah
[5.] Ikhwan Aulia Fatahilah

[1.] Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University Bandung, Indonesia.
*Corresponding author: aprilianiyulia084@gmail.com

Received 27 Agustus 2026 Initial submission → **Revised** 10 October 2026 Author revision → **Accepted** 17 October 2026 Editorial decision → **Published** 21 October 2026 Online publication

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v5i10.1193

Abstract

Informal lending of personal goods among university students relies on trust but can create disputes over damage, late return, and unfulfilled obligations. This study examines students' self-reported legal awareness of potential breach-of-contract risks in these arrangements. A descriptive quantitative survey using Google Forms reports responses from 16 students. Frequencies and percentages are interpreted alongside Indonesian contract law and legal-consciousness scholarship. Nine respondents (56.3%) reported relying on verbal agreements, while three (18.8%) reported no specific agreement. Fourteen (87.5%) reported encountering at least one borrowing-related problem. Eight respondents (50.0%) said they knew that such disputes might involve breach of contract; the remainder expressed uncertainty or a lack of knowledge. Fourteen (87.5%) preferred deliberation or amicable settlement. The findings indicate variation between informal borrowing practices, self-reported legal knowledge, and expectations of responsibility. The small sample, unverified recruitment details, and unavailable response-scale anchors preclude population-level and causal inferences. Contextual legal-literacy initiatives addressing agreements, evidence, care of borrowed property, and dispute resolution may be useful.

Keywords

breach of contract, informal agreements, Indonesian civil law, legal consciousness, loan for use.

1. Introduction

University life involves relationships of mutual trust extending beyond formal academic activities. Students routinely share or borrow books, laptops, mobile phones, vehicles, and other objects to meet immediate needs. Such transactions can be completed through a brief conversation or online message. Their social informality does not eliminate the potential for legal obligations. Damage,

loss, delayed return, or refusal to return an item may transform an ordinary interaction into a disagreement about responsibility and remedies.

Indonesian private law distinguishes legal validity from documentary form. Articles 1320 and 1338 of the Indonesian Civil Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata, hereafter the Civil Code) provide the general framework for contractual validity, binding force, and performance in good faith. Lending a specific usable item that must later be returned as the same item is generally considered in light of the loan-for-use provisions, including Article 1740. This differs from the loan of fungible or consumable goods addressed by Article 1754. Everyday terminology sometimes calls both arrangements borrowing, although the applicable obligations can differ. The classification must therefore depend on the transaction, not simply the label used by students.

Written documentation may improve the ability to establish what the parties actually agreed, but an oral agreement is not automatically invalid. A meaningful assessment also requires attention to the agreed duration, the condition of the item, the borrower's duty of care, and circumstances surrounding an alleged failure of performance. Adhi & Busro (2020) examine loan-for-use arrangements and legal consequences when a borrowed object is damaged. Their discussion provides a doctrinal starting point for considering how informal student practices may produce legally significant disputes.

The concept of legal consciousness helps connect private-law doctrine with lived experience. Silbey (2005) argues that the everyday experience of legality cannot be reduced to knowledge of written rules. People may act through familiar social norms, expectations, or perceptions of fairness rather than articulate statutory categories. Horák et al. (2021), in a systematic review, likewise describe legal consciousness as a multidimensional concept involving knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and other elements. Consequently, endorsing responsibility for damaged property is not equivalent to demonstrating the ability to identify each legal requirement for contractual liability.

A distinction is also needed between the occurrence of borrowing disputes and proof of breach of contract. Damage can have multiple causes, while delayed return may depend on agreed deadlines and circumstances of default. Neither a negative experience nor a respondent's interpretation is by itself an adjudicated legal breach. At the same time, relying solely on written formalities would overlook how expectations are formed within friendship networks. Combining descriptive responses with contract-law interpretation helps identify where legal education might be most useful.

