Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education
E-ISSN: 3123-9897
https://journals-arendra.or.id/rumahjurnal/index.php/QR-ECE
Page 284-303
Vol. 1 No. 4

Parenting in Early Childhood in Jambi Indonesia Through a Qualitative Analysis of Survey Documentation

Andriani
Master's Program in Early Childhood Education, Universitas Panca Sakti Bekasi, Bekasi, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Submitted:
July 16, 2026
Revised:
July 17, 2026
Accepted:
July 18, 2026

Keywords
caregiving practices
parental education
socioeconomic status
questionnaire design
family–school partnerships

Scan Me:

ABSTRACT

Surveys of parenting in early childhood often link parental education and socioeconomic circumstances to composite scores whose meaning depends on how the underlying practices are measured. This study examined how a 2024 survey report from Limbur Lubuk Mengkuang, Jambi, Indonesia, defined, measured, and interpreted those relationships. A qualitative document analysis traced the report's definitions, questionnaire materials, score appendices, and results through descriptive coding and comparison, with a regression reconstruction based on 171 coded records used to check consistency. Four themes concerned educational credentials as a proxy for caregiving knowledge, the combination of economic circumstances and educational aspirations, the aggregation of contrasting practices into a parenting score, and mismatches between instrument versions and statistical reporting. The reconstructed model reproduced the reported combined-model coefficients but yielded a different coefficient of determination and a different significance level for parental education. The findings support using specific examples of caregiving and direct questions about access when early childhood educators design family support or discuss routines with caregivers.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY license.

Corresponding author: Andriani, Universitas Panca Sakti Bekasi
Email: andriani24bungo@gmail.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i4.181

1. INTRODUCTION

Parenting during early childhood involves decisions about how to respond to distress, set limits, share activities, and organize care around the demands of work and household life. Early childhood development research situates these decisions within inequalities in the resources families can use and the services they can access (Attanasio et al., 2022). Studies of the home learning environment similarly show that relationships between socioeconomic measures and early learning vary with how home activities and preschool attendance are measured (Chan & Rao, 2024; Nag et al., 2024). In a survey, much of that variation becomes visible only through the concepts and questions chosen by the investigator. Examining those choices can clarify whether a study has documented access to resources, expectations of caregivers, or actual interactions with young children.

This distinction matters in Limbur Lubuk Mengkuang, a district in Jambi Province where a 2024 study examined education, socioeconomic status, and parenting among parents of young children (Andriani, 2024). The original survey brought together 171 responses and described considerable variation in formal education and questionnaire scores. Its narrative used these results to characterize some parents as more responsive and others as more restrictive. Whether such an interpretation follows depends on what the questionnaires asked, how responses were combined, and whether the reported tables can be reconciled. The report provides material for studying how a local investigation turned a complex set of caregiving relations into variables and then interpreted the results.

One difficulty is that credentials can indicate access to formal schooling while leaving everyday caregiving knowledge largely unrecorded. A caregiver may learn from relatives, previous experience, a teacher, or community services, and each source may be more relevant to a decision than years of schooling. Qualitative research on home learning under resource constraints documents caregiver initiative, while studies of culturally diverse families show that parents and educators may understand their partnership responsibilities differently (Gaspar et al., 2025; Hoiting & Halpern-Meekin, 2026). These insights make it important to examine what an education item makes visible and what knowledge remains outside the instrument. They also invite a closer look at whether aspirations for a child's schooling are being treated as evidence about the adult's education or about household resources.

A second difficulty concerns how parenting practices become a single outcome. A parent's explanation of a safety rule, punitive reaction to a mistake, and decision to refrain from punishment are different actions with potentially different meanings. Cross-cultural scholarship shows why behavioral expectations and warmth have to be interpreted together and in relation to the context in which children encounter them (Cheung et al., 2025; Lansford, 2022). In the Indonesian literature, Maisyaroh (2026) describes regulation as developing through responsive relationships, while Ni'matussilva (2026) examines parents' accounts of warmth and consistency in relation to young children's mental health. A composite score can be useful when its scoring logic is explicit, but the interpretive question is whether readers can trace that score back to the kinds of interactions it was designed to represent.

The study asked three questions about the report. First, how did the report define and operationalize parental education, socioeconomic circumstances, and parenting? Second, how did it

move from questionnaire categories and aggregate results to descriptions of parenting in families? Third, what do the documented alignments and discrepancies imply for research and collaboration with families in early childhood education? The unit of analysis was the report and its constituent materials, so the contribution is an account of the evidence behind the report's interpretations and a basis for designing follow-up research with caregivers.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Early Childhood Education Context

Households and early childhood education settings support learning through the arrangement of everyday activities. A longitudinal study in Tanzania links home conditions, family socioeconomic circumstances, and early literacy and numeracy across the transition to primary school (Ndijuye & Benguye, 2023). Research on preschool interventions also distinguishes what families have available from what adults and children do with those resources (Cahoon et al., 2024). That distinction matters in Jambi because the report foregrounds adults' credentials and economic position while offering much less detail about joint activity. A question about which learning opportunities caregivers can offer therefore requires attention to materials, time, relationships, and the occasions on which adults and children interact.

Local classroom studies illustrate what becomes observable when research follows particular activities. Hasanah and Yuntina (2026) examines vocabulary work with flashcards and describes how teacher–child interaction accompanied the use of visual materials. Ery and Badar (2026) documents English-language learning through songs, games, stories, and classroom conversation in one preschool. Rarawati (2026) examines multisensory activities in relation to readiness, while Ismah (2026) studies how Indonesian early childhood settings embed habits in routines and teacher modeling. These studies help identify concrete aspects of learning environments for a family study to examine, including who guides an activity, which materials children can use, and how adults respond when engagement changes.

Early childhood institutions also shape the kinds of support families can draw on. A daycare study examines how recurring expectations and relationships enter children's emerging self-identity (Musoheh, 2026). Research in Manggarai reports how teachers understood and enacted a growth mindset in settings with resource constraints, while research on problem-solving examines the guidance educators provide during learning activities (Sum & Delima, 2026; Utami et al., 2026). These studies extend the field of inquiry beyond home resources to include the institutional relationships children experience. In a study of Jambi families, this perspective makes contact with teachers, access to settings, and agreement or disagreement about daily routines relevant contextual questions.

