

Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: A Review of the Literature

Sara Bonetti and Mona Sakr

March 2026

Table of Contents

Executive summary	3
Background	4
Research Design	5
<i>Search 1: Academic literature</i>	5
<i>Search 2: Grey literature</i>	6
<i>Analysis</i>	6
Findings from the Literature	7
<i>Theme 1. Conceptualising quality in ECEC</i>	7
Structural and process quality	7
Broader conceptualisations	9
<i>Theme 2. Perspectives on quality</i>	9
Researchers' perspectives	10
Educators' perspectives	10
Parents' perspectives	11
Children's perspectives	11
The "contested" nature of quality.....	12
<i>Theme 3. Measuring and assuring quality</i>	12
Standardised tools	12
Quality improvement frameworks.....	13
Regulatory and policy frameworks.....	13
Conclusions: What We Know from the Literature	15
Bibliography	16
Appendix A	20

Executive summary

Quality in early childhood education and care is widely recognised as a key determinant of children's development and long-term outcomes. Yet despite its importance, the concept of quality remains difficult to define and operationalise across policy, research and practice. This rapid literature review synthesises international research published between 2015 and 2025 to examine how quality in early childhood education and care is conceptualised, measured, and supported across different systems. The review was carried out with funding from Nesta, with the immediate purpose of informing dialogues with policy-makers.

The review identifies several key insights:

- **Quality in early childhood education and care is widely described as contested**, yet across the literature there is substantial convergence around core elements such as qualified educators, responsive interactions, child-centred pedagogy, and safe and stimulating environments.
- **Most research conceptualises quality through two main dimensions: structural quality and process quality**, with growing recognition of a third dimension relating to **system-level conditions** such as funding, governance, and regulation.
- **Different stakeholders emphasise different aspects of quality**, but there is significant overlap between the perspectives of researchers, educators, parents, and children.
- **Standardised observational tools such as ECERS, CLASS and ITERS remain widely used internationally**, although they are increasingly critiqued for embedding particular pedagogical assumptions and privileging measurable aspects of quality.
- **Workforce conditions are consistently identified as a central lever for improving quality**, particularly educator qualifications, professional development, and supportive workplace cultures.
- **Market-based approaches to improving quality show mixed or weak evidence**, while regulatory frameworks and system-level investment appear more consistently associated with improvements in quality.

Overall, the literature suggests that while the concept of quality is complex and context-dependent, there is considerable agreement around the foundational elements required to support high-quality early childhood education and care.

Background

Quality early childhood education and care (ECEC) is a key determinant of children's long-term outcomes (Melhuish & Gardiner, 2020; OECD, 2012; von Suchodoletz et al., 2023). In England, recent policy developments have placed renewed emphasis on expanding access to ECEC, alongside broader reforms related to workforce development and system sustainability. These developments have intensified debates about quality: what it means, how it should be assessed and how it can be supported across the system.

However, existing literature portrays quality as a contested issue due to the absence of a universally agreed definition (Dahlberg, Moss & Pence, 2013; Moss, 2016; Tuastad et al., 2019). Different stakeholders bring diverse perspectives shaped by cultural contexts, pedagogical beliefs, and policy priorities, leading to fragmented policies, inconsistent practices, and disparities in children's learning experiences. Yet an important question remains: is there genuine disagreement on the core elements of quality in ECEC, or do these differences largely reflect varying perspectives and priorities?

This review responds to this challenge by examining how quality in ECEC is conceptualised, measured, and supported across the international literature. The Rapid Literature Review (RLR), carried out with funding from Nesta, aimed to establish a foundational understanding of how quality in ECEC is currently defined and operationalised around the world. In addition to examining academic research, the review also explored policy documents and quality frameworks to understand how quality is assessed, assured, and improved within different national systems, including England.

Current debates around quality are not merely theoretical. Despite the central role of quality in practice, research and policy, the lack of a shared understanding can contribute to fragmented policy approaches and inconsistent practices across the sector. Recent research on provision for children aged 0-2 highlights disparities in experiences for the youngest children, underscoring the importance of greater clarity around what constitutes quality in ECEC (Sakr, Bonetti & Halls, 2025).

Rather than remaining focused on fragmented debates, this review seeks to identify areas of consensus within the literature. The goal is not to impose a single definition of quality but to examine the principles, dimensions and system mechanisms that consistently emerge across research, policy, and practice. Developing a clearer understanding of these elements is an important step in supporting coherent policy, strengthening professional practice, and ensuring that every child has the best possible start in life.

Research Design

This RLR synthesises research published between 2015 and 2025 in order to explore definitions, perspectives, measurement approaches, and factors that influence and support quality in ECEC. The aim is to provide an overview of the global research on, and dialogues about, quality in ECEC in order to inform policy developments in England.