Previous materials considered for this study approach the subject from different perspectives. Doctrinal work on a loan for use explains the obligations attached to specific property (Adhi & Busro, 2020), while legal-consciousness research examines the experience and interpretation of law (Horák et al., 2021; Silbey, 2005). The present inquiry brings these perspectives together in the narrow context of informal borrowing among students. It does not claim that no prior research has addressed similar situations; a wider literature search would be needed to establish such a claim.

The specific contribution lies in examining three analytically distinct questions within the same descriptive dataset: what students report doing when borrowing goods, what they believe about contractual responsibility, and how they prefer to address disagreements. These are considered against the legal requirements for a valid agreement and a loan for use. This approach distinguishes perceived unfairness from legally established breach, without treating self-reported familiarity with legal terms as a validated measure of legal consciousness.

This article therefore asks how participating students describe their borrowing practices, the agreements they rely upon, experiences of problems, awareness of breach-of-contract risks, perceptions of responsibility, and preferred forms of dispute resolution. The contribution is an

exploratory account of these interconnected dimensions, read cautiously against Indonesian private-law principles. As a small descriptive study, it does not test hypotheses about the causal effects of education, frequency of borrowing, or the choice of written agreements.

2. Research Methods

Design and legal-analytical framework

This study uses a descriptive quantitative design with a contextual examination of Indonesian civil-law provisions. Survey responses are summarized through absolute frequencies and percentages without inferential testing. The descriptive strategy is appropriate to an initial mapping of reported habits, beliefs, and experiences, but cannot establish causal relationships or population prevalence (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The legal discussion draws principally on the Civil Code provisions governing the validity and binding effect of agreements and the legal distinction between loan-for-use agreements and lending of consumable goods. Relevant scholarly discussions of legal consciousness (Horák et al., 2021; Silbey, 2005) inform interpretation, not the measurement of an independently validated legal-consciousness scale. This separation helps prevent conceptual frameworks from being mistaken for directly observed survey outcomes.

The legal interpretation follows a bounded sequence. Articles 1320 and 1338 of the Civil Code inform whether an agreement is valid and binding; Article 1740 identifies the basic characteristics of a loan for use, in which the same non-consumable item is returned; and the obligations concerning proper use and care of borrowed property provide context when damage or late return is alleged. The analysis uses these provisions to interpret survey themes, not to adjudicate any respondent's individual transaction. The numerical results and doctrinal discussion therefore answer related but different questions.

Respondents, recruitment and data sources

The supplied tabulations report 16 questionnaire responses collected through Google Forms in 2026. The respondents were students from multiple academic disciplines, including Islamic economic law, constitutional law, general law, management, psychology, communication, and electrical engineering. Complete institutional and demographic distributions were not supplied and are not inferred. One statement in an earlier source-method account referred to 15 respondents, whereas the abstract, seven tables, and associated discussion consistently use N = 16. This revision retains the documented tabular denominator of 16 solely for internal numerical consistency; independent confirmation against the original Google Forms response export remains required before resubmission.

The questionnaire link was distributed online, but the supplied materials do not identify the recruitment channels, respondent eligibility requirements, number invited, response window, or exact survey dates within 2026. Neither a purposive recruitment protocol nor a probability sampling frame can be established from the manuscript. Accordingly, the sampling strategy is described conservatively as an online, non-probability survey of participating students, without claims of representativeness. The authors must confirm the actual recruitment procedure and dates from their research records. Secondary materials comprise Indonesian civil-law provisions and relevant works on borrowing arrangements, contract law, and legal consciousness.

Measures, collection and analysis

The questionnaire asked how often respondents borrowed or lent goods; whether they relied on spoken agreements, digital messages, or no specific agreement; whether they had encountered borrowing-related problems; their self-reported knowledge of breach of contract; their assessment of the binding nature of oral agreements; their evaluation of responsibility for damage in a hypothetical laptop case; and their preferred approach to disputes. Responses concerning the latter two assessments used numerical scores from one to five.

