Education and Human Development Journal
Tahun 2022; Vol. 7 (2); ISSN. 2541-0156; e-SSN. 2599-0292; hal. 52-63
https://journal2.unusa.ac.id/index.php/EHDJ/index
doi : 10.33086/ehdj.v7i2

Home learning profile of children in rural areas: A phenomenological study in Jember, East Java

Miftakhuddin[1*], Nurdin Kamil[2], Hadi Hardiansyah[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Tangerang Raya, Jl. Syeh Mubarok No. 25 Tigaraksa Kab. Tangerang
[1]miftakhuddin@untara.ac.id

Abstract: This study strives to compile a home learning (LFH) profile of rural children. This study was conducted using a phenomenological design. Data were collected through in-depth interviews and participatory observations in 13 villages. The validity of the data is checked using source triangulation and technique triangulation. Based on the qualitative analysis, the following significant findings are highlighted: (a) children and parents view LFH as government reimbursement for a crisis circumstance, rather than as a school-mandated requirement. (b) LFH in rural areas is implemented in a blended learning design (model: flipped classroom). The design was adopted since the prior full-online and hybrid learning designs were ineffective. (c) LFH participation rates tend to be low. Besides being caused by technical constraints, this is due to the socio-cultural environment that promotes pragmatism in the educational process. (d) Through the Madurese philosophy of *Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu', Ghuru, Rato*, the socio-cultural context gives prospects for the success of LFH and the growth of education in general. This concept serves as a guideline for the Madurese ethnic community to establish priorities and respect for three (or four) key figures in life according to Islamic tradition. underpins the child's decision to participate in LFH or not. The findings of this study have the potential to correct a number of prior studies that identified poverty and underdevelopment as the most influential determinants in the success of rural children's home learning.

Keywords: home learning profile; learning from home; rural home learning; Madurese phylosophy; home learning participation

Abstrak: Riset ini berusaha menyusun profil home learning (BDR) anak-anak pedesaan. Riset ini dilaksanakan dalam desain fenomenologi. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara mendalam dan observasi partisipatif di 13 desa. Pemeriksaan keabsahan data ditempuh melalui triangulasi sumber dan triangulasi teknik. Berdasarkan analisis kualitatif, riset ini menyoroti beberapa temuan penting berikut: (a) anak dan orangtua memandang BDR bukan sebagai kewajiban yang diinstruksikan sekolah, melainkan sebagai kompensasi dari pemerintah atas situasi krisis. (b) BDR di pedesaan terselenggara dalam desain blended learning (model: flipped classroom). Desain itu dipilih karena desain full-online dan hybrid learning yang sebelumnya diterapkan tidak maksimal. (c) tingkat partisipasi BDR cenderung rendah. Selain disebabkan kendala teknis, hal ini disebabkan lingkungan sosial-budaya yang mempromosikan pragmatisme terhadap proses pendidikan. (d) lingkungan sosial budaya memberi peluang bagi keberhasilan BDR dan pembangunan pendidikan secara umum melalui falsafah Madura: Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu', Ghuru, Rato. Falsafah ini adalah pedoman masyarakat etnis Madura untuk mengatur prioritas dan penghormatan kepada tiga (atau empat) figur penting bagi kehidupan sesuai tradisi islam di Jember. Falsafah ini juga mendasari keputusan anak untuk berpartispasi ataukah tidak berpartisipasi dalam BDR. Implikasi temuan riset ini adalah koreksi atas sejumlah riset terdahulu yang menyebut kemiskinan dan keterbelakangan sebagai variabel paling berpengaruh dalam keberhasilan home learning anak-anak pedesaan.

Kata kunci: profil home learning; belajar dari rumah; BDR di pedesaan; falsafah Madura; partisipasi BDR.

INTRODUCTION

The Learning from Home (LFH) policy which was initiated in early 2020 is not applicable for rural areas. Based on Circular No. 15 of (2020), Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) permits schools to do online, offline, or both types of learning. However, according to the 4

Submitted: 12 Maret 2021 Accepted: 21 September 2022 Published: 30 September 2022

ministerial decree (2021), schools need obtain approval from the education office and the Covid-19 managing acceleration task force if they wish to conduct face-to-face (F2F) learning. As a consequence, many schools (including this research site) eventually had to implement LFH since they were not permitted to use F2F. The rationale for this is that the right of children to receive educational services must be complemented with assured teacher safety from the spread of Covid-19 (MoEC, 2020b)

This research assesses that the aforementioned policies are inapplicable not rural areas for to main reasons. Aside from the fact that the policy tends to have a one-size-fits-all approach, the preliminary study results revealed that there was negligence and lack of seriousness in implementing LFH, both by students and their parents. The preliminary study in Jambearum village found Gery, a 4th grader student who did not complete the academic obligations imposed by his teacher as a manner of LFH implementation. He and his buddies, who also do not do LFH, prefer to engage in activities that are usual among children his age, such as playing with firecrackers, fishing, football, and so on. Parents entrusted with supporting LFH did not do much either because they had to go to the fields to carry out their farm laborer duties. Similarly, Daud (11 years old), the son of a fisherman in Puger Wetan village, prefers to go to sea with his father than LFH. Many other children in coastal villages make similar decisions as Daud.