The search process consisted of two main components: academic literature and grey literature.

Search 1: Academic literature

Searches for academic literature on quality in ECEC were conducted using the Middlesex University library search system, which draws from a wide range of databases including Education Research Complete and Web of Science. We searched for permutations of the following terms:

- 'Quality' AND 'early learning'
- 'Quality' AND 'early years'
- 'Quality' AND 'childcare'
- 'Quality' AND 'early childhood education'
- 'Quality' AND 'daycare'
- 'Quality' AND 'preschool'

The results were filtered to include only peer-reviewed journal articles published in English between 2015 and 2025. Where search results were excessive, additional filters were applied to limit results to relevant subject areas, such as education, childhood studies and developmental psychology (as opposed to paediatrics [applied in the case of the 'childcare' search which yielded more than 1,000 results]). The initial search produced 1,710 results.

Results from the six searches were combined and 113 duplicates were removed, leaving a total of 1,597 results. Initial sifting was by title, determining whether the output was relevant. Many articles were removed at this stage because they related to other sectors (e.g. paediatrics) or were not in English. After sifting by title, 535 articles were identified as potentially relevant. Following a further process of sifting by abstract and excluding articles to which we did not have full access, we were left with a total of 81 articles for full review.

When sifting, our inclusion criteria were that the article explicitly discussed quality in ECEC, focusing on how quality is defined, conceptualised, measured and supported. Secondly, we looked for articles that discussed quality from the perspective of different stakeholders, including parents, children or educators. Thirdly, articles needed to be critiques of current definitions and measurements of quality. Finally, the article needed to analyse system-level changes and the impact on quality at a regional or national level, rather than local, small-scale interventions.

Articles were excluded if they focused primarily on the predictive relationship between structural variables and process quality without discussing the concept of quality itself, if they examined small-scale interventions or local projects rather than broader system-level issues, and more generally if they did not meaningfully engage with the concept of quality in ECEC.

Search 2: Grey literature

To search the grey literature, we used a generic Google search, filtering results published in English between 2015 and 2025. The search terms used were the same as the ones used for the academic literature. For each search term, the first 10 pages of results were recorded. Items that were not full reports or substantial documents, such as blogs, videos, webpages, or opinion pieces, were excluded. At that point, a total of 194 items were recorded.

After sifting the list to exclude results that belonged to the peer-reviewed literature or with links that were not working, a high number of duplicates were noticed. Therefore, results from the six searches were combined and 55 duplicates eliminated, leaving 139 items to review.

Titles were then screened for relevance to quality in ECEC. Many results were removed at this stage that were not focused on quality, leaving 99 items identified as potentially relevant.

A further review of these documents was carried out, applying the same inclusion criteria used for the academic literature. The key reasons for exclusion were that despite the mention of 'quality' in the title or the intention, the focus of the item was strictly health-related or generic on early childhood development; focused on activities, play ideas or milestones, usually as a simple list with a brief explanation. Some items were excluded because they were short blogs, opinion pieces or lacking in-depth discussion or the source was a government or large-scale training provider. We were left with a final count of 20 items of grey literature to review in depth.

Analysis

Each item included in the review was analysed using a structured template designed to capture key aspects of how quality was addressed in the literature. Particular attention was paid to:

- whether and how quality was defined or conceptualised
- whether and how quality was measured or assessed
- the stakeholders involved in defining or evaluating quality
- any implications for policy or practice related to improving quality in ECEC systems.

In addition to the general search of grey literature, a targeted search was conducted to identify national or system-level quality frameworks used in ECEC. This involved reviewing documentation and publicly available materials from relevant national organisations and government bodies.

Findings from the Literature

In this section, we present the key findings emerging from the academic literature. The grey literature largely reinforced insights emerging from the academic literature and was used to contextualise findings within policy developments. While the literature frequently describes quality as contested, the review also reveals considerable areas of convergence across research, policy, and stakeholder perspectives regarding the key elements that underpin high-quality ECEC.

Our findings are organised according to the following themes:

1. Conceptualisations of quality
2. Perspectives on quality
3. Approaches to measuring and assuring quality.

The academic articles were categorised according to these themes (see Annex A). Out of the 80 articles that underwent full review, 63% (50) addressed the topic of the conceptualisation of quality, 33% (26) looked into different stakeholders' perspectives on quality, and 43% (34) investigated quality measurements and assurance. Several items addressed more than one theme.

Theme 1. Conceptualising quality in ECEC

Existing literature portrays quality as a contested issue due to the absence of a universally agreed definition. In fact, quality is often understood as value-laden, and influenced by various contexts, including economic, ethnic, cultural, and spiritual aspects (Dahlberg et al., 2024). Despite this diversity, common themes and definitions emerge across the literature.