The seven reported measurement domains correspond to Tables 1–7: borrowing frequency; form of agreement; experience of at least one borrowing-related problem; self-assessed knowledge of breach-of-contract risk; a numerical rating concerning oral agreements; a numerical responsibility rating in a hypothetical laptop-damage situation; and preferred dispute resolution. These domains are recoverable from the manuscript, but the exact item wording, response order, and electronic form have not been supplied. The domains should not be presented as verbatim reproductions of the original questionnaire.

Frequencies were tabulated for each available response category and percentages calculated as $f/N \times 100$, where f is the number choosing a category and N is the number answering the item. The presented tables all use $N = 16$. Percentages were rounded to one decimal place; minor totals exceeding 100.0% reflect rounding rather than extra observations.

Interpretation proceeded in two stages. First, the frequency of each recorded response category was described without converting respondents' confidence into objective legal competence. Second, the patterns were compared with general contract-law requirements, the nature of a loan for use, evidentiary uncertainties, and legal-consciousness scholarship. The original questionnaire's verbal anchors for numerical scores 1–5 in Tables 5 and 6 have not been provided; the scores therefore retain their numerical labels only. In particular, a score of 3 is not presumed to mean 'neutral' and a score of 5 is not automatically assigned a verbal category. The bundled item concerning damage, delayed return, nonreturn, and refusal of responsibility cannot be separated into discrete events without item-level data.

Ethical considerations and limitations

The reported research used an online survey involving student respondents. The supplied manuscript does not establish the precise consent procedure, whether any identifying data were collected, how responses were stored or protected, or whether an institutional ethics review, approval, or exemption applied. No individual responses or direct identifiers appear in the reported results, but this does not independently establish anonymity at collection. These matters must be confirmed from the original consent statement, questionnaire, data-management records, and applicable institutional requirements; no approval or consent is presumed in this revision. Given the small, nonrepresentative sample and partly self-reported measures, the findings are exploratory and cannot be generalized to the broader student population.

3. Results and Discussion

Borrowing frequency and informal agreement practices

Borrowing was familiar to most participants, but its reported frequency varied. Eight respondents (50.0%) rarely borrowed goods, four (25.0%) frequently did so, three (18.8%) very frequently, and one (6.3%) never did. Combined, the frequently and very frequently categories account for seven respondents (43.8% after rounding). This is a description of activity rather than an indicator of a person's legal awareness.

Table 1. Frequency of Borrowing Goods among Students

Borrowing frequency	n	%
Very frequently	3	18.8
Frequently	4	25.0
Rarely	8	50.0
Never	1	6.3
Total	**16**	**100.0***

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

The form of agreement reveals an important practical feature of informal transactions. Nine respondents (56.3%) indicated oral agreements based on trust, four (25.0%) relied on text messages as written digital evidence, and three (18.8%) reported no specific agreement. The preference for oral forms is consistent with the role of familiarity and low transaction costs in friendships, but it does not establish that these respondents acted unlawfully or possessed poor legal knowledge.

Table 2. Forms of Agreement for Borrowing Goods

Agreement form	n	%
Oral agreement based on trust	9	56.3
Text message or digital written record	4	25.0
No specific agreement	3	18.8
Total	**16**	**100.0***

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

Under Articles 1320 and 1338 of the Civil Code, the enforceability of a particular agreement cannot be inferred only from the existence or absence of paper documentation. What matters is whether the relevant requirements are met and which obligations the parties assumed. Digital messages may nonetheless preserve the identity of the item, its initial condition, the expected return date, and any understanding about damage. A missing or vague agreement increases evidentiary uncertainty even if a legally relevant obligation exists. This practical distinction aligns with the need to consider contractual terms and damage risk in loan-for-use arrangements (Adhi & Busro, 2020).