Caregiving settings become especially consequential when a child needs additional support. The case study by Ratniawati (2026) compares a four-year-old's communication in educational and clinical contexts, and Isnaini (2026) examines how educators in a playgroup respond to delayed communication. A separate kindergarten case illustrates how a child's concentration and mobility were studied within everyday activities (Jelina, 2026). Their observational and interview materials make it possible to ask where a particular behavior appears and which responses help the child participate. These case studies provide a methodological reference point for the Jambi analysis, because the uploaded questionnaire and aggregate tables document a different level of evidence.

2.2 Review of International Qualitative Studies

Qualitative studies of families with limited income reveal constraints that broad socioeconomic categories can conceal. Research on food insecurity describes how caregivers negotiate children's eating in conditions of uncertainty, while work on preschool meals examines how the allocation of food provision between families and institutions changes the context of mealtime (Hevesi et al., 2024; Searle et al., 2023). In practice, the conditions that shape a meal can include the schedule of adults' work, the availability of ingredients, and whether a service provides food. The accounts of meal routines invite attention to which choices are possible on an ordinary day, as well as how caregivers respond when plans change. These studies suggest that a report can record concern about meeting needs while leaving the timing, severity, and practical consequences of hardship undocumented.

Qualitative work also reveals how the same activity can carry different meanings for families and professionals. Studies of parent–teacher communication in Sweden and collaborative guidance in Indonesian preschools examine the expectations caregivers and educators bring to their relationships (Hendriawan et al., 2026; Yngvesson, 2026). Accounts from families with low income during disruptions to kindergarten learning bring institutional demands and home conditions into the same analysis (Turnbull et al., 2025). A qualitative evaluation of a responsive-feeding program similarly shows the value of eliciting caregivers' accounts around a specific practice and the materials designed to support it (Baxter et al., 2026). These designs can recover reasons, dilemmas, and points of agreement that a closed response category leaves unstated.

Young children's media use provides another example of the distinction between a practice and its circumstances. Qualitative studies in Indonesia have considered parental decisions about digital content, teacher accounts of mobile phone use, and the relationship between daycare routines and independence (Saharudin & Putri, 2026; Shofa, 2026; Soniati, 2026). Reviews also distinguish screen context, parent involvement, and the kinds of activity that media can displace (Mallawaarachchi et al., 2024; Rahmadani et al., 2026). A survey item about permission, prohibition, or frequency would capture one part of the arrangement. Understanding why a caregiver makes a decision would require additional detail about the child's activity, the adult's availability, and what other options were open at the time.

Indonesian research on children's emotional and physical well-being further clarifies what evidence a study of parenting can use. A phenomenological study examines how parents perceive well-being-oriented education after trauma, while a review of street-connected children separates direct evidence from broader literature on regulation and adversity (Ferawati, 2026; Ibrohim et al., 2026). Research on nutrition includes a study of teachers' experiences with meal provision and a review of how nutrition programs can be developed in early childhood education (Isnaini et al., 2026; Liyana, 2026). These articles inform the interpretation of institutional support and caregiving context in the present study. Their specific populations and purposes also set limits on comparison, especially where the Jambi report provides no equivalent accounts of adversity, service access, or nutrition.

The studies reviewed here also differ in whose observations are available. A teacher's account can explain what a preschool expects from a family or what a child does in a group, while a caregiver's account can explain arrangements that teachers rarely see. A documentary source can show how both perspectives are represented, provided the record identifies which perspective supplies a particular

claim. In the Jambi report, much of the account of parenting appears in the instrument and the researchers' explanation of scores, so the provenance of statements matters as much as the substantive category assigned to them. This difference informed the choice to investigate how parenting was represented in the document and to use qualitative studies of families as comparisons for what could be learned through additional research.

2.3 Conceptual or Theoretical Framework

The analysis used three related concepts to interpret the source materials. Formal educational attainment denotes a credential, whereas practical caregiving knowledge includes what adults learn and use in everyday decisions. Socioeconomic circumstances include material resources, time, work conditions, and the support available to a household. Parenting practices are situated actions, and a parenting style is a broader interpretation of patterns across such actions (Lansford, 2022; Lansford, 2024; Yeshua & Berger, 2026). The concepts guided comparisons across the report's definitions, item wording, and conclusions so that an observation about one level could be kept distinct from an inference about another.

Research on family stress and investment supplies possible pathways through which resources can affect children's experiences. Studies have examined links between economic conditions, parenting, attention, and behavioral regulation, including distinct roles for hardship, household conditions, and cognitive stimulation (Liu et al., 2024; Meng et al., 2024). Research with Chinese preschoolers similarly tests models in which parenting or children's regulation can help explain relationships between socioeconomic measures and developmental outcomes (Lin et al., 2024; Xia, 2025). These studies help identify the kinds of processes a follow-up study might examine. The Jambi document analysis treats those pathways as interpretive possibilities because its source materials do not track sequences of events or measure the proposed processes separately.

A relational approach also distinguishes guidance from the immediate behavior a child displays. Warm explanations, stable boundaries, a chance to respond, and help with settling distress can matter even when the child takes time to comply. Research on parenting and self-regulation examines links between parenting styles and regulatory skills, while work on parental effortful control considers the adult processes that may enter everyday interactions (Blume et al., 2025; Yeshua & Berger, 2026). For the document analysis, the central question was how the instrument identifies adult actions and what information readers need to infer an overall style. This framing avoids treating a single item about correction, accommodation, or discussion as sufficient evidence about the relationship.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study used qualitative document analysis of the 2024 report on parental education, socioeconomic status, and parenting in Limbur Lubuk Mengkuang (Andriani, 2024). The report was selected purposively from the materials available because it addressed the three constructs in a defined district and contained the evidence needed to follow how each construct was interpreted. It included the investigators' definitions, questionnaire blueprints and displayed forms, coded score tables, and the statistical and narrative results. The presence of those materials in one document allowed

comparison of measurement decisions and reported claims within the same investigation (Morgan, 2022). The unit of analysis was the report as a bounded case, and the units were passages, items, and table entries. The source survey supplied the research record for the analysis, which asks how caregiving was represented and what evidence supported the interpretations.