Gery and Daud only practice LFH when their school teacher comes to their house every three or four days to monitor their progress at home. Gery and Daud did academic assignments that they had not done in the previous week during the visit. These two cases demonstrate that rural communities do not prioritize LFH as a home learning.

Further inquiry into the aforementioned case indicated that even if the parents were not working, the children did not appear to participate in the LFH. There are three major causes behind this. First, children aged 7 to 12 years do not yet have a developed feeling of responsibility and independence (Crain, 2014), hence they require adult supervision. Second, a large number of parents are illiterate. Some of them are elementary school graduates who have fallen back into illiteracy since their jobs do not require them to read or write (Miftakhuddin, 2018). This circumstance not only makes it difficult for children to have a good learning experience, but it also makes it tough for parents to help and guide their children. Third, there is poverty as well as a strong materialistic focus (Miftakhuddin et al., 2016). This reason most dominates the decisions of children and parents to prefer work over LFH. For them, LFH will be a waste of time, whereas labor will be profitable. The preceding arguments also illustrate that the MoEC (2020d, 2020c) encouragement to maximize parents' roles in LFH does not suitable to rural communities.

Empirical evidence in the experience of Gery and Daud shows that, in rural areas, home learning is not accepted as part of the school's teaching and learning activities, but rather as government compensation for the country's crisis situation. There are tendentious symptoms in the perception and behavior of children and parents towards home learning that lead to neglect and rejection. In the end, they regard LFH active day as a day off that can be used to play, assist parents, work, and so on.

As the study of Alifia et al. (2020) and Gupta & Khairina (2020), children like the ones mentioned above are disproportionately affected by inequity in the implementation of home learning. Gupta & Khairina (2020) stated that they lose one-third of what they should learn in a year (learning loss). The academic achievement gap between rural and urban pupils, which existed before to pandemic, is now wider and more noticeable (UNICEF, 2021), because not all rural children access home learning resources (Yarrow & Bhardwaj, 2020). This indicates that the government's collaboration program with TVRI, internet providers, and e-learning platform providers (EdTech) is less beneficial to rural children. Based on the challenges dan behaviors of rural children in carrying out home learning, this research was undertaken to address the fundamental main problem: *what is the profile of home learning for rural children?*. The problem is then split down into the following two specific research questions: (a) How do children and their parents interpret BDR? (b) Why and how do children take the BDR mechanism?

Due to base on cross-sectional data, the home learning profile provides comprehensive information about the dynamics of children's learning (Kaffenberger, 2019). Thus, home learning profile analysis can explain the links between children's learning involvement patterns and their socio-cultural environments (Crouch et al., 2021). Answering the research questions above, theoretically, can mapping the children's cognitive and cultural intervention, as well as the determinants that affect rural children's engagement in home learning. In the meanwhile, practically, the home learning profile is a valuable contribution that can be referred to in formulating policies at the national and regional levels. Education policymakers can assess learning inequalities and identify groups of children who are left behind, and arrange the priorities of educational development (Crouch et al., 2021). As a result, policymakers can construct different problem-solving models to create a flexible home-based learning plan for rural children based on their learning styles and preferences.

This urgency must be considered because, so far, no research has presented the home learning profile of rural children, despite the fact that some of them discuss similar issues; LFH in the countryside. Existing research focuses solely on the impact of LFH (Wahyuningsih, 2021), parents' perceptions (Ludji & Marpaung, 2021), communication barriers and access to digital learning resources (Reddy & Ramesh, 2020; Setiawan & Iasha, 2020), and comparisons of information technology involvement between rural and urban children (Nita et al., 2021). Previous researchers did not address the necessity for information on home learning profiles. Even the results of the LFH evaluation survey conducted by MoEC (2020a) do not offer it.

METHODS

A phenomenological design is used in this qualitative study to construct a home learning profile for rural children. Through this design, we can understand how participants interpret educational policies in special contexts (Suranto, 2006). This study characterizes LFH as a phenomenon since it influences participant's beliefs and perceptions about schooling, resulting in behavioral changes in response to LFH regulations (Moran, 2000). This study adheres to the phenomenological method proposed by Husserl (1983). In the first stage, a phenomenological reduction is performed to filter any subjective (individual-incidental) educational experiences. Following that, eiditis reduction (ideation) is performed, i.e. reducing the observations to their essence (Priyoyuwono, 2008).