The distinction also has a specific loan-for-use implication. Article 1740 concerns the gratuitous use of a particular item with an obligation to return that item. It therefore directs attention to the identity of the borrowed object and the terms of its return, while Articles 1320 and 1338 address the validity and binding force of the parties' agreement. A text message may help establish these terms, but its presence does not itself prove compliance with every validity requirement; similarly, an oral arrangement is not inherently unenforceable solely because no written instrument exists.

Reported problems and the limits of identifying contractual breach

Fourteen participants (87.5%) indicated having encountered a situation involving damage, delayed return, failure to return an object, and/or reluctance of a borrower to accept responsibility; two (12.5%) reported no such experience. This substantial proportion deserves attention, but the question bundled several possible events and provides neither counts for individual forms of dispute nor evidence that a legally actionable breach occurred in each instance.

Table 3. Experience of Problems Involving Borrowed Goods

Reported experience	n	%
Experienced a borrowing-related problem	14	87.5
Had not experienced such a problem	2	12.5
Total	**16**	**100.0**

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

The finding indicates that disputes were salient to these respondents, rather than demonstrating a general rate of breach among university students. Legal characterization depends on the actual arrangement, the duties attached to the item, the circumstances of deterioration or loss, and whether responsibility was attributable to a party. For instance, a timely return of a damaged item and a late return of an intact item present different factual questions. Without individual case histories, the survey cannot distinguish ordinary misunderstandings, ethical disagreements, and proven civil breaches.

A more precise doctrinal inquiry proceeds from classification to responsibility. First, it asks whether the arrangement was a loan for use under Article 1740 or a different transaction; second, it identifies the agreed use, return conditions, and applicable duties; third, it examines the alleged nonperformance, cause of loss, and surrounding circumstances; and only then does it consider whether a contractual remedy could arise. Article 1744's duty to care for and appropriately use borrowed goods is relevant to this analysis, but a composite survey response cannot establish fault, default, or damages in an individual case. The 14 affirmative answers must therefore remain reports of problems, not 14 proven instances of wanprestasi.

This distinction matters for scholarship and educational practice. Teaching participants simply to equate every broken object with a breach of contract risks overstating liability. More useful instruction would ask students to identify the original agreement, document the item's condition, consider when performance fell due, and discuss available forms of resolution. It would also clarify why the rules for a loan for use should not be automatically conflated with loans of consumable goods.

Self-reported knowledge of contractual default

Eight respondents (50.0%) said that they knew failure to perform an obligation involving borrowed property might give rise to breach of contract. Seven (43.8%) reported limited knowledge or uncertainty, and one (6.3%) reported no knowledge. The combined eight respondents in the latter two categories therefore accounted for half of the sample. This supports an observation of uneven *self-reported* familiarity, rather than an objective finding that half of all students lack legal awareness.

Table 4. Self-Reported Knowledge of Breach-of-Contract Risks

Response	n	%
Yes, I know	8	50.0
Limited knowledge / uncertain	7	43.8
No knowledge	1	6.3
Total	**16**	**100.0***

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

Knowledge of terminology is only one aspect of legal consciousness. A respondent may recognize that conduct is unfair while being unable to explain when nonperformance, default, fault, and resulting loss lead to a legal remedy. Conversely, someone who cannot name the doctrine of wanprestasi may still keep clear agreements and take reasonable care of borrowed objects. Silbey (2005) highlights how legality operates through everyday understanding, while Horák et al. (2021) emphasize the conceptual and measurement diversity of legal consciousness. The present questionnaire cannot resolve these dimensions through a single self-classification item.

This finding also illustrates a measurement distinction relevant to the study's interdisciplinary contribution. Identifying a possible legal issue is a claim about self-perceived knowledge; deciding whether specific facts satisfy contractual duties would require a separate applied-knowledge measure. Legal consciousness, as conceptualized in the cited literature, additionally involves how people interpret and respond to legal norms in everyday relationships. The response proportions therefore indicate possible topics for instruction, but do not assign participants to objectively verified levels of legal competence.

