



Indonesian Journal of Entrepreneurship Learning and Innovation

Vol. 1, No. 1, February 2026, pp. 57-71

<https://ppjp.ulm.ac.id/journals/index.php/ijeln/issue/view/xxx>

ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Print) | XXXX-XXXX (Online)



Adaptive Educational Orientation in the Digital Era: A Comparative Study Based on Parental Occupation in Karang Indah Village, Barito Kuala

^{1*}Muhammad Abdillah, ²Sharfina Puteri Amima

^{1,2}Bachelor's Program in Economics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

Article Info

Keywords:

Parental Occupation
Educational Orientation
Family Education
Resilience
Digital Parenting

ABSTRACT

Technological change, artificial intelligence, and shifts in family interaction require parents to prepare children to become more independent, adaptive, resilient, and capable of lifelong learning. This study aims to compare Future Educational Orientation for Children (OPADD) based on parental occupation in Karang Indah Village, Barito Kuala Regency. OPADD is positioned as a researcher-developed operational construct that describes family educational orientation through four dimensions: an adaptive mindset toward change, independence or self-driving, resilience, and agility. The study employed a quantitative non-experimental approach with a cross-sectional comparative design. The sample consisted of 140 respondents selected purposively. Data were collected using a closed-ended Likert-scale questionnaire and analysed with descriptive statistics, Levene's test for homogeneity of variance, and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using IBM SPSS Statistics. The overall OPADD score had a mean of 78.57 and a standard deviation of 21.757. Levene's test yielded $p = 0.068$, while ANOVA produced $F(7,132) = 0.824$ with $p = 0.569$. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. In this sample, no statistically significant difference in mean OPADD scores was found across parental occupational groups. This result does not mean that occupation is entirely unrelated to educational orientation. Instead, occupational category alone was insufficient to differentiate family educational orientation. The findings should be interpreted cautiously because group sizes were unequal, one occupational code remained unidentified, sampling was non-probabilistic, and the source document did not include normality-test output. Future research should examine parental education, income, digital literacy, parenting style, learning support, and access to information as additional explanatory variables.

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA 4.0](#)



*Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Abdillah

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat
Jl. Brig Jend. Hasan Basri, Pangeran, Kec. Banjarmasin Utara, Kota Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Selatan 70123, Indonesia
Email: 2310113310010@mh.s.ulm.ac.id

Submitted 4 Feb 2022; Accepted 06 March 2023; Published 30 April 2023

Journal homepage: <https://ppjp.ulm.ac.id/journals/index.php/ijeln/index>
<https://doi.org/>

Copyright © Authors, 2026, ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Print) | XXXX-XXXX (Online)

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital technological change has expanded children's learning spaces from schools and families to various digital platforms. This change has not only altered learning tools, but also the ways children obtain information, build habits, communicate, and make decisions. In this situation, the family remains the first environment that guides technology use and shapes children's attitudes toward change. Studies in Indonesia show that digital parenting should not be understood merely as limiting screen time. Parents also need to engage in active mediation, select content, provide explanations, serve as role models, and establish consistent rules. Asmawulan et al. (2026) found that active mediation, content selection, consistent communication of rules, and parental involvement were associated with the regulation of children's screen use. Mukhtar et al. (2025) also showed that active guidance is important when children begin interacting with artificial-intelligence-based technology, while limited parental AI literacy can hinder reflective guidance.

These findings strengthen the position of parents as mediators rather than merely supervisors. The adaptation of an internet parental mediation instrument in Indonesia by Ulfa et al. (2025) emphasizes that mediation practices need to consider cultural context because the ways parents engage with children's internet use cannot always be equated with those in other countries. Dewi et al. (2024) further demonstrated the importance of parents' digital literacy in shaping internet use among children and adolescents. Widyandari and Maharani (2021) also found that, for most respondents, mothers' involvement in guiding young children's gadget use remained at a moderate level. These findings indicate that family readiness for the digital era depends on the quality of guidance, literacy, and parent-child interaction.

Digital transformation also creates new challenges for family education. Technology can broaden learning opportunities, but unguided use may reduce the quality of direct interaction, increase dependence on devices, or make children accustomed to obtaining instant solutions. Rahmawati and Latifah (2020) showed that gadget use and the quality of mother-child interaction were associated with preschool children's socio-emotional development. Cahyati et al. (2024) found an association between parents' digital media habits and the amount of time preschool children spent using digital media. Therefore, family educational orientation in the digital era needs to address not only academic achievement, but also independence, risk management, resilience, and adaptability.