A recurring question in the literature concerns the primary purpose of evaluating quality. Is it to improve child development and secure health and well-being, or does it serve broader purposes such as accountability, legitimization, or even the professionalisation of the workforce? The literature suggests that quality evaluation serves multiple purposes—child development, accountability, workforce professionalisation—and these must be clarified (Rudoe, 2020; Dahlberg et al., 2024).

Structural and process quality

The most prevalent conceptualisation divides quality into two main dimensions (Eadie et al., 2024):

Structural Quality refers to the set of more distal, regulated, and often measurable inputs or features that set the stage for quality interactions. It includes aspects such as:

- **Staff qualifications and continuous professional development (CPD):** Higher teacher educational levels are consistently associated with better classroom interaction

quality (Yang, Rao & Sun, 2024; von Suchodoletz et al., 2023). Frequency and diversity of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) also correlate positively with quality. CPD interventions for caregivers are moderately effective in improving caregiver-child interaction quality and overall childcare quality at the classroom level (Yang, Rao & Sun, 2024).

- **Child-to-staff ratios and group size:** Smaller groups and lower ratios are linked to favourable conditions for quality, though evidence shows trade-offs when regulations alter workforce composition (Wysłowska & Slot, 2020; Ali et al., 2024).
- **Physical environment and resources:** Adequate infrastructure, age-appropriate activities, materials, and health and safety standards are also key components (Brodin et al., 2015; Diale & Sewagegn, 2021).
- **Government investment and regulations:** These form the foundation for quality, establishing minimum standards and influencing structural indicators like qualification levels and ratios. Minimum standards underpin quality but can have unintended effects, particularly when framed through market logics (Ali et al., 2024).

Process Quality refers to children's actual experiences and interactions within the ECEC provision. Key elements include:

- **Educator-child interactions:** High-quality, responsive interactions are consistently linked to child outcomes. High-quality interactions involve responsiveness, emotional support, and opportunities for sustained shared thinking (von Suchodoletz et al., 2023; Soliday Hong et al., 2019).
- **Pedagogical approaches and curriculum:** Developmentally appropriate, child-centred, and play-based approaches are emphasised. The Te Whāriki curriculum in New Zealand, for example, links pedagogical theories to quality, highlighting bioecological, sociocultural, Kaupapa Maori, and Pasifika theories (Winslow et al., 2025).
- **Children's engagement and wellbeing:** These are considered central to process quality, and are sometimes the main focus of measurement tools, such as the Leuven scale (Rudoe, 2020; Cade et al., 2022).
- **Inclusion and diversity:** Quality ECEC should be culturally responsive and empowering for all children; some explicitly look at how ECEC provision can counter disadvantage for young children and position this as a central facet of quality (Sumsion et al., 2018).

While structural indicators alone do not directly influence child developmental outcomes, it is agreed that they are strongly correlated with process quality indicators, which in turn do link directly to outcomes (von Suchodoletz et al., 2023).

Broader conceptualisations

Beyond the structural-process quality dimensions, several additional conceptualisations of quality emerge in the literature that are important to consider:

- **System quality:** This third domain considers the overall system supports, including funding, regulatory standards, and the synergies and effectiveness of different elements of the ECEC system (Eadie et al., 2024; Størksen et al., 2024).
- **Quality as contextual and culturally responsive:** Several articles emphasise that quality is not universal but needs to be defined and understood within specific local, cultural and national contexts. For instance, the New Zealand framework embeds quality in its cultural context through Kaupapa Maori and Pasifika theories (Winslow et al., 2025; Diale & Sewagegn, 2021).
- **Quality as transformative:** Some perspectives, particularly from parents and educators, define quality through its transformative impact on both children and parents, emphasising trust, emotional support and community embeddedness (Demissie & Pearse, 2024).
- **Quality as a negotiated and multi-voiced construct:** Quality can be seen as emerging from negotiations and dialogues involving various stakeholders (Sollars, 2020; Sollars 2022).

Policy lever: workforce development and professionalism

The literature consistently identifies the ECEC workforce as a central lever for improving quality. In particular, educator qualifications and access to professional development are associated with stronger quality provision. The evidence also suggests that workforce development is most effective when it is supported by positive workplace cultures, opportunities for reflective practice, and ongoing access to professional learning within settings (Yang et al., 2024).

Theme 2. Perspectives on quality

Different stakeholders hold distinct, yet often overlapping, perspectives on what constitutes quality in ECEC. These perspectives are interwoven with broader discourses that shape how quality is framed in practice, research and policy:

- **Community discourses** link quality to relationships and community connectedness (Sollars, 2020; Sollars, 2022; Waters-Davies et al., 2023).
- **Market discourses** rely on free market forces and parental "choice" to improve quality, a premise often challenged by research.