To get a thorough picture and comprehension of the meaning of LFH policy as a phenomenon from a subject or first-person perspective (Stolz, 2020), a Research Assistance Group was formed to undertake participatory observations and in-depth interviews. Data was collected in locations that satisfied two rural criteria: (a) having a low Human Development Index (HDI) based on BPS Jember (2022) data, and (b) having a high reliance and passive adaption to the natural environment (Rahardjo, 2017). In Jember, areas that meet these criteria are dominated by the ecology of paddy fields, plantations, and coastal.

The collected data was analyzed following the steps proposed by Miles et al. (2014), including condensation data, display data, and conclusion drawings. In the data condensation phase, the data is reduced and its validity is confirmed through source and technical triangulation (Denzin, 1978). Data that has been determined to be valid are subsequently structured by summarizing, developing specific themes, and establishing specific categories (coding). The organized data is then presented in table presentations and descriptive descriptions. The organized data is then displayed in tabular format with detailed explanations. Finally, conclusions (conclusion drawing/verification) are reached. The output of this phase is the confirmation of research findings as a result of data analysis. A series of stages of analysis according to the flow are pursued while still referring to research questions, research objectives, methodological limitations, and relevant theories (Berg, 2009; O'leary, 2017).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The initial analysis reveal a number of common obstacles that, according to Adedoyin and Soykan (2020), are common to stymie the implementation of home learning, such as the difficulty of the internet signal, a stronger distractor than the child's commitment to learning, and the lack of expertise in operating digital devices. This study also confirms the findings of other researchers who investigated the implementation of home learning in rural Indonesia (Wahyuningsih, 2021), Philippines (Agaton & Cueto, 2021), and Ethiopia (Belay, 2020), who raised concerns about internet connectivity, technological facilities, teacher innovation, and parental background (both educational background and welfare). Unsurprisingly, UNICEF (2020a) estimates that three out of every four children are not covered by online learning originate from rural areas and disadvantaged families. However, more importantly, this study exposes the experience of home learning in rural settings according to subjects' perspective (Table 1).

Table 1. Overview of home learning profile

Dimension	Conditions
Digital literacy	Controlled and empowered platforms are not e-learning or video conferencing platforms, but rather social media platforms (chat applications; WhatsApp). This platform serves as the primary means of communication between parents and teachers.
Teaching practices	• Home visit • At the beginning of the policy, the teacher applied hybrid learning. However, because hybrid learning did not perform well, it was replaced with blended learning (specifically using the flipped classroom model).
Literacy and participation of parents	• Parents carry out mentoring (not teaching), and even then not all of them. • Some parents are illiterate people.
Intervention of culture	• Pragmatic thinking towards education. • The Madurese ideology has a strong hold: *Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu', Ghuru, Rato*. This mindset influences the commitment to implement, not implement, or postpone the LFH.
Preferences and Aspirations	• Children and their parents prefer normal teaching (at school) • For them, LFH should be done by the teacher. If not, then the child does not perform LFH
Support system	• The use of chat application (WhatsApp) to schedule a home visit • WFH should be done collectively. This type of learning provides a social environment akin to traditional school-based learning.

The findings of this research illustrate how the features of rural communities greatly influence behavior in responding to LFH policies. Not unexpectedly, the most prominent characteristics are poverty and low digital literacy which demonstrates the abilities of children and parents in recognizing and using communication tools. Further investigation expounds that there are other factors that determine children's attitudes towards the LFH policy. The research findings are addressed in detail in the following three major themes.

Teaching Practices

At the beginning of the LFH policy, the practice of home learning in rural areas adopted a full-online learning design. However, due to the various constraints, learning is then transformed into hybrid learning. Because the hybrid design is still regarded as less than ideal, home learning

currently solely employs home visits and blended learning (model: flipped classroom). This study highlight that this strategy is not entirely successful. This is because, as noted by Fauzi et al. (2021), the trend of teacher and parent participation in children's home learning differs from the trend in urban regions. Table 1 shows how trends in rural areas tend to be synonymous with passivity.

The fundamental reason why children and parents cannot engage in full-fledged online learning is the lack of instruments to assist it. However, hybrid learning cannot be implemented due to children's and parents' limited digital literacy. Hybrid learning is a learning approach that combines F2F with computer-mediated learning (Ferdig et al., 2012). Generally, the facilities that are equipped to perform hybrid learning are e-learning platforms and video conferencing platforms (O'Byrne & Pytash, 2015). This requirement can definitely not be met by rural communities who only know WhatsApp as the most sophisticated communication platform just because it can send photographs without requiring strong internet connectivity.