In this article, Future Educational Orientation for Children (OPADD) is positioned as an operational construct developed by the researcher. The term is not treated as a universally established standardized scale. OPADD is used to summarize parents' perspectives and actions in preparing children to face social, educational, occupational, and technological change. The construct was developed by synthesizing ideas related to self-driving, resilience, agility, digital literacy, and adaptive parenting. This position is important so that the article does not claim that OPADD is a construct that has already been widely validated in previous literature.

The first dimension is an adaptive mindset toward change. Parents with an adaptive orientation are expected not only to direct children toward grades or diplomas, but also to help them understand change, seek information, assess risks, and make use of new learning opportunities. Hudiana (2023) describes digital parenting as a strategic

family response to social change and globalization. In a more practical context, Asmawulan et al. (2026) showed that stable rules are more meaningful when accompanied by warm communication and explanation. This is relevant to future education because children need to understand the reasons behind decisions rather than merely comply with them.

The second dimension is independence or self-driving. This concept describes an individual's ability to take responsibility for choices and the direction of action. Melani et al. (2023), in their review of driver and passenger mentalities, identify willingness to assume responsibility, risk, and decision-making as characteristics of a driver mentality. In the family context, this idea can be translated into parental support that allows children to practise making choices, solving problems, learning from consequences, and reducing excessive dependence on adult assistance.

The third dimension is resilience. Resilience is important because educational and occupational pathways do not always proceed as planned. Children need the ability to recover from failure, manage pressure, and seek help appropriately. Jayanti and Kawuryan (2025) showed that overly indulgent parenting and teaching approaches can weaken students' mathematical resilience. Pramudita et al. (2025) also positioned adolescent resilience as an outcome associated with relational and psychological factors, including parental attachment. In digital environments, Hendriani et al. (2024) identified fathers' roles as guides, controllers and supervisors, supporters, and mediators in strengthening children's digital resilience. Muslim and Ramkita (2022) further noted that interactive communication, a comfortable family atmosphere, appropriate facilitation, and democratic parenting can support online resilience.

The fourth dimension is agility or learning agility. In this study, agility is understood as children's readiness to learn new things, adjust strategies when conditions change, and solve problems flexibly. This dimension is not measured simply as technological ability. The focus is on learning habits and adaptation developed through parenting. Susnita and Putro (2026) showed that digital parenting needs to integrate technological literacy with cultural values and family relationships. Kahar et al. (2026) also found that digital parenting was positively associated with children's socio-emotional development, although it explained only part of the variation in outcomes. This finding reminds us that future educational orientation should be understood as the result of interactions among multiple factors rather than a single factor.

The term strawberry generation is often used to describe a generation that is creative and has broad access to information, yet is perceived as more easily pressured when facing failure or demands. The term needs to be used cautiously so that it does not become a label that oversimplifies the psychological conditions of young people. In this study, strawberry generation is not treated as a psychological diagnosis. The term is used as a popular framework to emphasize the importance of developing resilience, responsibility, and the ability to deal with difficulties.

More relevant empirical evidence comes from studies of resilience and parenting. Jayanti and Kawuryan (2025) showed that so-called strawberry parenting and teaching can reduce mathematical resilience. Pramudita et al. (2025) found that adolescent resilience is associated with relationship quality and psychological beliefs. Thus, the main concern of this study is not to label children, but to examine family educational practices that allow children to face challenges gradually. Parents can

provide emotional support without removing all consequences of children's choices. This approach is consistent with communicative and adaptive digital mediation, as reported by Hendriani et al. (2024), Asmawulan et al. (2026), and Ren et al. (2026).

Theoretically, parental occupation may be related to daily experiences, social networks, income, parenting time, and exposure to educational information. However, occupation is not identical to the entire socioeconomic condition of a family. Two parents with the same occupation may differ in education level, income, digital literacy, parenting style, and educational aspirations. Therefore, occupational category should be treated as one indicator of family background rather than as the sole determinant of educational orientation.

Several studies in Indonesia show that family characteristics can be associated with educational outcomes. Marceylla and Subroto (2021) found that socioeconomic status and parental education were significantly associated with the GPA of Economics Education students. Afina and Soesatyo (2019) also found a positive association between parental socioeconomic status and students' interest in pursuing master's-level study. However, both studies examined broader socioeconomic status rather than occupation alone. Therefore, their findings cannot be used to conclude that occupational category will necessarily differentiate children's educational orientation.