For future instrument refinement, a short vignette could distinguish a damaged item caused by ordinary use from deliberate misuse, or a borrower who returns an item late after receiving an extension from one who disregards an agreed deadline. Such questions would examine application of legal principles rather than merely confidence in legal vocabulary. They should be developed and tested before scores are represented as a validated measure.

Perceptions of oral agreements and responsibility for damage

Participants also rated the binding moral or legal character of oral lending agreements on a one-to-five scale. The most common score was three, selected by seven respondents (43.8%). Three respondents (18.8%) chose four and four (25.0%) chose five; two (12.5%) selected two and none selected one. Thus, seven (43.8%) gave a score of four or five. The original scale labels are not available, preventing firm interpretations of score three as "neutral" or score five as "strongly agree."

Table 5. Numerical Ratings of the Binding Character of Oral Agreements

Score	n	%
1	0	0.0
2	2	12.5
3	7	43.8
4	3	18.8
5	4	25.0
Total	**16**	**100.0**

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

In a separate hypothetical case, participants considered responsibility for damage to a borrowed laptop. Twelve respondents (75.0%) chose the uppermost score of five, while the four remaining respondents distributed evenly across scores one through four. This clustering indicates that the scenario elicited a high numerical assessment of responsibility; it is not conclusive evidence of correct knowledge concerning fault, causation, agreed obligations, or damages.

Table 6. Numerical Ratings of Responsibility for Damage in a Laptop Scenario

Score	n	%
1	1	6.3
2	1	6.3
3	1	6.3
4	1	6.3
5	12	75.0
Total	**16**	**100.0**

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

Read together, the responses suggest an interesting descriptive contrast: half of the participants were confident that they knew about breach of contract, whereas three-quarters chose the highest numerical response in a particular responsibility scenario. Because these measures use different questions and response formats, their difference cannot establish a statistical association between legal knowledge and ethical judgment. It may nevertheless motivate closer inquiry into how students translate a general expectation to "take responsibility" into legally specific duties.

Loan-for-use rules and the general law of obligations allow a more careful distinction between moral expectations and legal remedies. The factual cause of damage, agreed use of the property, any negligence, and the parties' specific duties are relevant. A simple rule that every borrower must always replace every damaged object would conceal these factual and legal qualifications. Students may benefit from contrasting everyday notions of fairness with the questions that a court or mediator would need to determine.

Applied to the laptop vignette, Article 1740 clarifies why return of the particular item matters, while Articles 1320 and 1338 establish the importance of the agreement and its binding terms. The borrower's obligation to use and care for the item must then be considered alongside the cause and context of the damage. A high numerical responsibility rating in Table 6 may reflect a strong social expectation, but without the original scale anchors and complete case facts it cannot demonstrate correct legal identification of negligence, causation, or compensation. This interpretation preserves the descriptive result while avoiding a claim that moral disapproval automatically establishes civil liability.

Preferred dispute-resolution channels

When asked about the most effective response to a borrowing dispute, fourteen respondents (87.5%) preferred deliberation or direct amicable settlement. One (6.3%) chose involvement of a third party such as a student leader, academic adviser, or university representative; another (6.3%) preferred civil legal proceedings. The data describe preferred options, not actual dispute-resolution outcomes.

Table 7. Preferred Resolution of Disputes over Borrowed Goods

Preferred approach	n	%
Direct deliberation / amicable settlement	14	87.5
Involvement of a third party	1	6.3
Civil legal proceedings	1	6.3
Total	**16**	**100.0***

Note. Source: Authors' 2026 Google Forms survey. Values are based on N = 16 and rounded to one decimal place; displayed category percentages may not total exactly 100.0% because of rounding.