3.2 Participants and Research Context

The parent survey took place between March and July 2024 in Limbur Lubuk Mengkuang, Jambi Province, and reported 171 respondents drawn from a stated population of 600 parents (Andriani, 2024). The report framed its inquiry around parents of children aged two to six and included separate education frequency tables for mothers and fathers. Those details establish the context of the source and do not resolve the identity of each questionnaire respondent or the distribution of caregiving responsibilities in individual households. The present study selected the report as a document relevant to the research questions and recruited no additional participants. Interpretation is therefore bounded by the district, period, instruments, and level of aggregation documented in the source.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

The corpus included the portions of the report that defined the constructs, documented the instrument, displayed the scores or statistical results, or interpreted those results. Background passages were included when they specified the local context or explained why the investigators expected a relationship between the constructs. For each piece of evidence, the analysis recorded its location and its role as a definition, questionnaire prompt, score entry, statistical output, or interpretive claim. Comparable entries were then brought together, such as the education categories in the displayed form and the frequencies listed in Chapter IV. Published journal articles informed the analytical approach and contextualized the discussion, while the Jambi report supplied the evidence for the four themes.

3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

After an initial reading of the full report, descriptive codes were assigned to passages, items, and table entries. Codes stayed close to the evidence, distinguishing, for example, an educational credential from an educational aspiration, and listening to a child from choosing to withhold punishment. A second pass grouped the codes by their role in the report's reasoning. Credential and assumed caregiving knowledge formed the first group, while aspiration and material provision formed the second. Codes about guidance, punishment, and score direction formed the third group, and version differences and incompatible statistical entries formed the fourth. Theme statements were refined by checking whether they captured a pattern across different parts of the document and by retaining examples that limited the interpretation (Byrne, 2022; Nicmanis, 2024). Table 1 traces selected codes to their documentary evidence and final theme.

The numerical check began by transcribing the three coded appendices and matching the education, socioeconomic, and parenting rows by their response IDs. Each appendix contained 171 unique IDs, and every ID matched across the three appendices. The education predictor was the sum of the mother's and father's education codes, the socioeconomic predictor was the sum of 12 displayed item scores, and the parenting outcome was the sum of 18 displayed item scores. All row sums matched the totals printed in the appendices, and the reconstruction used those totals as entered. Ordinary least squares with an intercept was used for the combined model and for the education-only

and socioeconomic-only comparisons. Conventional two-sided p values were calculated from t = B / SE with 168 residual degrees of freedom in the combined model and 169 in each single-predictor model. The calculations served as an internal check on the documentary evidence from the original survey.

The analysis evaluated each claim at the level supported by its source. An instrument item establishes the wording and category assigned to a proposed action, while an appended score establishes the number recorded for that item. The two sources together can help explain how a total was constructed, but they provide limited evidence about the intentions or interactions of a caregiver. When the narrative gave a score a broader meaning, the comparison traced that interpretation back to the item wording and checked for a documented scoring or classification rule. The analysis retained incompatible entries as evidence of reporting discrepancies and used qualitative reporting guidance to make the provenance and limitations of these observations explicit (Braun & Clarke, 2024a; Braun & Clarke, 2024b; Braun & Clarke, 2025).

Table 1

From Descriptive Codes to Themes

Selected codes	Documentary evidence	Resulting theme
Credential, schooling route, assumed knowledge	Education form and Chapter IV Tables 4.2–4.3 record formal qualifications. The background and discussion associate qualifications with caregiving knowledge.	4.1 Educational attainment as a proxy for caregiving knowledge
Educational aspiration, material provision, household priority	The socioeconomic blueprint and form include hopes for the child's education, an item on food affordability, and an item on providing for children's wants.	4.2 Economic circumstances and educational aspiration in one measure
Listening, punitive correction, permissive response, score direction	The parenting blueprint assigns different orientations to these practices. The score appendix and Table 4.5 report an overall total or category.	4.3 Diverse parenting practices condensed into a composite score
Duplicated wording, item count, incompatible significance	Parenting form items 12 and 18 repeat a prompt. Chapter IV item counts and regression summaries differ from the appended records or reconstructed output.	4.4 Discrepancies between instrument materials and statistical interpretation

Note. The examples are drawn from the 2024 research report. Section numbers point to the corresponding findings.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

The analysis used the supplied research report and relied on the coded rows only to check the displayed scores and model output. The people who contributed to the survey were not contacted, and response identifiers and individual score rows are omitted from this manuscript. Statements about caregiving in the findings are attributed to the report or its instrument. The available documentation did not establish an ethics clearance number or the terms of consent for the original survey. Any follow-up study using new interviews or identifiable records would require an appropriate ethics and access process.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Educational Attainment as a Proxy for Caregiving Knowledge

The report treats education as both a formal credential and a possible source of knowledge about raising children. The credential appears in Chapter IV as the highest level of formal schooling recorded separately for mothers and fathers. The most frequent categories were general senior secondary school for mothers, with 55 of 171 entries, and vocational senior secondary school for fathers, with 47 of 171 entries. Combining the three upper secondary routes yields 111 entries for mothers and 112 for fathers, while diploma and bachelor's categories together account for 16 and 35 entries respectively. The tables describe the distribution of formal attainment, but they contain no cross-tabulation showing how the score or its constituent practices varied within those categories.

In the report's introductory and interpretive passages, education takes on a broader meaning. It is associated with knowledge, understanding of child development, and capacity to encourage independence. Elsewhere, the report recognizes experience and nonformal learning as sources of caregiving knowledge, but its attainment item does not document those sources. The appendices also contain a generic highest-education question whose listed options differ from the disaggregated routes visible in the results tables. The education appendix gives a summed code for each response, and using it reproduces the combined model coefficients. The sum treats adjacent credential codes as equal increments, although the codes distinguish general, vocational, and religious schooling routes.

The tables therefore establish variation in credentials across the survey sample. The summed education code adds a particular measurement assumption because the two caregivers contribute equally to the total and each step between categories is treated as numerically equivalent. For example, a one-code step can separate two upper secondary pathways, even though the paths differ by type of schooling. Households with different combinations of credentials can also have the same total. The score can reproduce the model input, but the document does not establish that a higher total measures greater knowledge of child development or more responsive caregiving.

4.2 Economic Circumstances and Educational Aspiration in One Measure

The report's conceptual material describes socioeconomic status using several possible dimensions, including work, income, assets, and housing. Its socioeconomic item blueprint, however, presents questions about whether the adult's education motivates higher aspirations for the child as well as questions about household income and provision. One prompt concerns income sufficient only for daily food, whereas another concerns providing for wants that go beyond school needs. These examples place a material constraint, an adult aspiration, and a reported willingness to provide within a common measurement area. The resulting interpretation depends on the score key and the instrument version used in the survey.