In rural contexts, family support may be more important than occupational labels. Indrawati and Alfiasari (2016) showed the importance of informational support and attachment in children's academic achievement in rural areas. Nurdini and Hernawati (2023) also demonstrated that parental expectations and academic self-efficacy play roles in the academic motivation of rural senior high school students. These findings are relevant to Karang Indah Village because educational orientation may be shaped by support, communication, and expectations within the family regardless of differences in everyday occupations.

Digital access can broaden the sources of family socialization. Andini and Yuliati (2024) showed that socialization by parents, teachers, and social media can jointly shape the behaviour of school-age children. In a rural context outside Indonesia, Ren et al. (2026) found that communicative and intensive parental mediation patterns were more effective in supporting children's digital resilience than mediation focused only on rules or technical monitoring. Dockery et al. (2022) showed that parental expectations regarding children's participation in higher education tend to be stable and are associated with parents' perceptions of children's academic achievement. These two international studies strengthen the proposition that family educational orientation is shaped by interactions among expectations, communication, children's experiences, and information access, not solely by occupation.

Indonesian literature has extensively discussed socioeconomic status, parental education, digital parenting, family support, resilience, and academic motivation. However, studies specifically comparing future educational orientation across parental occupational categories in rural communities in South Kalimantan remain limited. This study addresses that gap by testing whether OPADD scores differ statistically among parental occupational groups in Karang Indah Village, Barito Kuala. A comparative focus was selected so that the conclusions match the analytical capability of one-way ANOVA. Accordingly, this article does not use causal-effect terminology when explaining the ANOVA results.

The objectives of the study are to: (1) describe respondent characteristics based on occupation; (2) describe OPADD scores; and (3) test differences in mean OPADD scores among parental occupational groups. The statistical hypotheses are H0: there is no difference in mean OPADD scores among parental occupational groups; and H1: at least one occupational group has a different mean OPADD score.

2. METHOD

Research Approach and Design

The study used a quantitative non-experimental approach with a cross-sectional comparative design. This design was selected because occupational data and OPADD scores were collected during one observation period, after which mean OPADD scores were compared among occupational groups. No experimental treatment or variable manipulation was applied. Therefore, the findings are interpreted as differences or the absence of differences among groups, not as evidence of cause-and-effect relationships.

Conceptual material concerning future education, driver and passenger mentalities, and the importance of resilience was used as part of the foundation for developing the research idea and indicators. This revised article strengthens that foundation with accessible journal literature, particularly on digital parenting, resilience, parental support, educational expectations, and rural contexts. The additional literature is intended to clarify the theoretical position of the OPADD construct rather than replace the primary data that had already been collected.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The target population consisted of parents or guardians with school-age children who resided in Karang Indah Village, Barito Kuala Regency, South Kalimantan. The research sample comprised 140 respondents. Sampling used a non-probability approach with purposive sampling. The criteria stated in the source document included parents or guardians who actively cared for children, lived in Karang Indah Village, and were willing to complete the questionnaire. Because this sampling technique did not give every member of the population an equal chance of selection, generalization of the findings should be limited to the context of the sample studied.

Respondents were grouped according to their main occupation. The data included the categories Farmer/Livestock Breeder, Entrepreneur/Trader, Labourer, Employee/Civil Servant, Homemaker, Student, Other, and one response coded as "9" without an occupational label. The unidentified code was retained because the source SPSS output included it in the analysis. However, this condition represents a data-quality issue that should be cleaned and reanalysed before the manuscript is submitted to a journal.

Research Variables and Instrument

The grouping variable was parental occupation. The variable being compared was the OPADD score. OPADD was operationalized through four dimensions: an adaptive mindset toward change, independence or self-driving, resilience, and agility. The questionnaire used closed-ended Likert-scale statements to capture parents' perceptions and behavioural tendencies in directing their children's education. Total scores recorded in the research data ranged from 13 to 91.

- 1) Adaptive mindset toward change measures parents' readiness to introduce technological change, flexible thinking, and the use of new learning opportunities to children.
- 2) Independence or self-driving measures parental support for children's ability to make responsible decisions, complete tasks, and develop internal motivation.
- 3) Resilience measures how parents help children face failure, pressure, consequences, and recovery processes without excessive protective parenting.
- 4) Agility measures parental support for children's ability to learn new things, adjust strategies, adapt to their environment, and solve problems flexibly.