As an alternative to hybrid learning, the teacher chooses blended learning (model: flipped classroom). According to teacher interviews, the choice of this model is linked to the teacher's efforts to adapt to the qualities of her students. In one of the interview sessions, when asked why she chose the flipped classroom, the she stated:

> *It's impossible for children to be fully online. You can't utilize zoom either because you don't own a laptop. It can be done on smartphone, but not everyone has one. Those with smartphone frequently ride to the village hall for wifi. As a result, it's best to simply follow what the kids use. It is okay to use WhatsApp. It's preferable to meet on Monday at whoever's house. Give assignments, 7 to 11 a.m. They will be completed at home from Tuesday to Thursday. Those that are unable to do so may contact via WhatsApp. Those who don't have a ride can borrow a friend's phone. Then, on Friday, we met again and discussed (assignments were handed on Monday)* [Hidayati, interview, 12 February 2022].

Because teachers become very selective, Herwin et al. (2021) refer to this method of teaching as a sort of curriculum simplification. Simplification does not only apply to the targeted materials and competencies, but also to the three main elements of learning, namely objectives, methods, and assessment procedures. At first glance, flipped classroom appears to be a viable approach for increasing home learning participation. Furthermore, the approach is consistent with the blended learning paradigm, meaning facilitating learning as a continual process rather than a one-time event (Rao, 2019). In actuality, however, many students complain about the amount of content assigned/charged to them to work on. When asked if he or she could accomplish the prescribed homework, one child gave an answer that was representative of other rural children. He stated:

> *Mrs. Nisa assigned numerous tasks. Very boring. Many tasks are difficult to complete. They haven't always been taught, but they have always been told to do homework ... No, the task is not done. Dad and Mom don't understand (the material), thus it isn't done ... We'll work on it when Mrs. Nisa comes. We'll collaborate with other (friends)* [Dani, interview, February 10, 2022].

This response was confirmed by the findings of a UNICEF (2020) research in Jember, by parents who also represent other parents. In thick Javanese, he says:

> *The teacher gave the assignment straight away, sir. 10 pages, 15 pages. I can't help with the work, sometimes I tell Selfi (next-door neighbor's child). She's in college, so he can definitely study elementary school. But if she herself is studying online, he has to go to the city to gain internet connectivity. Then my chlid homeworks no longer done. At least 5 pages. Especially*

if it's in English. Let's just go with the teacher when we meet [Sulis, interview, February 16, 2022].

Based on the above experience, three primary issues must be addressed: material absorption (attainment of competence/learning objectives), digital literacy, and equitable distribution of online resources. In terms of content understanding, it is obvious that ineffectiveness of contributes to learning loss (UNESCO et al., 2021), because less meaningful learning is more prone to causing misconceptions (Miftakhuddin et al., 2019). That is, even when learning objectives or competencies are simplified, they are not fully achieved. This condition is inextricably linked to the second issue, namely digital literacy.

Prior et al. (2016) prove that individual skills in running an e-learning assistance platform are directly linked to learning objectives attainment. This means that the higher one's level of digital literacy, the greater the positive impact on academic performance (Yustika & Iswati, 2020). This study emphasizes the urgency of increasing digital literacy, particularly in terms of technical proficiency and teaching, learning, and self-development. These two aspects require more attention than the other four because, according to a UNICEF (2021) study in Jember, many children have been aware of the existence of EdTech platforms such as Ruangguru, Brainly, Zenius, and Quipper, but they did not use them at all due to common obstacles and the specific constraints that were revealed at the beginning of the discussion section. This difficulty evolves into the third issue, which is the dissemination of online facilities. Research by Salim & Hanif (2021) concludes that the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) of instructors in rural areas is good. They are optimistic about learning success if technology can be used to organize learning as much as possible, such as administering scores to evaluate student achievement progress, visualizing abstract concepts, saving time, and so on. As a result, the distribution of online facilities, as advocated by UNICEF (2020) and Azzahra (2020), should be considered as a next step.

Socio-cultural environment

According to Belay (2020), children's interests and performance are heavily influenced by their parental background. He presented an example of how children from higher-income homes tend to have more positive attitudes on monitoring and giving learning toolkits. This study aligns with the notion in terms of education level. However, in terms of welfare levels, this study contradicts Belay's (2020) claim. Empirical data analysis from rural Jember shows that culture has a greater influence than the degree of welfare. The culture in question is derived from the two dominant ethnic groups in Jember, namely ethnic Javanese in southern Jember and ethnic Madurese on the north and south coasts of Jember.