The descriptive results place 57 responses in the very high socioeconomic score category, 44 in high, 26 in low, and 44 in very low. These are the report's score categories, and the available text supplies no verified link to household income thresholds, recognized poverty categories, or direct measures of material deprivation. The results narrative describes four questions with four response alternatives, while the published cut points in the table extend to a very high category beginning at 48.

The score appendix resolves part of the discrepancy by showing that the totals sum 12 items scored from one to four. All 57 responses in the highest category scored the maximum of 48.

The overlap between the educational aspiration prompts and the separately modeled education predictor is also consequential. The education item concerns completed schooling, whereas aspiration items concern what adults hope their children will attain and how they describe their own motivation. The report's discussion makes it possible to see why both topics were considered relevant to parenting, but the measurement structure leaves their roles ambiguous. An association involving the socioeconomic score could reflect multiple domains that the report discusses together, including work, community participation, and household priorities. The score can be reproduced as a sum, but its interpretation as material advantage would require evidence about how those domains relate to actual resources.

A further ambiguity concerns the difference between having enough for necessities and choosing which wishes to meet. The questionnaire materials place a statement about difficulty meeting children's needs alongside a statement about granting wants outside school needs. One is framed in terms of available income, while the other could register an adult's spending priorities, a belief about desirable parenting, or the capacity to buy an item. The score appendix provides response combinations, but neither those scores nor the wording distinguish the meanings that households attached to them. This matters for interpreting the socioeconomic score because a claim about material hardship requires evidence about the resources and constraints themselves, even when those constraints appear alongside information about what families value.

4.3 Diverse Parenting Practices Condensed Into a Composite Score

The parenting blueprint distinguishes authoritarian, democratic or authoritative, and permissive orientations. Items in the first group refer to demands, punitive correction, and limited discussion. The second group includes listening to the child, exchanging ideas, praising behavior, supporting interests, and restricting an activity considered unsafe. The third group includes granting wishes, avoiding confrontation, and refraining from punishment. These distinctions provide material for identifying the range of caregiving practices the study intended to capture, but they also create a need to specify how items with different meanings contributed to the reported outcome.

Listening to a child's explanation illustrates the importance of context and scoring direction. The instrument frames listening as part of democratic parenting and presents the frequency of the action as a selectable response. Refraining from punishment is placed under permissiveness even though the item leaves open whether the adult set a limit, explained a consequence, repaired harm with the child, or took no further action. Both choices could appear together in a single interaction, and their joint meaning depends on what else happened. The report supplies wording for the separate actions but no respondent-level examples linking them in episodes of family life.

The parenting table reports 24 responses in the very high category, 97 in high, 10 in low, and 40 in very low. The category counts can be reproduced when a total of 36 is included in the lowest group, although the printed interval reads below 36 and leaves that score unassigned. The 18 displayed item scores sum directly to each parenting total, and the report supplies no rule for converting those totals into classifications of authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive parenting. It also does not establish how the direction of contrasting items was handled before the scores were entered in the

appendix. A high total therefore has an arithmetic meaning under the reported scoring scheme, but the direction of its meaning for caregiving quality or style remains unresolved. The same uncertainty applies to claims that one style was more common among families with a particular credential or socioeconomic score.

4.4 Discrepancies Between Instrument Materials and Statistical Interpretation

The largest instrument discrepancies concern the recorded categories, the number of scored items, and the way item wording aligns with the blueprint. For parental education, the questionnaire lists grouped options, the frequencies show separate schooling routes, and the coded appendix sums the two caregivers' entries. For socioeconomic status, Chapter IV describes four questions, while the displayed form and score table show 12 items, including education aspirations, work, community participation, and household priorities. The parenting blueprint places listening to a child's account in its democratic sequence, but the displayed form uses item 12 for granting a wish and repeats that prompt at item 18. The form and score appendix contain 18 parenting items while the results narrative again describes four questions. Table 2 shows where each discrepancy arises and which interpretation it affects.

Table 2

Instrument Versions and Implications for Interpretation

Construct	Blueprint and displayed form	Scoring evidence and implications
Parental education	The blueprint distinguishes schooling pathways. The displayed education prompt groups secondary options and lists graduate degrees, while Chapter IV separates SMA, SMK, and MA.	The appendix sums two education codes on a 1–7 scale. Equal code increments and equal weights for both caregivers are implicit in the regression input. The total gives no direct measure of caregiving knowledge.
Socioeconomic status	The blueprint and displayed form include 12 prompts on aspirations, income, work, community position, and family priorities. Chapter IV describes four questions.	The appendix sums 12 scores from 1 to 4. All 57 cases in the top category scored 48. The total describes a composite with a ceiling and cannot identify income or material hardship by itself.
Parenting practices	The blueprint identifies three orientations. The displayed form repeats a permissiveness prompt at items 12 and 18 and omits the corresponding listening item from the blueprint. Chapter IV describes four questions.	The appendix sums 18 item scores. A total of 36 must be included in the bottom group to reproduce Table 4.5. No documented style-classification rule connects these totals to authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive parenting.

Note. SMA, SMK, and MA are Indonesian general, vocational, and Islamic senior secondary school pathways.

Table 3 compares the reported and reconstructed regression entries. For the combined model, the reconstruction reproduced the displayed coefficients, t statistics, sums of squares, and omnibus F value. The regression sum of squares divided by the total sum of squares gives $R^2 = .779$, which is also the value calculated from the 171 coded rows. The model summary instead reports $R^2 = .823$ and adjusted $R^2 = .808$, compared with reconstructed values of .779 and .776. The report's explanatory paragraph also refers to interpersonal intelligence and self-regulation, although the coefficient and

ANOVA tables identify the outcome as the parenting score. These discrepancies locate the inconsistency in the reported model summary and its interpretation.

The combined-model education t statistic was reproduced at 1.097, but its two-sided p value was .274, compared with .004 in the coefficient table and .000 in the narrative of the education test. In the education-only model, the reconstructed coefficient was .304 with SE = .430, giving t = .708 and p = .480. The education-only table prints B = .804, which is incompatible with the reported standard error and t statistic, and lists .000 for significance. The socioeconomic coefficient and t statistic were reproduced in both the combined and socioeconomic-only models, with $p < .001$ in each. Thus, the printed significance claim for the education score is unsupported by the reconstructed models, and the association involving the socioeconomic score concerns the composite entered in those models. These calculations check the internal consistency of the supplied document and supply no new evidence about how parents cared for their children.