The source document states that the instrument underwent expert assessment for content validity and internal reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha before use. However, the validity and reliability coefficient values were not reported in the document provided. Because these figures are unavailable, this revised article does not add values that cannot be verified. In the final version for publication, the researcher should report the number of items, response scale, item-level validity or content validity results, and Cronbach's Alpha value so that instrument quality can be evaluated transparently.

Data Collection Procedure

The research procedure consisted of establishing the focus and indicators, developing the questionnaire, collecting field data, coding respondent characteristics, calculating OPADD scores, and conducting statistical analysis. Primary data were obtained from 140 respondents through the questionnaire. The data were then entered into IBM SPSS Statistics to obtain frequency distributions, descriptive statistics, a homogeneity test, and ANOVA. Journal literature was used in developing the theoretical framework and interpreting the findings.

Data Analysis Techniques

Descriptive analysis was used to present occupational frequencies and OPADD score characteristics, including the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, variance, minimum, maximum, and range. Inferential analysis used one-way ANOVA to compare mean OPADD scores across more than two independent occupational groups. The decision criterion used a significance level of 0.05. If $p < 0.05$, H_0 was rejected. If $p \geq 0.05$, H_0 was not rejected. The phrase " H_0 was not rejected" is used because a non-significant p-value does not prove that H_0 is absolutely true.

Before ANOVA, the source document provided Levene's test output to assess homogeneity of variance. The p-value based on the mean was 0.068, indicating insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that group variances differed at the 0.05 level. However, the source output did not include residual-normality tests or normality tests within each group. In addition, group sizes were highly unequal and several groups contained very few respondents. Therefore, the ANOVA assumptions were not fully documented and the inferential results should be interpreted cautiously.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics by Parental Occupation

The study involved 140 respondents. The largest group was Farmers/Livestock Breeders with 47 respondents (33.6%), followed by Homemakers with 43 (30.7%),

Entrepreneurs/Traders with 22 (15.7%), Other with 12 (8.6%), Employees/Civil Servants with 7 (5.0%), Labourers with 5 (3.6%), and Students with 3 (2.1%). One response (0.7%) was coded as "9" and remained unidentified. This distribution shows unequal group sizes. This imbalance is important because groups with very small *n* values produce less stable estimates of means and standard deviations than larger groups.

Table 1

JENIS PEKERJAAN ORANG TUA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	PETANI/PETERNAK	47	33,6	33,6	33,6
	WIRASWASTA/PEDAGANG	22	15,7	15,7	49,3
	BURUH	5	3,6	3,6	52,9
	KARYAWAN/ASN	7	5,0	5,0	57,9
	IBU RUMAH TANGGA	43	30,7	30,7	88,6
	PELAJAR/MAHASISWA	3	2,1	2,1	90,7
	LAINNYA	12	8,6	8,6	99,3
	9	1	,7	,7	100,0
	Total	140	100,0	100,0	

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Parental Occupation

Note. The original SPSS output shows one category coded as "9" with one respondent. Based on the available document, the code cannot yet be interpreted as a specific occupation.

Description of Future Educational Orientation for Children Scores

OPADD scores from 140 respondents had a mean of 78.57 with a standard error of 1.839. The median was 89 and the mode was 91. The standard deviation was 21.757 with a variance of 473.355. The minimum score was 13 and the maximum was 91, giving a range of 78. The total score was 11,000. The relatively large difference between the mean and median, together with the high standard deviation, indicates a broad spread of scores. However, without distributional output, a histogram, or a normality test, the direction or degree of skewness cannot be determined from summary statistics alone.

At the group level, Students had the highest mean score of 87.33 (SD = 6.351; *n* = 3), followed by Entrepreneurs/Traders at 82.91 (SD = 17.824; *n* = 22), and Farmers/Livestock Breeders at 81.11 (SD = 19.175; *n* = 47). Labourers had a mean of 76.80 (SD = 29.541; *n* = 5), Homemakers 76.63 (SD = 22.437; *n* = 43), the Other category 74.25 (SD = 25.730; *n* = 12), and Employees/Civil Servants 64.43 (SD = 35.260; *n* = 7). Descriptive differences in means should not be interpreted directly as population differences because group sizes are unequal and statistical significance must be determined through inferential testing.