- **Investment discourses** view ECEC quality as crucial for future economic and societal benefits, positioning children and families as "human resources". This perspective suggests that if ECEC is an investment, quality is necessary for that investment to "pay off" in terms of improved child outcomes and national prosperity (Wong & Rao, 2022; Chandler & Dilmaghani, 2025).

Researchers' perspectives

Researchers often define quality through established measures and their associations with child outcomes. Some of the standardised measures discussed in the literature are tools like the ECERS (Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale), CLASS (Classroom Assessment Scoring System), and ITERS-R (Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised), which are widely used globally to measure various aspects of quality, particularly process quality. These measures are often designed to view the environment from the child's perspective (Clifford et al., 2020).

Meta-analyses confirm modest but significant associations between these measures and child outcomes (Soliday Hong et al., 2019; von Suchodoletz et al., 2023). However, critics argue that these tools reflect Anglo-American assumptions and embed specific pedagogical assumptions, potentially overlooking relational and ethical aspects of quality. A strain of academic literature, particularly drawing on critical theory, argues that the concept of quality has been shaped by neoliberal and managerial influences, leading to a focus on quantifiable, standardised, and often reductive measures. This perspective suggests that such definitions can disempower educators and families and overlook the complex, ethical, and relational aspects of ECEC (Dahlberg et al., 2024).

Beyond these criticisms, studies using these measures generally find modest, though significant, associations between quality and children's developmental outcomes. This has led some to question whether quality should only be defined by its impact on developmental outcomes, or instead through its broader impact, suggesting that a more visionary understanding of the impact of high-quality ECEC is also needed (Demissie & Pearse, 2024).

Educators' perspectives

Educators' understandings of quality are often nuanced and multi-dimensional, extending beyond standardised definitions. Examples from the literature:

- In Malta, educators highlighted factors such as the environment, relationships with children, parents, and colleagues, educator attitudes and qualifications, child-oriented factors (learning, wellbeing, engagement), and issues with policy and praxis (Sollars, 2022).
- In England, nursery school headteachers emphasized individualised child progress, the 'reflective practitioner,' and children's wellbeing and involvement, viewing each child as a 'whole child' (Rudoe, 2020).

- Across various countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Italy, Georgia), educators value policy frameworks for establishing shared standards and supporting reflective practice, but express frustration with administrative burdens and perceived lack of pedagogical freedom (Brodin et al., 2015).
- Australian educators conceptualize quality as a “multidimensional, value-laden synergy involving leadership, children’s agency, relational warmth, and dynamic flow” highlighting intangible aspects like culture and ethos (Sumsion et al., 2018).
- Family childcare providers in the US, particularly immigrant/refugee providers, often define quality through “relational and community-centred caregiving”, which may conflict with standardised Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) definitions (Taing, 2023).

Parents’ perspectives

Parents' views on quality often align with, but also extend beyond, professional definitions.

- In Malta, parents identified themes such as setting-related factors, child-related factors, educator and administrator factors, relationships and communication with families, and policies and praxis. There is significant overlap with educators' perspectives (Sollars, 2020).
- Parents are generally aware of quality and have an implicit understanding that connects with externally observed quality measurements. Their perceptions can be influenced by factors like the child's relationship with their key person, especially in home-based settings. In Portugal, parents and teachers rated classroom quality more highly than external observers, raising questions about whose perceptions matter most (Barros & Leal, 2015).
- Parents in Hong Kong and Singapore prioritised affordability alongside trust and developmental programming (Wong & Rao, 2022).

Children’s perspectives

Increasingly, research is exploring quality from the direct perspectives of children, often using creative and play-based methods. Children's voices can and should be drawn into quality frameworks and some of the literature explored this. For example:

- In the US, children aged 4-6 described a "good early years professional" as a teacher who adapts to the culture of childhood and attends to individual diversity, highlighting specific ideas like "awareness of children's full potential" and "active listening to children" (Werner, et al., 2015).
- In Finland, asking children what they dislike about ECEC services revealed insights into quality, with common complaints relating to negative peer interactions, being limited in their behaviours (rules), and a negative atmosphere (e.g., too loud) (Brodin et al, 2015).

- In Germany, children's feedback in a quality evaluation process centred on wanting to decide what they do, move freely, complaining about rules and punishments, and disliking mandatory outdoor time or eating situations (Werner et al., 2015).

While children can form and express views on aspects of their lives, some researchers recognised that it's important to acknowledge that not all children can form or express views on all issues, especially complex policy matters (Wright et al., 2023).