Javanese people in Andongsari and Ampel villages tend to think pragmatically towards education. That means, attending to school is determined by whether or not the results of schooling are beneficial to students and their livelihoods (Taylor et al., 2008). For them, if LFH does not make life easier for the children and their families (in fact, it is a hassle/burden), then it is unnecessary. Instead, children are trained to assist their parents at work so that they will have practical skills that they believe will be more productive and useful later in life. This is why the implementation of home visits occasionally fails since the teacher is unable to locate the children at home. This idea is vividly represented in the following interview excerpts from students' parents, who, when questioned about their efforts to assist LFH responded:

It's like a holiday. What can I do? I'm only a peasant; why am I even being asked to be teacher? I sent Rohman (the informant's kid) to school so he could learn to read and write, unlike his parents, who only know about money, fertilizer, and hoe. Instead of being dizzy, sir, I took Rohman to the fields. He is sixth grader, and he is capable of assisting us while training how to make money [Rohimah, interview, 9 February 2022].

It's the same as parents becoming instructors if it's done online. I'm not familiar with any educational subjects. I was married in the second grade of junior high school. I usually just go with it, and if you don't know, that's fine. I brought him here (pointing west direction). That land is leased by the sugar factory. The sugar cane workers will be Rp. 100.000 a day. It's okay while waiting for the teacher to come home [Witing, interview, 9 February 2022].

This pragmatic mindset has, in fact, been around for a long time. This cognitive construct has become a way of life for rural communities, particularly those with subsistence qualities, whether they live in fields, plantations, or coastal environments. To clearly illustrate the characteristics of subsistence communities, it is critical to use the following farmer groups as examples, which also represent the livelihood hierarchy of plantation workers and fisherman on the coast.

Farmers in rural Jember are divided into two categories. The first group is farmers or agricultural entrepreneurs who grow for profit (business). The second group is the peasant, which is subsistence or focused to meet life's essentials in a minimalist manner (Rahardjo, 2017). Wharton (2008) still categorizes subsistence character into two types: production subsistence and living subsistence. Production subsistence is characterized by a low degree of commercialization and monetization of crop yields. Living subsistence is characterized by self-consumption of the harvest (not sold). However, there are no peasant with subsistence character anymore. Farmers are grouped into two groups: All of them are dichotomously divided into farmer and peasant (production subsistence).

This style of community organization also applies to communities in plantation worker settlements and coastal villages. The profit-oriented plantation worker is characterized by the foreman status he obtained from PTPN which manages tea, coffee and cocoa plantations. Meanwhile, subsistence workers are typically identified as harvesters and bush weeders. Similarly, in fishing settlements, there is a hierarchy of livelihoods. Ownership of ship distinguishes profit-oriented fisherman from subsistence fishermen who possess a boat. The catch is, of course, significantly different. As a result, subsistence fisherman typically employ their child to help in their boat or to work as assistants on the skipper's ship in his village. The goal is that children can imitate the masters who can be successful without having to attend high school. Even the skipper's son, who is financially sufficient of meeting the online facilities supporting LFH, frequently wants to go to sea.

The reasons stated above show that community pragmatism has a considerable influence on school priorities. Children eventually transform the character appointed by their parents into a cherished and emulated role model. During one of the interviews, a fisherman's son from Sumberrejo Village stated: "*Haji Solihin went to junior high school and continued to go fishing. He is now wealthy. He has a car, four cows, and those red ships*" [Rizal, 14 years-old, interview, 16 February 2022]. This is what is meant by cultural factors having a greater influence than welfare factors, because the decision to participate in LFH or not is based on pragmatic thinking rather than financial ability. This cultural trend is more visible in the children of ethnic Madurese in northern Jember.

Madurese communities in rural Jember strongly adhere in the philosophy of *Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu', Ghuru, Rato*. In the Madurese language, *Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu'* means fathers and mothers, *Ghuru* means instructor (signifies: *kiai*), and *Rato* means queen or king (signifies: government). According to Holis et al. (2019), this worldview demonstrates a very high reverence for the key figures of life in the Islamic tradition adopted by the Madurese society. The concept, however, is hierarchical. Parents are treated with the utmost respect. Everything they stated absolutely had to be obeyed. The kiai is then respected, and eventually the government. In this situation, teachers in schools are parts of the rato (unless the teacher is also a kiai or religious figure in the community). As a result, children perceive the LFH policy as a government directive that must be implemented with the permission of parents and kiai.

As a religious community, on the other hand, traditional Madurese parents have great respect for the kiai. On situations that they cannot decide on their own, Madurese parents frequently advise their children to consult and obey the kiai. Practically, the kiai has the highest authority in social control, despite the fact that in the philosophy of Bhuppa'-Bhabbhu', Ghuru, Rato, he occupies the second stage priority. According to Latief et al. (2009), this high regard causes rural Madurese children to prefer the *ngaji* (recite Qur'an dan learn islamic manner) over school. It does not matter if they drop out of school as long as they continue to *ngaji*. Miftakhuddin et al. (2016) discovered that the cultural tendency had shifted marginally seven years later. Kiai tend to instruct their pupils to be active at school in the morning, assist their parents in the fields in the afternoon, and ngaji at night. Instead, the school does not have domination on the Islamic teaching in school curriculum.