Table 2

Descriptives

OREINTASI PENDIDIKAN ANAK DIMASA DEPAN ALL

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
PETANI/PETERNAK	47	81,11	19,175	2,797	75,48	86,74	13	91
WIRASWASTA/PEDAGANG	22	82,91	17,824	3,800	75,01	90,81	13	91
BURUH	5	76,80	29,541	13,211	40,12	113,48	24	91
KARYAWAN/ASN	7	64,43	35,260	13,327	31,82	97,04	13	91
IBU RUMAH TANGGA	43	76,63	22,437	3,422	69,72	83,53	13	91
PELAJAR/MAHASISWA	3	87,33	6,351	3,667	71,56	103,11	80	91
LAINNYA	12	74,25	25,730	7,428	57,90	90,60	21	91
9	1	81,00	.	.	.	.	81	81
Total	140	78,57	21,757	1,839	74,94	82,21	13	91

Descriptive Statistics of OPADD Scores by Parental Occupational Group

Homogeneity of Variance Test

Levene's test based on the mean produced a Levene Statistic of 2.017 with $p = 0.068$. Because $p > 0.05$, there was insufficient evidence to reject the assumption of homogeneity of variance at the 5% level. The indicator based on the median produced $p = 0.535$, while the trimmed-mean indicator produced $p = 0.096$. Thus, based on the available output, homogeneity of variance can be considered adequate for proceeding with ANOVA. Nevertheless, this result should still be considered together with the unequal group sizes and the presence of a category containing only one respondent.

Table 3

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
OREINTASI PENDIDIKAN ANAK DIMASA DEPAN ALL	Based on Mean	2,017	6	132	,068
	Based on Median	,848	6	132	,535
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,848	6	110,729	,535
	Based on trimmed mean	1,840	6	132	,096

Results of the Homogeneity of Variance Test Using Levene's Test

Note. The Levene table in the source output shows $df1 = 6$, whereas the ANOVA table shows between-groups $df = 7$. This difference may be related to the presence of a category containing only one respondent. The revised article does not alter the statistical output because the raw data were not available for recalculation.

Hypothesis Testing Using One-Way ANOVA

The ANOVA results show a between-groups Sum of Squares of 2,754.522 with $df = 7$ and a Mean Square of 393.503. The within-groups Sum of Squares was 63,041.764 with $df = 132$ and a Mean Square of 477.589. The F value was 0.824 with $p = 0.569$. Because p was greater than 0.05, H_0 was not rejected. This means that the

study data did not provide sufficient statistical evidence to conclude that mean OPADD scores differed by parental occupation.

This conclusion differs from the statement that "there is no effect at all." ANOVA in this design only tests whether mean scores differ significantly among groups. It does not prove perfect equivalence among occupations, does not measure a causal relationship, and does not rule out the possibility that other variables such as education, income, digital literacy, or parenting style explain a greater proportion of score variation.

Table 4

ANOVA

OREINTASI PENDIDIKAN ANAK DIMASA DEPAN ALL

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2754,522	7	393,503	,824	,569
Within Groups	63041,764	132	477,589		
Total	65796,286	139			

Summary of One-Way ANOVA Output

Discussion**No Significant Difference Across Occupational Groups**

The main finding shows that parental occupation did not significantly differentiate OPADD scores in the Karang Indah Village sample. Descriptively, mean differences existed among groups, but within-group variation was also substantial. Employees/Civil Servants, for example, had a lower mean than several other groups, but their standard deviation was very high. The Student group had the highest mean, but it contained only three respondents. These conditions help explain why visible mean differences were insufficient to provide evidence of a statistically consistent difference.

This finding is important because it demonstrates the limitation of using occupation as a single proxy for family conditions. Occupation may be related to income, social networks, time, and experience, but it does not capture all forms of family educational capital. Marceylla and Subroto (2021) found that socioeconomic status and parental education were associated with students' GPA. Afina and Soesatyo (2019) found that socioeconomic status was associated with interest in pursuing master's-level study. Both studies used a broader construct of socioeconomic status. Therefore, the non-significant occupational variable in this study does not directly contradict those findings. Instead, the difference suggests that occupational category alone may be too coarse to represent family resources.

In rural communities, family support and educational expectations can operate across occupational categories. Indrawati and Alfiasari (2016) showed that informational support and family relationships are important for children's academic achievement in rural areas. Nurdini and Hernawati (2023) showed that parental expectations and academic self-efficacy contribute to the academic motivation of rural senior high school students. These findings support the explanation that parents with

different occupations may have relatively similar educational expectations and learning support when they possess comparable commitment and access to information.