Table 3

Reported and Reconstructed Regression Results

Model or term	Values reported in Chapter IV	Values reconstructed from the appendices
Combined model fit	$R^2 = .823$, adjusted $R^2 = .808$, $F(2, 168) = 295.887$	$R^2 = .779$, adjusted $R^2 = .776$, $F(2, 168) = 295.887$, $p < .001$
Education, combined model	B = .223, SE = .203, t = 1.097, p = .004 in the table	B = .223, SE = .203, t(168) = 1.097, p = .274
Socioeconomic score, combined model	B = 1.107, SE = .046, t = 24.280, significance printed as .000	B = 1.107, SE = .046, t(168) = 24.280, p < .001
Education-only model	B = .804, SE = .430, t = .708, significance printed as .000	B = .304, SE = .430, t(169) = .708, p = .480
Socioeconomic-only model	B = 1.108, SE = .046, t = 24.287, significance printed as .000	B = 1.108, SE = .046, t(169) = 24.287, p < .001

Note. N = 171 in each model. B is the unstandardized coefficient, SE is its standard error, and reconstructed p values are two-sided.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpreting Education and Resources in the Jambi Report

The first theme suggests that early childhood educators can use attainment to describe whom an institution serves while asking caregivers directly how they learn about raising children. For example, a teacher might invite a caregiver to describe where they turned for advice when a child resisted a routine and what they found useful. That question leaves room for experience, relatives, and community or preschool contacts to emerge. Studies of home learning in Tanzania and of learning and behavioral profiles show that activities and home conditions matter alongside broad family measures (Bonifacci et al., 2026; Ndijuye & Dadi, 2024). A discussion about a recent experience would give educators information that the credential code cannot provide.

The second theme suggests asking families about concrete barriers to participation before choosing how to deliver support. Studies of cash transfers distinguish investments in early learning

from outcomes involving child care, employment, language, nutrition, or sleep (Gennetian et al., 2024; Hart et al., 2024; Sperber et al., 2023; Stilwell et al., 2024). That distinction matters when deciding whether a family needs information, a different meeting time, or help locating a service. A short intake conversation can ask separately about what caregivers hope to change, which resources are available, and what currently makes a routine difficult. The resulting information can guide decisions about meeting times, contact channels, and local referrals without assigning families a level of need based on a composite score.

Evidence on psychosocial difficulties and access to preschool reinforces the value of asking about specific conditions and outcomes (Bjorvatn et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2024). Two families with the same score may face different constraints if one has difficulty reaching a center and another cannot attend during work hours. Asking each caregiver which option would be feasible can inform whether a center offers a brief conversation at pickup, a scheduled call, or a group session. Educators can then record whether the change in delivery allowed previously unreached caregivers to participate. This makes the purpose of collecting the information explicit and gives the program a way to check whether its response addressed the barrier.

5.2 Moving From Style Categories to Situated Caregiving

The parenting materials contain useful starting points for an account of concrete interaction. Questions about discussing a mistake, supporting an interest, and setting a safety limit direct attention to practices that educators can discuss with families. Research on culturally grounded expectations and parental warmth shows why the rationale, manner, and relational consequences of control matter for interpretation (Cheung et al., 2025; Lansford, 2022; Lansford, 2024). Indonesian research on parenting and social-emotional development and a study of determinants of preschool parenting offer further context for examining local constructions of caregiving (Eka Putri et al., 2023; Monalisa et al., 2023). Used carefully, style categories can help generate questions about interaction, while the evidence for classifying a family needs to be built from multiple practices and circumstances.

Digital media offers an example for discussing caregiving without assigning a style. Research distinguishes screen context, parental strategies, and opportunities for parent–child conversation (Brushe et al., 2024; Fitzpatrick et al., 2023; Machell et al., 2026; Mallawaarachchi et al., 2024). A teacher might ask a caregiver to describe a recent occasion when they ended a child's screen activity. The account could clarify why the limit was set, how the child responded, and what other activity was available. Educators can use those details to agree on a manageable change and revisit whether it helped the family's routine.

Food and movement routines make the same methodological issue visible in a different domain. Studies of working parents' incorporation of local foods and parent–child physical activity describe specific demands associated with organizing routines (Maratus Sholikah et al., 2026; Xiong, 2025). The details of schedules, food access, other caregivers, and children's preferences may change the practical options available even when parents hold similar goals. A qualitative field study could therefore compare episodes across activities and ask whether the same caregiver sets limits differently for safety, convenience, or the child's comfort. This would also support analysis of situations in which the child's response changes what the adult does next.

The third theme also draws attention to families in which more than one adult provides regular care. A brief discussion with the adults involved can identify where a rule is shared and where the context requires different responses. The account of each caregiver can be tied to a specific time or activity, such as getting ready for preschool or settling after a conflict. This information can help teachers and families agree on which part of a routine to address first. It can also clarify whether a strategy developed with one caregiver is feasible for another adult who helps carry it out.

5.3 Implications for Research and Partnerships With Families

The fourth theme has implications for how early childhood institutions record and evaluate family support. A center using a questionnaire can retain the administered wording and record how items, response options, scoring direction, and thresholds connect to each reported measure. It can also document who completed the form and which denominator was used when summarizing participation. If a summary appears inconsistent, staff can check the version and scoring rule before reporting group differences or using the result to allocate support. These steps address the same evidence gap exposed by the regression reconstruction and protect against treating a summary measure as an account of a family's practices.

For a future field study, purposive recruitment could seek variation in education routes, work schedules, caregiving arrangements, and contact with early childhood services. Interviews could begin with recent situations that parents choose to describe, then examine the child's response, the adult's decision, and alternatives considered at the time. Educators' accounts could address the same domains when appropriate, with care taken to distinguish home practices from what staff observe in an institution. Research on parent–teacher collaboration through guidance and play illustrates how institutional and family perspectives can be studied together (Hendriawan et al., 2026; Nofianti et al., 2025). Including diverse caregivers and documenting whose account supports each claim would make it easier to examine similarities and differences without reducing households to a single educational or economic profile.