The "contested" nature of quality

While some argue quality is deeply contested (Dahlberg et al., 2024), bottom-up and top-down perspectives often converge on similar elements: qualified staff, safe environments, child-centred pedagogy, and strong relationships (Brodin et al., 2015; Sollars, 2022). This raises the question of whether quality is truly contested, or whether disagreements concern how quality should be measured and governed.

Policy lever: parental engagement and information

Parents play an important role in shaping and recognising quality in ECEC systems. While families often rely on informal signals such as recommendations or personal impressions when choosing childcare, research suggests that strengthening parents' understanding of what constitutes high-quality early learning can support improvements at a system level (Barros & Leal, 2015). This implies a shift in how parents are positioned within ECEC systems: not only as consumers making choices, but as partners and co-constructors of quality (Demissie & Pearse, 2024).

Theme 3. Measuring and assuring quality

Various mechanisms are employed to measure, assure, and improve quality in ECEC.

Standardised tools

As mentioned, tools such as ECERS, CLASS, ITERS-R are widely used for quality assessment. These tools are seen as implicit theories of quality, reflecting specific pedagogical understandings (e.g., CLASS's focus on "serve and return" exchanges). While their predictive power for child outcomes can be modest, they are useful for providing a baseline understanding of quality and for guiding improvement efforts, and remain widely used globally, often integrated into national frameworks (Siraj et al., 2019).

However, evidence also points to important divergences between externally assessed quality and stakeholder perceptions. For example, Barros and Leal (2015), using ITERS-R alongside parents' (using ITERS-Parent Questionnaire) and teachers' (using Teacher Questionnaire)

ratings, found parents and teachers seemed to consider provision's quality to be better than what researchers did. This highlights a tension between standardised assessments of quality and the ways in which quality is experienced and interpreted by different stakeholders, raising questions about how different perspectives should be weighted in defining and assessing quality.

Quality improvement frameworks

Some countries, e.g., the US and Australia, have well established and comprehensive quality frameworks, which are used to rate ECEC programs and/or drive continuous improvement. For example, some Quality Rating Improvement Systems (QRIS) in the USA involve tiered rating systems, quality standards, support for programs, financial incentives, and quality assurance.

A key debate exists around the effectiveness of QRIS in driving developmental gains for children, with some research suggesting weak associations between higher QRIS ratings and child outcomes. In addition, educators sometimes report that QRIS lead to "onerous workload requirements" for providing proof of quality, which can impede quality interactions with children (Connors & Morris, 2015; Siraj et al., 2019).

In a similar way, vouchers were introduced in Hong Kong as a way to increase parental bargaining power, anticipating that this in turn would lead to higher quality provision as a result of competition. However, this study found that quality assurance requirements attached to the vouchers, rather than marketization itself, led to perceived quality improvements (Wong & Rao, 2022). There is little evidence to suggest that the force of market competition supports quality improvement in ECEC.

Regulatory and policy frameworks

National and regional policy frameworks play a significant role in defining and enforcing quality standards around the world:

- Norway, despite its generous and renowned quality ECEC offer, has found the need to establish explicit definitions of structural, process, and results quality at a national level (Størksen et al., 2024).
- In Australia, the National Quality Standard (NQS) aims to raise quality through national law, regulations, and an assessment and rating process. And while it embedded visionary concepts such as belonging, this risks being constrained by dominant interpretations (Sumsion et al., 2018).
- Inspection systems, like the Corrective and Preventive Actions (CAPA) process in Ireland, can be effective in fostering quality improvement by identifying non-compliance and driving tangible quality improvements (Rouine, et al., 2022).
- US evidence shows that regulation can create unintended labour market effects.

For example, Ali et al. (2024) found that in some cases stricter group size and ratio requirements limited the number of children providers were able to take in, in turn reducing the overall demand for childcare workers or forcing providers to hire less qualified staff to offset higher costs. These effects were most pronounced in lower-income areas, where providers struggled most to absorb regulatory cost.

However, some research critiques these frameworks as mechanisms of standardisation and regulation, potentially narrowing understandings of quality and prioritising measurable outcomes over holistic child development (Dahlberg et al., 2024).

Policy lever: systemic conditions and governance

The literature highlights the importance of system-level conditions in supporting quality in ECEC. Universal access alone is not sufficient; high-quality provision must also be widely available. Government investment, regulatory standards, and accountability frameworks play a key role in establishing minimum quality conditions and supporting improvement across the system (Størksen et al., 2024). At the same time, evidence suggests that market competition alone does not reliably lead to higher quality and may exacerbate inequalities in access to high-quality provision (Chandler & Dilmaghani, 2025).