The Role of Digital Parenting as a Theoretical Explanation, Not a Tested Variable

The initial manuscript linked the absence of occupational differences to the democratization of digital information. This explanation is theoretically plausible, but it cannot be confirmed by the research data because internet access, digital literacy, media-use intensity, and digital parenting patterns were not measured directly. Therefore, the revised article positions digital access as a possible explanation rather than as an empirically proven cause.

The literature supports this possibility. Dewi et al. (2024) demonstrated the importance of parental digital literacy in children's internet use. Mukhtar et al. (2025) showed that parents' AI literacy affects the quality of guidance in relation to smart technology. Asmawulan et al. (2026) showed that active mediation and consistently communicated rules are associated with the regulation of screen use. Cahyati et al. (2024) also reported an association between parents' digital media habits and children's digital-media time. Conceptually, wider access to information can expose parents from different occupations to similar parenting resources. However, this assumption can only be tested if variables related to digital access and literacy are incorporated into the research model.

Hudiana (2023) views digital parenting as a response to social change. Susnita and Putro (2026) showed that digital parenting practices continue to interact with local cultural values. These two studies emphasize that digitalization does not automatically standardize family practices. Parents may access the same technology but interpret and apply it differently according to education, values, experience, and social environment. Therefore, the term "value convergence" should be used cautiously. The study data only show that no significant mean difference was found, not that all parents share identical parenting values.

Self-Driving, Resilience, and Agility as Directions for Family Education

OPADD positions independence, resilience, and agility as important directions for family education. The concept of self-driving is relevant because future education requires children to manage decisions and responsibilities. Melani et al. (2023) distinguish a driver mentality, which is prepared to assume responsibility and risk, from a more passive passenger mentality. In family practice, parents can give children opportunities to make choices, solve problems, manage time, and evaluate mistakes. This practice does not mean leaving children without guidance. Parents still provide age-appropriate boundaries, feedback, and support.

Resilience is also an important component. Jayanti and Kawuryan (2025) showed that overly indulgent parenting and teaching can weaken students' ability to face mathematical challenges. Pramudita et al. (2025) identified parental attachment and psychological factors as important components in understanding adolescent resilience. Thus, resilience is not developed through excessive pressure, but through supportive relationships that also allow children to face difficulties gradually.

In digital environments, the family's role becomes increasingly complex. Hendriani et al. (2024) found that fathers can act as guides, supervisors, supporters, and

mediators in strengthening children's digital resilience. Muslim and Ramkita (2022) also emphasized interactive communication, democratic parenting, appropriate facilitation, and a comfortable family atmosphere in developing online resilience. Among rural children in China, Ren et al. (2026) showed that communicative and intensive mediation patterns supported digital resilience more effectively than predominantly technical monitoring. These findings reinforce the argument that relationship quality and mediation are more substantive than parental occupational labels.

Agility in OPADD can be understood as the ability to adjust learning approaches when circumstances change. Kahar et al. (2026) showed that digital parenting had a positive relationship with socio-emotional development, but the model explained only 17.9% of outcome variation. This finding is important for avoiding single-factor explanations. Children's agility is likely influenced by many factors, including learning experiences, school support, temperament, peers, access to technology, and family communication patterns. Therefore, future studies need to measure the agility dimension with better-tested indicators and distinguish it from digital literacy and resilience.

Educational Expectations and Family Socialization

Future educational orientation is also related to parental expectations. Dockery et al. (2022) found that parents' expectations regarding children's participation in higher education were relatively stable and associated with perceptions of children's academic achievement. In the Indonesian context, Nurdini and Hernawati (2023) demonstrated the importance of parental expectations for the academic motivation of rural students. These findings indicate that a family's educational vision arises not only from economic status or occupation, but also from parents' assessments of children's potential and the educational experiences they observe in everyday life.

Socialization within the family also occurs alongside schools and media. Andini and Yuliati (2024) showed that school-age children's behaviour can be influenced by socialization from parents, teachers, and social media. In the digital era, information about education, study options, skills, and occupations is available through many channels. Therefore, farming families, traders, homemakers, labourers, and civil servants may all be exposed to similar educational discourse. However, the extent to which this information is used still needs to be measured rather than assumed to be uniform.