Thus, the Madurese cultural register provides a sound understanding of how to uphold the honor of parents, kiai, and the government (Sukri, 1999). This conception has evolved into a personality that is passed down through informal and non-formal education (Fitriani, 2020). It is a metric that establishes priority in all elements of traditional Maduree life, including formal education and the dynamics that surround it. In the context of this research, information regarding the pattern of children's obedience to prominent figures and their relationship to the achievement of LFH is a basic reference in the framework education strategies based on local wisdom.

Preference and Aspirations

A study by Cui et al. (2021) in China claim that the transition from F2F to LFH lowers children's performance in learning and completing academic tasks. Furthermore, they discovered that parents were stressed and frequently complained about the challenges they experienced. Cui et al. (2021) were then propose enhancing learning interaction and decreasing the provision of academic assignments to maintain the mental health of parents and children. Parents' choices and goals in rural Jember are nearly identical to the above experience. In rural Jember, parents' preferences and aspirations are nearly identical to the above experience.

Parents frequently question the volume of tasks assigned to children, the lack of LFH support services, and the obligation imposed on parents to instruct their children. That aspirations, however, was not communicated to anyone. Parents are unsure about who to approach or how to express their desires. One of the parents stated in an interview, "*This has never been online, sir. When I was student, school was at school. Home is for homework. After all, this home is now a school. So, who is the teacher?*" [Suparmu, interview, February 12, 2022]?

In addition to representing aspirations, the interview excerpts indicate a preference for learning conditions at school, despite the fact that learning takes place at home. This preference is also reinforced by children's, who claimed that they were less enthused about implementing LFH because the atmosphere was not the same as classical learning at school.

One of the reasons for the low appeal of home learning for children is the absence of social presence from classmates (Sikirit, 2020). So far, home learning under a home visit scheme to perform collective teaching has proven to be the most successful technique to accommodate such structural constraints. Teachers frequently send information about collective LFH via WhatsApp a few days before the visit. This strategy, however, does not always work. In some circumstances, the teacher was unable to locate the children because they were out in the fields or fishing with their parents.

The findings in this study illustrate a distinctive perception of LFH that has not been revealed by other researchers. Research by Lase et al. (2022) in rural Gunungsitoli, Ludji & Marpaung (2021) in rural Kupang, and Husain et al. (2020) in rural Morotai shows that children and parents do not have experience implementing LFH. However, they have no choice but to adhere to BDR, notwithstanding its restrictions. In this study, parents and children have two alternatives: (a) urging school teachers to do collective teaching at home, and (b) accomplishing tasks in a haphazard manner.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study ultimately concludes that a government education policy is not always addressed linearly by the community. When the LFH policy is formulated in this manner at the national level, the execution at the regional and educational unit levels can differ greatly. Based on our findings in this study, we claim that the level of community development (in terms of economy, education, literacy, and digital infrastructure) and the way or cultural guidelines of the community in interpreting the policy determine the diversity of implementation. All of these elements combine to produce a support system that influences LFH implementation.

This study indicates that whether or not an education policy is implemented is determined not by the theoretical quality of the policy, but by the fit and proper (appropriateness) between the policy and the policy recipients. Furthermore, based on the findings of this study, it appears that cultural intervention has contributed to the adoption of LFH, and in fact its impact is significant. As a result, one of the practical implications of this study is that it corrects a number of prior studies that identified poverty and underdevelopment as the most relevant determinants in the success of LFH in rural children.

Based on these implications, we recommend that the next researcher to conduct an inductive flow study to ensure that education policies meet the criteria of fit and proper (appropriateness). The following study could look into the planning for the Implementation of the Kurikulum Merdeka (IKM), or other policy studies involving persons from vulnerable/marginal groups.

REFERENCE

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: The challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *0*(0), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180

Agaton, C. B., & Cueto, L. J. (2021). Learning at home: Parents' lived experiences on distance learning during COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *10*(3), 901–911. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21136

Alifia, U., Barasa, A. R., Bima, L., Pramana, R. P., Revina, S., & Tresnatri, F. A. (2020). *Belajar dari rumah: Potret ketimpangan pembelajaran pada masa pandemi covid-19* (Issue Smeru Research Institute No. 1/2020).