For early childhood settings, family support is more likely to address the decisions caregivers face when it starts with their descriptions of an ordinary day. Reviews of parenting programs identify questions about sustained participation, delivery in routine settings, and how programs can be implemented at scale (Aboud et al., 2025; Cooper et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2026). These concerns are relevant to decisions about session timing, location, and whether a family member can participate alongside another caregiver. Work on multicomponent interventions and implementation characteristics also suggests that parenting guidance should be examined in relation to caregiver well-being and practical delivery (Ahun et al., 2024; Al Sager et al., 2024). A district program could use such evidence to plan discussions and evaluate which arrangements families find accessible, while collecting local feedback before deciding how to expand provision.

Research on preschool parenting and social-emotional development in Jambi supplies a regional point of comparison for family support (Eka Putri et al., 2023; Monalisa et al., 2023). The district's own service arrangements and families' priorities would shape how such comparisons could inform a program. A learning group might begin by inviting caregivers to describe how rules, learning time, play, and support are arranged in their household and what makes those routines feasible. Educators could then use the accounts to decide whether the next conversation should focus on an

interaction, a school expectation, or a practical resource problem. If the group is evaluated, the measures should reflect those purposes separately so that participation and feasibility are visible alongside any practice changes.

Across the four themes, a center could record access, engagement, and reported changes in routines as distinct outcomes. Access might be assessed by who was able to attend after a scheduling adjustment, while engagement might be reflected in whether caregivers could raise issues that mattered to them. A reported practice change could be described through a concrete episode discussed at a later meeting. Those measures would give the program information about service delivery as well as interaction at home. Feedback can then guide decisions about whether to adapt the program for a different center or group of caregivers.

5.4 Scope and Limitations

The source is one report from one district, and its materials support an interpretation of the research record. The analysis cannot determine how the participants interpreted each item, which wording was administered, or how the mismatched entries appeared in the report. Internal comparison also cannot resolve whether characteristics of households omitted from the report would explain any of its results. Published studies provide contextual comparisons, but they represent varied methods and settings. The contribution is therefore to specify the documentary basis of the claims, including the evidence a future study would need to investigate experiences within families.

A related limitation concerns perspective within the report. Its language gives prominence to adult education, socioeconomic position, and the investigator's classification of parenting, while children's reactions and the accounts of relatives or other caregivers receive little space. Their absence in the documentary material leaves questions about shared caregiving and changing routines unanswered. Moreover, sensitive practices such as punitive responses would require methods that support candid participation and protect confidentiality before any conclusions about their occurrence could be drawn. A future study could address these gaps through ethically approved interviews and contextual observations, with attention to who can speak about each experience.

The survey period limits interpretation of temporal variation. An account gathered in one season may reflect a different work schedule or set of household obligations from an account gathered later. The available tables pool the responses across the reporting period. They therefore cannot reveal changes in how particular households organized care over time. Repeated conversations would help situate those changes alongside family decisions.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis identified four patterns in how a 2024 survey report from Limbur Lubuk Mengkuang represented parenting. The report used educational credentials as a proxy for caregiving knowledge and combined material circumstances with educational aspirations in a socioeconomic score. It also aggregated contrasting practices into a parenting total and reported model summaries that were partly inconsistent with the appended scores. The reconstructed regression supports several printed coefficients and ANOVA entries but does not support the printed significance claim for the education score. For early childhood institutions, the findings favor asking caregivers about specific interactions and access barriers, and documenting how measures used in family support are

constructed. Direct accounts of caregiving and verified records of instrument administration would help establish how the documented practices are understood and enacted in the district.

7. REFERENCES

Aboud, F., Omoeva, C., Contreras Gomez, R., Hatch, R., Chaluda, A., Krstic, K., Hapunda, G., Sichimba, F., Choden, K., Tusiimi, M., & Popp, J. (2025). Scaling parenting programs for early child development in four low- and middle-income countries. *Frontiers in Public Health, 13*, Article 1604308. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1604308

Ahun, M. N., Ali, N. B., Hentschel, E., Jeong, J., Franchett, E., & Yousafzai, A. K. (2024). A meta-analytic review of the implementation characteristics in parenting interventions to promote early child development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1533*(1), 99–144. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.15110

Al Sager, A., Goodman, S. H., Jeong, J., Bain, P. A., & Ahun, M. N. (2024). Effects of multi-component parenting and parental mental health interventions on early childhood development and parent outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 8*(9), 656–669. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(24)00134-2

Andriani (2024). *Pengaruh tingkat pendidikan dan status sosial ekonomi terhadap parenting style orangtua di Provinsi Jambi* [Unpublished master's research report]. Universitas Panca Sakti Bekasi.

Attanasio, O., Cattan, S., & Meghir, C. (2022). Early childhood development, human capital, and poverty. *Annual Review of Economics, 14*, 853–892. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-092821-053234

Baxter, K. A., Gallegos, D., & Byrne, R. (2026). A qualitative evaluation of Eat, Learn, Grow: A digital microlearning programme to promote responsive feeding practices. *Maternal & Child Nutrition, 22*(3), Article e70191. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.70191

Bjorvatn, K., Ferris, D., Gulesci, S., Nasgowitz, A., Somville, V., & Vandewalle, L. (2024). Long-term effects of preschool subsidies and cash transfers on child development: Evidence from Uganda. *AEA Papers and Proceedings, 114*, 459–462. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20241014

Blume, J., Garcia, G. M., Garcia, M., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2025). Associations between parenting styles and child self-regulation skills: A series of meta-analyses. *Journal of Family Psychology, 39*(7), 885–898. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001379

Bonifacci, P., Compiani, D., Vassura, C., Affranti, A., Peri, B., Ravaldini, V., & Tobia, V. (2026). Home learning environment and screen time differentially mediate the relationship between socioeconomic status and preschoolers' learning and behavioural profiles. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 57*(2), 467–480. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-024-01724-z

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024a). A critical review of the reporting of reflexive thematic analysis in Health Promotion International. *Health Promotion International, 39*(3), Article daae049. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daae049

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024b). Supporting best practice in reflexive thematic analysis reporting in Palliative Medicine: A review of published research and introduction to the Reflexive Thematic Analysis Reporting Guidelines (RTARG). *Palliative Medicine, 38*(6), 608–616. https://doi.org/10.1177/02692163241234800

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2025). Reporting guidelines for qualitative research: A values-based approach. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 22*(2), 399–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2024.2382244