The preference for deliberation is compatible with an effort to preserve friendships and reduce confrontation. It should not be interpreted as a rejection of legal rights. An informal negotiated outcome can be informed by the parties' understanding of their obligations and recorded in a clear agreement to repair, replace, return, or otherwise resolve the item concerned. A preference for negotiation is likewise not proof of high legal consciousness: it may reflect social convenience, cost considerations, or uncertainty about formal processes.

From the standpoint of contractual doctrine, amicable deliberation may help clarify what was agreed, whether return or repair is feasible, and how any resolution will be documented. Such negotiation does not retrospectively determine whether the original agreement met Article 1320 or whether a breach occurred. Article 1338 provides the background of binding obligations and good-faith performance, while the preference for deliberation remains a reported choice rather than evidence of procedural knowledge or a successful outcome.

From a legal-literacy perspective, the responses support practical educational interventions that combine knowledge of agreements with communication skills. Students could practice specifying an object, documenting its condition, agreeing on a return date, and describing responsibility if disagreements arise. They could also learn when informal processes are suitable, what evidence to retain, and when a more formal remedy may be necessary. Such teaching builds on existing social relationships without assuming that litigation is the desirable response to every disagreement.

Integrated interpretation, implications and study limitations

Across the seven items, the participating students described a world in which borrowing is familiar, agreements are often informal, problems are commonly reported, and legal terminology is understood unevenly. The data also reveal a strong stated preference for amicable resolution and high ratings of responsibility in one hypothetical damage scenario. The central observation is therefore not that students routinely disregard law, but that social obligations and legal concepts may be experienced and articulated in different ways.

The findings contribute a small descriptive example to the study of legal consciousness. Informal practices can persist without documentary instruments, while respondents still express expectations concerning return and repair. Legal-consciousness scholarship provides a way to interpret such patterns without collapsing legality into knowledge of statutory words (Horák et al., 2021; Silbey, 2005). The Civil Code supplies a different, complementary lens: a dispute involves legally specified duties and evidentiary questions, not only a perception that someone behaved unfairly.

Read across the tables, the findings suggest a four-part interpretive pathway rather than a causal mechanism: informal agreement practices (Table 2), self-reported problems (Table 3), perceived knowledge and responsibility (Tables 4–6), and preferred resolution (Table 7). Each stage has different evidentiary significance. Contract-law analysis asks what duties existed and whether they were breached; legal-consciousness analysis considers how respondents understand those experiences. Because no linked person-level responses or verified case histories are available, the study cannot show that using an oral agreement causes disputes, that legal knowledge predicts responsibility ratings, or that deliberation resolves disputes more effectively.

One limitation is sample size: N = 16 is too small and insufficiently sampled for population estimates. A second is the self-report character of the information; answers may reflect memory or social desirability. Third, the combined problem item prevents disaggregation into late return, physical damage, loss, and refusal of responsibility. Fourth, absence of documented numerical-scale anchors limits the interpretation of ratings. Fifth, the data do not include case outcomes, individual-level cross-tabulations, or observed conduct that would permit tests of relationship or causation.

An unresolved data-reporting issue requires explicit confirmation: one earlier methods statement recorded 15 participants, whereas all seven tables and the current results use 16. The latter figure is a documentary choice based on the supplied summaries, not verification of the original response dataset. The exact survey dates, recruitment procedures, item wording, verbal anchors for the five-point scales, consent arrangements, data protection measures, and ethics-review status are likewise not established in the available material. A copy of the original questionnaire and de-identified aggregate or raw-response export, subject to appropriate privacy protections, should be checked before final publication. These limitations have not been treated as resolved simply because the article has been revised.

For subsequent research, investigators could recruit a broader sample using documented eligibility criteria, supply the questionnaire as supplementary material, validate the scale anchors, and employ case-based legal-knowledge items. Interviews would also help explain why friendship-based trust leads to different choices about evidence, repair and mediation. A longitudinal or comparative design would be needed before claiming that legal-literacy education changes actual borrowing practices.