Methodological Implications of a Non-Significant Result

A non-significant result still has scientific value when interpreted proportionately. First, $p = 0.569$ indicates that the data do not provide sufficient evidence to claim a difference in mean OPADD scores by occupation at the 5% significance level. Second, the result is not evidence of absolute equivalence among groups. Third, post hoc testing is not required to search for different group pairs when the omnibus ANOVA is non-significant, unless an a priori contrast had been specified before the analysis.

Fourth, the strength of the conclusion is influenced by the sample composition. The Farmer/Livestock Breeder and Homemaker groups were very large, whereas the Student and Labourer groups were very small. One occupational code even contained only one respondent. This imbalance makes estimates for small groups unstable and can

reduce statistical power to detect differences. Fifth, the source document does not present normality tests or residual diagnostics. Although Levene's test was non-significant, the ANOVA assumptions were not fully documented.

Sixth, purposive sampling limits generalizability. The findings are more appropriately stated as a description of the 140 respondents who participated in Karang Indah Village than as a conclusion about all parents in Barito Kuala. Seventh, OPADD is a researcher-developed operational construct. The quality of future conclusions would improve if the instrument were examined through documented content validity, exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis, reliability testing for each dimension, and measurement invariance testing if it is to be used across different occupational groups.

Practical Implications for Family Education

In practical terms, the findings suggest that family education programs in the village should not be differentiated solely by occupation. Parent-strengthening materials can focus on competencies more directly related to children's education, such as communicating educational expectations, providing learning support, digital literacy, technology mediation, strengthening resilience, and giving children age-appropriate opportunities to assume responsibility. Programs may involve schools, village government, community groups, and parents from different occupational backgrounds.

A cross-occupational approach is also more consistent with the finding that mean OPADD differences were not significant. Parent groups can learn together how to establish consistent digital boundaries, select content, guide children in using AI responsibly, and develop balanced learning routines. Asmawulan et al. (2026), Mukhtar et al. (2025), and Ulfa et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of active mediation, literacy, and cultural-context compatibility. These principles are relevant for designing parenting programs that are not limited to prohibiting technology use.

3. CONCLUSION

Based on the one-way ANOVA, no significant difference in mean Future Educational Orientation for Children (OPADD) scores was found across parental occupational groups among the 140 respondents in Karang Indah Village, Barito Kuala, $F(7,132) = 0.824$, $p = 0.569$. Thus, H_0 was not rejected. This result indicates that occupational category, when considered alone, was insufficient to differentiate family educational orientation in the study sample. The finding cannot be interpreted as meaning that occupation is entirely irrelevant or that all parents have identical orientations.

Future research should clean and simplify occupational categories before analysis, increase sample sizes in small groups, use probability sampling where possible, and document assumption testing comprehensively. Subsequent analytical models should include parental education level, family income, digital literacy, parenting style, learning support, educational expectations, and intensity of information access. If the OPADD instrument is to be used more broadly, researchers should test its factor structure and the reliability of each dimension. Multivariate regression or Structural Equation Modeling may be used after instrument quality, sample size, and analytical assumptions have been adequately established.