Brushe, M. E., Haag, D. G., Melhuish, E. C., Reilly, S., & Gregory, T. (2024). Screen time and parent-child talk when children are aged 12 to 36 months. *JAMA Pediatrics, 178*(4), 369–375. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.6790

Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity, 56*(3), 1391–1412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y

Cahoon, A., Jiménez Lira, C., Estévez Pérez, N., Benavides Pando, E. V., Campver García, Y., Paz García, D. S., & Simms, V. (2024). Meta-analyses and narrative review of home-based interventions to improve literacy and mathematics outcomes for children between the ages of 3 and 5 years old. *Review of Educational Research, 94*(6), 803–842. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231212491

Chan, Y. Y., & Rao, N. (2024). Home and preschool influences on early literacy and numeracy development in England, Estonia, and the United States. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 32*(3), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2023.2257913

Cheung, H. S., Liem, G. A. D., & Ang, R. P. (2025). Introduction to the special section on parenting across cultures: Bridging commonalities and specificities in parental control and warmth. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 49*(5), 415–418. https://doi.org/10.1177/01650254251349763

Cooper, J., Dermentzis, J., Loftus, H., Sahle, B. W., Reavley, N., & Jorm, A. (2022). Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of parenting programs in real-world settings: A qualitative systematic review. *Mental Health & Prevention, 26*, Article 200236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mhp.2022.200236

Eka Putri, A. B., Badarussyamsi, B., & Yusria, Y. (2023). Pola asuh orangtua dalam perkembangan sosial emosional anak usia dini. *Journal of Educational Research, 2*(1), 99–114. https://doi.org/10.56436/jer.v2i1.220

Ery, E., & Badar, S. (2026). Implementation of English language learning for early childhood at Al-Ikhlas Klapanunggal preschool: A qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(4), 206–233. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i4.169

Ferawati, F. (2026). Well-being–based early childhood education for trauma recovery: A phenomenological study of parental perceptions. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i1.1

Fitzpatrick, C., Cristini, E., Bernard, J. Y., & Garon-Carrier, G. (2023). Meeting preschool screen time recommendations: Which parental strategies matter? *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1287396. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1287396

Gaspar, C. R., Jahromi, L. B., & Rooney, M. E. (2025). Culturally and ethnically diverse parents' views of home-school partnership responsibilities. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 23*(4), 446–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X251339306

Gennetian, L. A., Duncan, G. J., Fox, N. A., Halpern-Meekin, S., Magnuson, K., Noble, K. G., & Yoshikawa, H. (2024). Effects of a monthly unconditional cash transfer starting at birth on family investments among US families with low income. *Nature Human Behaviour, 8*(8), 1514–1529. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01915-7

Hart, E. R., Gennetian, L. A., Sperber, J. F., Penalva, R., Magnuson, K., Duncan, G. J., Halpern-Meekin, S., Yoshikawa, H., Fox, N. A., & Noble, K. G. (2024). The effect of unconditional cash transfers on maternal assessments of children's early language and socioemotional development: Experimental evidence from U.S. families residing in poverty. *Developmental Psychology, 60*(12), 2290–2305. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001824

Hasanah, S., & Yuntina, L. (2026). Improving early childhood vocabulary recognition through flashcard media: A qualitative study in kindergarten. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(3), 145–148. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i3.167

Hendriawan, D., Mashudi, E. A., Sundari, N., & Arzaqi, R. N. (2026). Collaborative guidance practices in ECE: Parents and teachers as partners. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, 10*(2), 1417–1428. https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v10i2.7733

Hevesi, R., Downey, M. R., & Harvey, K. (2024). Living in food insecurity: A qualitative study exploring parents' food parenting practices and their perceptions of the impact of food insecurity on their children's eating. *Appetite, 195*, Article 107204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2024.107204

Hoiting, J., & Halpern-Meekin, S. (2026). "I teach her at home": Home learning environments amid resource constraints. *Family Relations, 75*(4), 2731–2751. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.70200

Ibrohim, A. A., Arzaqi, R. N., Juliyanti, A., & Romadhoni, Y. (2026). Emotion regulation and resilience among street-connected children in early childhood: A systematic literature review. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(4), 244–254. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i4.98

Ismah, T. N. (2026). Seven habits of great Indonesian children in early childhood education contexts: A qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(2), 97–112. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i2.12

Isnaini, F. Z. (2026). Analysis of characteristics and intervention strategies for children with delayed communication at KB Fatimatuzzahra Sukabumi City. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(1), 26–48. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i1.2

Isnaini, F. Z., Jelina, M., Mutakin, D. Z., & Imamah, I. (2026). The importance of balanced nutrition in early childhood and its development programs. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(3), 162–181. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i3.90

Jelina, M. (2026). Concentration obstacles and high mobility behavior in a senior kindergarten student: A case study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(1), 59–65. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i1.4

Lansford, J. E. (2022). Annual Research Review: Cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 63*(4), 466–479. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13539

Lansford, J. E. (2024). Cultural values, parenting and child adjustment: Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Psychology, 59*(4), 505–511. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.13121

Lin, X., Xie, W., & Liao, Y. (2024). The mediating role of negative parenting and children's mastery motivation on socioeconomic status and Chinese preschoolers' problem behaviors. *Early Education and Development, 35*(7), 1638–1653. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2023.2260690

Liu, Q., Zhang, Y., & Razza, R. A. (2024). Preschoolers' attentional and behavioral regulation: Differential pathways through poverty and parenting. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 33*, 3384–3401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-024-02917-9

Liyana, L. (2026). Early childhood teachers' experiences in integrating the Free Nutritious Meal Program into early childhood learning: A phenomenological study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(1), 49–58. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i1.5

Luo, J., van Grieken, A., Kruizinga, I., & Raat, H. (2024). Longitudinal associations between socioeconomic status and psychosocial problems in preschool children. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 33*(4), 1029–1038. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-023-02217-5

Machell, A., Ewin, C., Horwood, S., Downing, K. L., & Hesketh, K. D. (2026). Effect of parent-focused interventions for screen use on developmental outcomes in young children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 23*(1), Article 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-026-01919-8

Maisyaroh, N. (2026). Self-regulation in early childhood as a relational process in early childhood education. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(1), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i1.3