Conclusions: What We Know from the Literature

The literature highlights that quality in ECEC is a complex and multi-dimensional construct shaped by a range of interacting factors. Across the international research base, quality is most commonly conceptualised through the interplay between structural conditions, process quality, and broader system-level factors. While debates remain about how quality should be defined and measured, the literature consistently points to a number of core elements that underpin high-quality ECEC.

These include the presence of qualified and well-supported educators, positive and responsive educator-child interactions, child-centred and developmentally appropriate pedagogies, and safe and stimulating learning environments. Structural features such as staff qualifications, professional development opportunities, group size, and ratios create the conditions that enable these experiences to occur, while process quality reflects the day-to-day interactions and learning experiences of children within ECEC settings.

At the same time, the literature increasingly recognises that quality cannot be understood solely at the level of individual settings. System-level conditions, including regulatory frameworks, funding structures, workforce policies, and accountability mechanisms, play a critical role in shaping the environments in which quality can emerge and be sustained. This highlights the importance of adopting a systemic perspective when considering how quality can be assessed, supported and improved.

The review also underscores the importance of recognising multiple perspectives in defining and understanding quality. While researchers, educators, parents, and children may emphasise different aspects of quality, the literature reveals considerable overlap in the elements they value. Incorporating these diverse perspectives can contribute to more meaningful and contextually relevant approaches to defining and supporting quality in ECEC.

Overall, the evidence suggests that although quality in ECEC is often described as a contested concept, there is significant convergence across the literature regarding the foundational conditions required to support high-quality early childhood education and care. Across research, policy, and stakeholder perspectives, a shared emphasis emerges around qualified and supported educators, strong educator-child relationships, child-centred pedagogies, and supportive learning environments, underpinned by system-level conditions such as effective governance, regulation, and sustained investment.

Recognising these areas of convergence can help shift debates about quality beyond questions of definition and towards a clearer understanding of the core conditions that underpin high-quality early childhood education and care systems.

Bibliography

Ali, U., Herbst, C. M. & Makridis, C. A. (2024). Minimum quality regulations and the demand for childcare labor. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 43(3), 660–695.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22568>

Barros, S. & Leal, T. B. (2015). Parents' and teachers' perceptions of quality in Portuguese childcare classrooms. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 30(2), 209–226.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-014-0235-4>

Brodin, J., Hollerer, L., Renblad, K., & Stancheva-Popkostadinova, V. (2015). Preschool teachers' understanding of quality in preschool: a comparative study in three European countries. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(6), 968–981.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.974035>

Cade, J., Wardle, F., & Otter, J. (2022). Quality early care and learning: Exploring child-centered pedagogy a qualitative multi-case study. *Cogent Education*, 9(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2144589>

Chandler, V., & Dilmaghani, M. (2025). Competition and childcare quality: Evidence from Quebec. *Journal of Social Policy*, 54(3), 868–893. doi:10.1017/S0047279423000314

Clifford, R. M., Yazejian, N., Cryer, D. & Harms, T. (2020). Forty years of measuring quality with the Environment Rating Scales. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 51, 164–166.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.08.006>

Connors, M. C. & Morris, P. A. (2015). Comparing state policy approaches to early care and education quality: A multidimensional assessment of quality rating and improvement systems and child care licensing regulations. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 30(Part B), 266–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.05.006>

Dahlberg, G., Moss P., and Pence A. (2013). *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Languages of Evaluation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P. & Pence, A. (2024). CIEC colloquium: Reflections on Beyond Quality at 25 years. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 25(1), 131–145.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491231222510>

Demissie, F. & Pearse, S. (2025). Parental engagement and transformation as a marker of quality in Early Childhood Education and Care. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 23(1), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X241293899>

Diale, B. M. & Sewagegn, A. A. (2021). Early childhood care and education in Ethiopia: A quest for quality. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 19(4), 516–529.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X21100255>

Eadie, P., Page, J., Levickis, P., Elek, C., Murray, L., Wang, L. & Lloyd-Johnsen, C. (2024). Domains of quality in early childhood education and care: A scoping review of the extent and consistency of the literature. *Educational Review*, 76(4), 1057–1086.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2077704>

Melhuish, E. & Gardiner, J. (2020). Study of Early Education and Development (SEED): Impact Study on Early Education Use and Child Outcomes up to age five years. Available online: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5e4e5c10e90e074dcd5bd213/SEED_AGE_5_REPORT_FEB.pdf

Moss, P. (2016). Why can't we get beyond quality? *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(1), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949115627895>

OECD (2012). Starting Strong III: A Quality Toolbox for Early Childhood Education and Care. OECD Publishing.