Azzahra, N. F. (2020). *Addressing distance learning barriers in Indonesia amid the Covid-19 pandemic*. Center for Indonesian Policy Studies. https://doi.org/10.35497/309162

Belay, D. G. (2020). COVID-19, distance learning and educational inequality in rural. *Pedagogical Research*, *5*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/9133

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research method for the social sciences* (6th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

BPS. (2022). *Indeks pembangunan manusia*. Badan Pusat Statistik Jember. https://jemberkab.bps.go.id/subject/26/indeks-pembangunan-manusia.html

Crain, W. (2014). *Theories of development: Concepts and applications* (6th ed.). Pearson. https://doi.org/10.1037/018101

Crouch, L., Kaffenberger, M., & Savage, L. (2021). Using learning profiles to inform education priorities: An editors' overview of the Special Issue. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *86*(July), 102477. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102477

Cui, S., Zhang, C., Wang, S., Zhang, X., Wang, L., Zhang, L., Yuan, Q., Huang, C., Cheng, F., Zhang, K., & Zhou, X. (2021). Experiences and attitudes of elementary school students and their parents toward online learning in China during the COVID-19 pandemic: Questionnaire study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *23*(5), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.2196/24496

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. McGraw-Hill.
Fauzi, I., Salim, H., & Syafrudin, U. (2021). Online learning paradigm in elementary schools: An evaluation by teachers in Indonesia during covid-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Iqra': Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan*, *6*(2), 166–183.
Ferdig, R., Cavanaugh, C., & Freidhoff, J. (2012). *Lessons learned from blended programs: Experiences and recommendations from the field*. iNACOL.
Fitriani, A. S. (2020). *Bhuppa' bhabbhu' guru & rato dalam cultural character masyarakat Madura*. UIN Sunan Ampel.
Gupta, D., & Khairina, N. N. (2020). *COVID-19 and learning inequities in Indonesia: Four ways to bridge the gap*. Worldbank.Org. https://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/covid-19-and-learning-inequities-indonesia-four-ways-bridge-gap
Herwin, H., Education, F., & Yogyakarta, U. N. (2021). How elementary school teachers organized online learning during the Covid-19 Pandemic? *World Journal on Educational Technology*, *13*(3), 437–449.
Holis, M., Ishomuddin, In'am, A., & Sulardi. (2019). *Fenomena guru: Perspektif fungsi & identitas sosial*. Jakad Media Publishing.
Husain, B., Kofia, M. I., Basri, M., & Mahmud, N. (2020). Parents' perception on implementing e-learning during new normal era at rural school. *Jurnal IKA PGSD*, *8*(2), 429–439. https://doi.org/10.36841/pgsdunars.v8i2.845
Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy*. Springer.
Kaffenberger, M. (2019). A typology of learning profiles: Tools for analysing the dynamics of learning. *RISE Insights*, 1–6.
MoEC. (2020a). *Kemendikbud rilis hasil survei evaluasi belajar dari rumah*. Kemdikbud.Go.Id. https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2020/05/kemendikbud-rilis-hasil-survei-evaluasi-belajar-dari-rumah
MoEC. (2020b). *Kemendikbud terbitkan pedoman penyelenggaraan belajar dari rumah*. Kemdikbud.Go.Id. https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2020/05/kemendikbud-terbitkan-pedoman-penyelenggaraan-belajar-dari-rumah
MoEC. (2020c). *Mendikbud Nadiem Makarim ajak orang tua berperan lebih besar dalam mendidik anak*. Kemdikbud.Go.Id. http://ditpsd.kemdikbud.go.id/artikel/detail/mendikbud-nadiem-makarim-ajak-orang-tua-berperan-lebih-besar-dalam-mendidik-anak#
MoEC. (2020d). *Peringati hardiknas, mendikbud ajak guru dan orang tua bersinergi optimalkan pembelajaran*. Kemdikbud.Go.Id. https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2020/05/peringati-hardiknas-mendikbud-ajak-guru-dan-orang-tua-bersinergi-optimalkan-pembelajaran
Surat Edaran No.15 tentang Pedoman Penyelenggaraan Belajar Dari Rumah Dalam Masa Darurat Penyebaran Corona Virus Desease (Covid-19), (2020).
MoEC. (2021). *Keputusan bersama 4 menteri tentang panduan penyelenggaraan pembelajaran di masa pandemi Covid-19*. Kemdikbud.Go.Id. https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2021/12/keputusan-bersama-4-menteri-tentang-panduan-penyelenggaraan-pembelajaran-di-masa-pandemi-covid19
Lase, D., Zega, T. G. C., Daeli, D. O., & Zaluchu, S. E. (2022). Parents' perceptions of distance learning during covid-19 in rural Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *16*(1), 103–113. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3890610
Latief, M. A., Khutobah, Tasnim, Z., & Rozaq, A. (2009). *Faktor-faktor penyebab anak usia sekolah pendidikan dasar tidak bersekolah di Kabupaten Jember*. Universitas Jember.
Ludji, I., & Marpaung, T. (2021). Parents' perception on the implementation of home learning during covid-19 (A case study on elementary school in rural area). *Jurnal Basicedu*, *5*(5), 3636–3643. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i5.1013
Miftakhuddin, M. (2019). Dedication of Unej Mengajar to improve the human resources quality in the retarded areas of Jember through a participatory approach. *Proceeding of Community*