Mallawaarachchi, S., Burley, J., Mavilidi, M., Howard, S. J., Straker, L., Kervin, L., Staton, S., Hayes, N., Machell, A., Torjinski, M., Brady, B., Thomas, G., Horwood, S., White, S. L. J., Zabatiero, J., Rivera, C., & Cliff, D. (2024). Early childhood screen use contexts and cognitive and psychosocial outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics, 178*(10), 1017–1026. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2024.2620

Maratus Sholikah, R., Ashlikhatul Kirom, F., Hasibuan, R., & Fitri, R. (2026). Integrating local food into early childhood nutritional caregiving practices among working parents: A case study of the Real Food Program. *Nak-Kanak: Journal of Child Research, 3*(2), 89–102. https://doi.org/10.21107/njcr.v3i2.251

Meng, W., Black, C. F. D., & Feng, M. (2024). Associations among family socioeconomic status, parenting and sustained attention for socioeconomically disadvantaged children at age 5 years. *Infant and Child Development, 33*(4), Article e2491. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2491

Monalisa, Yan, L. S., & Bahri, N. F. (2023). Determinan pola asuh orang tua pada anak usia pra sekolah di era new normal. *Jurnal Keperawatan Silampari, 6*(2), 929–936. https://doi.org/10.31539/jks.v6i2.4959

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 27*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044

Musoheh, M. (2026). The dominance of the daycare environment in early childhood care and its implications for the formation of children's self-identity. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(3), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i3.72

Nag, S., Vagh, S. B., Dulay, K. M., Snowling, M., Donolato, E., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2024). Home learning environments and children's language and literacy skills: A meta-analytic review of studies conducted in low- and middle-income countries. *Psychological Bulletin, 150*(2), 132–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000417

Ndijuye, L. G., & Benguye, N. (2023). Home environment, early reading, and math: A longitudinal study on the mediating role of family SES in transition from pre-primary to grade one. *International Journal of Educational Development, 98*, Article 102751. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102751

Ndijuye, L. G., & Dadi, N. (2024). Home learning environments and family socioeconomic status: Implications on early learning attainments in Tanzania. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 22*(2), 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X231195712

Nicmanis, M. (2024). Reflexive content analysis: An approach to qualitative data analysis, reduction, and description. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241236603

Ni'matussilva, F. (2026). Interpreting the role of parenting in maintaining early childhood mental health: A qualitative study of parents' perceptions in preschool contexts. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(2), 82–96. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i2.8

Nofianti, R., Waeno, M., & Dwi Utami, R. (2025). Partners in play: Examining parent-teacher collaboration on preschoolers' cognitive growth. *Golden Age: Jurnal Ilmiah Tumbuh Kembang Anak Usia Dini, 10*(4), 731–748. https://doi.org/10.14421/jga.2025.104-07

Rahmadani, D., Arzaqi, R. N., Aulia, A. N., & Arifah, A. B. (2026). Screen-based digital media exposure and early childhood self-regulation: A systematic literature review with attention to short-form video. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(4), 255–283. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i4.97

Rarawati, I. (2026). Multisensory learning activities in enhancing young children's learning readiness: A qualitative study in Indonesian early childhood settings. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(2), 113–130. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i2.11

Ratniawati, A. (2026). Clinical–educational qualitative case study of speech delay in a four-year-old boy. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(2), 66–81. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i2.7

Saharudin, S., & Putri, R. R. (2026). Beyond screen time: Content-based parental decision making in early childhood digital engagement—A qualitative study in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Terapan, 4*(1), 22–33. https://doi.org/10.61255/jupiter.v4i1.876

Searle, B., Staton, S., Littlewood, R., & Thorpe, K. (2023). Mealtimes in the context of poverty: Comparison of ECEC services providing food and those requiring food provided from home. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 49*(6), 995–1005. https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.13109

Shofa, A. H. (2026). The impact of screen time on children's independence in daycare contexts: A qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(3), 195–205. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i3.60

Soniati, N. (2026). The impact of mobile phone use on early childhood interaction and behavior patterns: A qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(2), 131–144. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i2.13

Sperber, J. F., Gennetian, L. A., Hart, E. R., Kunin-Batson, A., Magnuson, K., Duncan, G. J., Yoshikawa, H., Fox, N. A., Halpern-Meekin, S., & Noble, K. G. (2023). Unconditional cash transfers and maternal assessments of children's health, nutrition, and sleep: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Network Open, 6*(9), Article e2335237. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.35237

Stilwell, L., Morales-Gracia, M., Magnuson, K., Gennetian, L. A., Sauval, M., Fox, N. A., Halpern-Meekin, S., Yoshikawa, H., & Noble, K. G. (2024). Unconditional cash and breastfeeding, child care, and maternal employment among families with young children residing in poverty. *Social Service Review, 98*(2), 260–292. https://doi.org/10.1086/729364

Sum, T. A., & Delima, R. (2026). Growth mindset in early childhood teachers and the transformation of children's behavior. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(3), 182–194. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i3.88

Turnbull, K. L. P., Jaworski, B., Cubides Mateus, D. M., Coolman, F. L., LoCasale-Crouch, J., Moon, R. Y., Hauck, F. R., Kellams, A., & Colson, E. R. (2025). Maternal perspectives on COVID-19 kindergarten learning impacts: A qualitative study of families with low income. *Discover Education, 4*(1), Article 34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00421-w

Utami, F., Meilanie, R. S. M., & Hapidin, H. (2026). The role of educators in encouraging problem-solving skills in early childhood. *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education, 1*(4), 234–243. https://doi.org/10.66291/qr-ece.v1i4.172

Xia, X. (2025). Family socioeconomic status and Chinese preschoolers' early academic skills: Parenting style and self-regulation as sequential mediators. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development, 48*(1), 137–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/02103702241300055

Xiong, L. (2025). Challenges and facilitators to parent–child shared physical interventions during preschool and school age education: A systematic review and meta synthesis. *Frontiers in Public Health, 13*, Article 1658179. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1658179

Yeshua, M., & Berger, A. (2026). Self-regulated parenting: A systematic review of the relations between effortful control, the Big-Five, and parenting practices. *Psychological Reports, 129*(2), 947–980. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941241256623

Yngvesson, T. E. (2026). Parents' experiences of communication with preschool teachers in Sweden: A qualitative study. *Education Sciences, 16*(1), Article 90. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16010090

Zhang, H., Wang, X., & Lin, R. (2026). Facilitators and barriers to sustained engagement in parenting programs: A systematic review. *Qualitative Health Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315261445120