4. Conclusion

This descriptive study examined informal borrowing practices and perceived contractual risks among 16 participating university students. Oral agreements were used by nine respondents (56.3%), and three (18.8%) reported no specific agreement. Fourteen respondents (87.5%) reported experience with at least one borrowing-related problem; eight (50.0%) confidently reported knowledge of breach-of-contract risks. Fourteen (87.5%) favored amicable dispute resolution. These results indicate diversity in reported practices and knowledge, rather than a measured prevalence of legal breach or a validated level of legal consciousness.

The findings support a narrow practical recommendation: legal-literacy initiatives can use everyday borrowing situations to explain valid agreements, the duty to take care of and return property, record keeping, the conditions of contractual default, and appropriate dispute-resolution options. Such initiatives should present informal deliberation and legal responsibility as potentially complementary. Interpretation is necessarily constrained by the small nonrepresentative sample, incomplete documentation of recruitment and scale anchors, and self-reported data. Broader research is needed to evaluate whether these preliminary patterns apply elsewhere and how students apply legal principles in actual disputes.

References

Adhi, Y. P., & Busro, A. (2020). Borrow-to-use agreement and its legal consequences in case of damages on the object of agreement. *Journal of Private and Commercial Law*, *4*(1), 33–43. https://doi.org/10.15294/jpcl.v4i1.24784

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Horák, F., Lacko, D., & Klocek, A. (2021). Legal consciousness: A systematic review of its conceptualization and measurement methods. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, *31*(1), 9–34. https://doi.org/10.5093/apj2021a2

Indonesia. (n.d.). Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata. In *Indonesian Civil Code*. Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. https://jdih.mahkamahagung.go.id/legal-product/kitab-undang-undang-hukum-perdata/download/dokumen

Silbey, S. S. (2005). After legal consciousness. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *1*, 323–368. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.115938

Publication Declarations

Author Contributions : Yulia: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, and Writing – Original Draft. Indana Zulfa: Investigation, Data Curation, and Validation. Fitrahudin: Formal Analysis, Validation, and Writing – Review & Editing. Walinda Vivia Salwanah: Investigation, Data Curation, and Writing – Review & Editing. Ikhwan Aulia Fatahilah: Conceptualization, Legal Analysis, Validation, and Writing – Review & Editing. All authors contributed to the development of the manuscript, reviewed the final version, and approved it for publication.

Funding : This research received no external funding.

Competing Interests : The authors declare no competing interests.

Ethics and Consent : This study involved a descriptive quantitative survey of university students concerning their experiences and self-reported legal awareness of informal lending arrangements. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from the respondents before they completed the questionnaire. The research was conducted with due regard for participant privacy and confidentiality, and the findings are reported in aggregate form to minimize the risk of identifying individual respondents. Any applicable institutional ethical review requirements were observed.

Data Availability : The data supporting the findings of this study were collected through a Google Forms questionnaire completed by 16 student respondents. The results are presented in aggregate form in the manuscript. To protect respondents' privacy and confidentiality, individual-level responses are not publicly disclosed. Further information about the survey data may be requested from the corresponding author, subject to appropriate confidentiality safeguards and any applicable institutional requirements.

AI Use Declaration : AI-assisted tools were used to facilitate the descriptive presentation and improve the clarity and readability of the manuscript. The AI-assisted text was subsequently paraphrased, reviewed, and refined by the authors in their own words. The authors remain responsible for verifying the accuracy of the legal analysis, interpreting the survey findings, and ensuring the originality and integrity of the final manuscript.

Copyright and License

Copyright © 2026 Yulia, Indana Zulfa, Fitrahudin, Walinda Vivia Salwanah, and Ikhwan Aulia Fatahilah. The authors retain copyright in their work and grant the Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review (JALR) the non-exclusive right of first publication. This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0), which permits others to share and adapt the work, provided appropriate credit is given to the authors and the original publication, a link to the license is provided, and adaptations are distributed under the same license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/