Rouine, H., McDonnell, F., & Hanafin, S. (2022). Making a Difference: The Impact of Statutory Inspection on the Quality of Early Years Services. *Child Care in Practice: Northern Ireland Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Child Care Practice*, 28(2), 153–163.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2019.1701410>

Rudoe, N. (2020). 'We believe in every child as an individual': Nursery school head teachers' understandings of 'quality' in early years education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 46(5), 1012–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3610>

Sakr, M., Bonetti, S. & Halls, K. (2025). Quality in the Baby Room: Actionable Findings from a Global Evidence Review. Available online: www.thebabyroom.blog/report-1

Siraj, I., Howard, S. J., Kingston, D., Neilsen-Hewett, C., Melhuish, E. C., & de Rosnay, M. (2019). Comparing regulatory and non-regulatory indices of early childhood education and care (ECEC) quality in the Australian early childhood sector. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 46(3), 365–383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00325-3>

Soliday Hong, S. L., Sabol, T. J., Burchinal, M. R., Tarullo, L., Zaslow, M., & Peisner-Feinberg, E. S. (2019). ECE quality indicators and child outcomes: Analyses of six large child care studies. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 49(2019), 202–217.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.06.009>

Sollars, V. (2020). Defining quality in early childhood education: parents. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 28(3), 319–331.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2020.1755488>

Sollars, V. (2022). Reflecting on 'quality' in early childhood education: practitioners' perspectives and voices. *Early Years*, 42(4–5), 613–630.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2020.1849034>

Størksen, I., Lenes, R., ten Braak, D., McClelland, M., & Golinkoff, R. M. (2025). Quality in Norwegian Early Childhood Education and Care: Progress, Persistent Challenges, and Recommendations for the Future. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 53(7), 2631–2640. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01770-1>

Sumsion, J., Harrison, L., Letsch, K., Bradley, B. S., & Stapleton, M. (2018). Belonging in Australian early childhood education and care curriculum and quality assurance: Opportunities and risks. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 19(4), 340–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949118796239>

Taing, V. (2023). From Rights Claims to Quality Frames in US Child Care Advocacy. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 64(4), 587–605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2023.2198574>

Tuastad, S. E., Bjørnstad, E., & Alvestad, M. (2019). Contested quality: The struggle over quality, play and preschooling in Norwegian early childhood education and care. In S. Garvis & S. Phillipson (Eds.), *Policification of early childhood education and care: Early childhood education in the 21st century* (Vol. 3). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203730539>

von Suchodoletz, A., Lee, D. S., Henry, J., Tamang, S., Premachandra, B., & Yoshikawa, H. (2023). Early childhood education and care quality and associations with child outcomes: A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 18(10): e0293056. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0293056>

Waters-Davies, J., Tyrie, J., Chicken, S., Knight, C., & Grout, E. (2025). Belonging, community and capability: listening to the voices of young children to realise process quality in early childhood curriculum enactment in Wales. *Education 3-13*, 53(8), 1410–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2023.2276854>

Werner, C.D., Linting, M., Vermeer, H.J., & Van Ijzendoorn, M.H. (2015). Noise in center-based child care: Associations with quality of care and child emotional wellbeing. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 42, pp. 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.05.003>

Winslow, R., Green, E., & Penman, F. R. (2025). Considerations of quality: examining theoretical perspectives informing infant and toddler pedagogy in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Early Years*, 45(2), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2024.2347944>

Wong, J. M. S., & Rao, N. (2022). Pursuing quality in early childhood education with a government-regulated voucher: views of parents and service providers in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy*, 37(1), 39–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1764628>

Wright, L. H. V., Rizzini, I., Gwele, M., McNair, L., Porto, C. L., Orgill, M., Tisdall, E. K. M., Bush, M., & Biersteker, L. (2023). Conceptualising quality early childhood education: Learning from young children in Brazil and South Africa through creative and play-based methods. *British Educational Research Journal*, 00, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3940>

Wysłowska, O., & Slot, P. L. (2020). Structural and Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care Provisions in Poland and the Netherlands: A Cross-National Study Using

Cluster Analysis. *Early Education and Development*, 31(4), 524–540.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2020.1734908>

Yang, Y., Rao, N., & Sun, J. (2024) From Pre-Service Preparation to Professional Development: Early Childhood Teachers' Learning Experiences, ECE Quality, and Child Development in China. *Early Education and Development*, 35(5), pp. 1080–1102.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2024.2336659>