REFERENCES

- Afina, N. A., & Soesatyo, Y. (2019). Pengaruh status sosial ekonomi orang tua dan prestasi akademik terhadap minat melanjutkan studi S2 mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi angkatan 2014 Unesa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUPE)*, 7(1), 26–30. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jupe.v7n1.p26-30>
- Andini, P. F., & Yulianti, L. N. (2024). The role of socialization in forming sustainable consumption behavior in school-age children: Peran sosialisasi dalam pembentukan perilaku konsumsi berkelanjutan pada anak usia sekolah. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 17(2), 146–157. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2024.17.2.146>
- Asmawulan, T., Katoningsih, S., Kunca Az Zahra, I., Wafa, K., & Pramudita, D. A. (2026). Adaptive dialogic digital parenting and screen time regulation in Indonesian early childhood families: An explanatory sequential mixed methods study. *Golden Age: Jurnal Ilmiah Tumbuh Kembang Anak Usia Dini*, 11(2), 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jga.2026.112-11>
- Cahyati, W. H., Fauzi, L., Rahayu, T., & Chia, M. Y. H. (2024). Parental digital media habits correlated with time spent on digital media among preschool children. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(1), 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i1.1768>
- Dewi, I. P., Darmawan, D., & Dalimunthe, H. H. B. (2024). Analysis of parents' digital literacy abilities and its influence on internet use in early childhood and adolescents. *JIV-Jurnal Ilmiah Visi*, 19(2), 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JIV.1902.6>
- Dockery, A. M., Koshy, P., & Li, I. W. (2022). Parental expectations of children's higher education participation in Australia. *British Educational Research Journal*, 48(4), 617–639. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3786>
- Hendriani, W., Tedjadipura, A. A., Khaerunnisa, S. M., Wulandari, P. Y., & Cahyono, R. (2024). Peran ayah dalam pengasuhan yang memperkuat resiliensi digital anak. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 17(2), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2024.17.2.132>
- Hudiana, I. D. A. C. U. (2023). Pola pengasuhan digital parenting dalam masyarakat globalisasi: Perspektif teori perubahan sosial. *Harmony: Jurnal Pembelajaran IPS dan PKN*, 8(2), 131–135. <https://doi.org/10.15294/harmony.v8i2.70729>
- Indrawati, A. R., & Alfiasari. (2016). Dukungan informasional orang tua: Penentu keberhasilan prestasi akademik anak di perdesaan. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 9(3), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2016.9.3.159>
- Jayanti, T., & Kawuryan, S. P. (2025). Strawberry generation: When strawberry parenting and teaching weaken students' mathematical resilience. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 15(1), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v15i1.pp139-148>
- Kahar, M. I., Wahyuningsih, N. E., & Anggraeni, D. (2026). Digital parenting and socio-emotional development in early childhood: Evidence from Palu City, Indonesia. *Golden Age: Jurnal Ilmiah Tumbuh Kembang Anak Usia Dini*, 11(1), 99–110. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jga.2026.111-07>
- Marceylla, D. V., & Subroto, W. T. (2021). Pengaruh status sosial ekonomi dan tingkat pendidikan orang tua terhadap IPK mahasiswa Pendidikan Ekonomi Unesa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUPE)*, 9(1), 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jupe.v9n1.p36-42>

- Melani, N., Hanifah, S., Manekawati, A. D., Aprilianti, D., Noviyana, D. A., & Nurhayati, P. (2023). Self driving: Dikotomi peran antara mentalitas driver versus passenger. *Literaksi: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 1(1), 255–260. <https://doi.org/10.70508/literaksi.v1i01.343>
- Mukhtar, Z., Selvi, I. D., Mukhtar, N., & Jasandra, A. (2025). Digital parenting in the era of artificial intelligence: The role of parents in guiding early childhood interaction with smart technology. *JOYCED: Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 5(2), 260–270. <https://doi.org/10.14421/joyced.2025.52-08>
- Muslim, M., & Ramkita, M. (2022). Digital parenting dalam membangun online resilience anak pada era transformasi digital di Kota Palembang. *NUSANTARA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, 9(10), 3788–3799. <https://doi.org/10.31604/jips.v9i10.2022.3788-3799>
- Nurdini, G. A., & Hernawati, N. (2023). Harapan orang tua, efikasi diri akademik, dan dampaknya terhadap motivasi akademik siswa SMA. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 16(3), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2023.16.3.213>
- Pramudita, A., Latifah, M., & Riany, Y. E. (2025). Strawberry generation: The role of parental attachment, friendship quality, and mental health self-efficacy on adolescent self-resilience. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 24(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.24.2.151-164>
- Rahmawati, M., & Latifah, M. (2020). Penggunaan gawai, interaksi ibu-anak, dan perkembangan sosial-emosional anak prasekolah. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 13(1), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2020.13.1.75>
- Ren, W., Zhu, X., & Huang, R. (2026). Parental mediation patterns and children's digital resilience in rural China: A latent profile analysis. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 35(2), e70062. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.70062>
- Susnita, Y. I., & Putro, K. Z. (2026). Mediasi budaya dalam pengasuhan digital: Integrasi nilai-nilai Islam dan kearifan lokal Madura untuk membangun resiliensi anak usia dini. *Kiddo: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini*, 7(1), 128–142. <https://doi.org/10.19105/kiddo.v7i1.23984>
- Ulfa, A., Kendhawati, L., & Moeliono, M. F. (2025). Adapting internet parental mediation survey: A pilot study. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 18(3), 275–286. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2025.18.3.275>
- Widyandari, D., & Maharani, E. A. (2021). Gawai pada anak usia dini: Peran ibu dalam pendampingan anak era disrupsi 4.0. *Golden Age: Jurnal Ilmiah Tumbuh Kembang Anak Usia Dini*, 6(2), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jga.2021.62-02>