Development, *2*, 454-466. https://doi.org/10.30874/comdev.2018.1463
Miftakhuddin, Masyhud, M. S., & Yuliati, N. P*enyebab Putus sekolah pada anak usia sekolah pendidikan dasar tahun 2013-2015 ditinjau dari perspektif etnosains dan cara mengatasinya (Studi kasus di Kec. Arjasa Kab. Jember Tahun 2016)*. Universitas Jember.
Miftakhuddin, Mustadi, A., & Zulfiati, H. M. (2019). Misconceptions between Social Studies and Social Sciences among Pre-Service Elementary Teachers. *International Journal of Education*, *12*(1), 16-25. https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v12i1.17514
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publication.
Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. Routledge.
Nita, V., Cahyaningsih, A. A. N., & Rachmawati, U. (2021). Online learning in elementary school during the Covid-19 pandemic. *The 14th University Research Colloqium 2021*, 96–100. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003206019-18
O'Byrne, W. I., & Pytash, K. E. (2015). Hybrid and blended learning: Modifying pedagogy across path, pace, time, and place. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *59*(2), 137–140. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.463
O'leary, Z. (2017). *The essential guide to doing your research project* (3rd ed.). Sage Publication.
Prior, D. D., Mazanov, J., Meacheam, D., Heaslip, G., & Hanson, J. (2016). Attitude, digital literacy and self efficacy: Flow-on effects for online learning behavior. *Internet and Higher Education*, *29*, 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.01.001
Priyoyuwono. (2008). Pendekatan fenomenologis terhadap komponen pendidikan. *Fondasia*, *1*(9), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.21831/foundasia.v1i9.5869
Rahardjo. (2017). *Pengantar sosiologi pedesaan dan pertanian*. UGM Press.
Rao, C. S. (2019). Blended learning: A new hybrid teaching methodology. *Journal of Research Scholar and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, *13*(3), 2456–8104.
Reddy, D. S., & Ramesh. (2020). Pros and cons of e-learning by children in rural areas during lockdown situation and ways to empower it. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Research*, 7–9.
Salim, H., & Hanif, M. (2021). Online media acceptance andk use in Indonesian rural area: Primary schools teacher's perspective. *Education and Human Development Journal*, *6*(1), 62–75.
Setiawan, B., & Iasha, V. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic: The influence of full-online learning for elementary school in rural areas. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar*, *6*(2), 114–123.
Sikirit, D. (2020). *The challenges of home learning during the COVID-19 pandemic*. UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/education-and-adolescents/coronavirus/stories/learning-home-during-covid-19-pandemic
Stolz, S. A. (2020). Phenomenology and phenomenography in educational research: A critique. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *52*(10), 1077–1096. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1724088
Sukri, R. A. (1999). Konsep "bapa'' babu' guru rato" pada masyarakat Madura sebagai wujud pengamalan sila ke-2 pancasila." *Jurnal Filsafat*, *30*, 143–153.
Suranto. (2006). Implementasi pendekatan fenomenologis dalam penelitian pendidikan. *Efisiensi: Kajian Ilmu Administrasi*, *6*(3), 218–228.
Taylor, M., Schreier, H., & Ghiraldelli, P. (2008). *Pragmatism, education and children: International philosophical perspectives*. Rodopi.
UNESCO, UNICEF, & World Bank. (2021). *COVID-19 learning losses: Rebuilding quality learning for all in the Middle East and North Africa* (p. 87). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380118
UNICEF. (2020a). *Covid-19: Are children able to continue learning during school closure?* UNICEF.
UNICEF. (2020b). *Strengthening digital learning across Indonesia: A study brief* (pp. 1–14). UNICEF.
UNICEF. (2021). *Situational analysis on digital learning landscape in Indonesia*. UNICEF.

https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/media/8766/file/Digital Learning Landscape in Indonesia.pdf
Wahyuningsih, I. (2021). The impact of teaching and learning online during covid-19 pandemic on primary school in rural area: A case study. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Masayarakat*, *6*(1), 727–732.
Wharton, C. R. (2008). *Subsistence agriculture & economic development*. Transaction Publisher.
Yarrow, N., & Bhardwaj, R. (2020). *Indonesia's education technology during COVID-19 and beyond*. Worldbank.Org. https://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/indonesias-education-technology-during-covid-19-and-beyond
Yustika, G. P., & Iswati, S. (2020). Digital literacy in formal online education: A short review. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, *15*(1), 66–76. https://doi.org/10.15294/dp.v15i1.23779