Appendix A

Full Reference	Theme 1: Conceptualisations of quality	Theme 2: Perspectives on quality	Theme 3: Measuring / assuring quality	Country / context
Ali, U., Herbst, C. M. & Makridis, C. A. (2024). Minimum quality regulations and the demand for childcare labor. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 43(3), 660–695. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22568			✓	United States
Barros, S. & Leal, T. B. (2015). Parents' and teachers' perceptions of quality in Portuguese childcare classrooms. <i>European Journal of Psychology of Education</i> , 30(2), 209–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-014-0235-4		✓		Portugal
Brodin, J., Hollerer, L., Renblad, K., & Stancheva-Popkostadinova, V. (2015). Preschool teachers' understanding of quality in preschool: a comparative study in three European countries. <i>Early Child Development and Care</i> , 185(6), 968–981. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.974035		✓	✓	Sweden Austria Bulgaria
Cade, J., Wardle, F., & Otter, J. (2022). Quality early care and learning: Exploring child-centered pedagogy a qualitative multi-case study. <i>Cogent Education</i> , 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2144589		✓	✓	United States
Carlbaum, S., & Rönnerberg, L. (2025). Exporting preschool quality assurance: ideational power and legitimation of a Scandinavian edu-business. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research</i> , 69(7), 1505–1518. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2024.2434816	✓		✓	Sweden Norway
Chandler, V., & Dilmaghani, M. (2025). Competition and childcare quality: Evidence from Quebec. <i>Journal of Social Policy</i> , 54(3), 868–893. doi:10.1017/S0047279423000314			✓	Quebec (Canada)

Clifford, R. M., Yazejian, N., Cryer, D. & Harms, T. (2020). Forty years of measuring quality with the Environment Rating Scales. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 51, 164–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.08.006	✓		✓	NA
Connors, M. C. & Morris, P. A. (2015). Comparing state policy approaches to early care and education quality: A multidimensional assessment of quality rating and improvement systems and child care licensing regulations. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 30(Part B), 266–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.05.006	✓		✓	United States
Dahlberg, G., Moss, P. & Pence, A. (2024). CIEC colloquium: Reflections on Beyond Quality at 25 years. <i>Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood</i> , 25(1), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491231222510	✓			NA
Demissie, F. & Pearse, S. (2025). Parental engagement and transformation as a marker of quality in Early Childhood Education and Care. <i>Journal of Early Childhood Research</i> , 23(1), 93–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X241293899	✓			England
Diale, B. M. & Sewagegn, A. A. (2021). Early childhood care and education in Ethiopia: A quest for quality. <i>Journal of Early Childhood Research</i> , 19(4), 516–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X21100255	✓			Ethiopia
Drange, N. & Rønning, M. (2020). Child care center quality and early child development. <i>Journal of Public Economics</i> , 188, 104204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104204	✓			Norway (Oslo municipality)
Eadie, P., Page, J., Levickis, P., Elek, C., Murray, L., Wang, L. & Lloyd-Johnsen, C. (2024). Domains of quality in early childhood education and care: A scoping review of the extent and consistency of the literature. <i>Educational Review</i> , 76(4), 1057–1086. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2077704	✓			NA

Evans, K. (2016). Beyond a logic of quality: Opening space for material-discursive practices of readiness in early years education. <i>Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood</i> , 17(1), 65–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949115627904	✓			England
Fairchild, N. & Mikuska, E. (2024). String Figuring young children. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i> , 00: 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3990		✓		England
Fenech, M. & King, S. (2022). Problematizing early childhood teacher registration as a mechanism to improve quality early childhood education and care. <i>Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood</i> , 23(1), 68–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949119896023			✓	Australia
Fenech, M., Harrison, L. J., Press, F. & Sumsion, J. (2020). Using metaphor to illuminate quality in early childhood education. <i>Australasian Journal of Early Childhood</i> , 45(2), 197–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939120918482	✓			Australia
Fenech, M., Salamon, A., & Stratigos, T. (2019). Building parents' understandings of quality early childhood education and care and early learning and development: changing constructions to change conversations. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 27(5), 706–721. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2019.1651972		✓		Australia
Garrity, S. M., Longstreth, S. L., Lazarevic, V., & Black, F. V. (2021). Examining the tensions between cultural models of care in family childcare and Quality Rating Improvement Systems. <i>Children & Youth Services Review</i> , 122(2021), Article 105927, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.105927	✓			United States
Gol-Guven, M. (2018). Ensuring quality in early childhood education and care: the case of Turkey. <i>Early Child Development and Care</i> , 188(5), 557–570. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2017.1412957	✓			Turkey

Gordon, J. A., Herbst, C. M. & Tekin, E. (2021). Who's minding the kids? Experimental evidence on the demand for child care quality. <i>Economics of Education Review</i> , 80(2021), Article 102076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2020.102076	✓			United States
Grant, S., Comber, B., Danby, S., Theobald, M., & Thorpe, K. (2018). The quality agenda: governance and regulation of preschool teachers' work. <i>Cambridge Journal of Education</i> , 48(4), 515–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1364699		✓	✓	Australia
Gustafsson Nyckel, J., Johansson, E. M., Lager, K., & Zimmerman Nilsson, M. H. (2025). The travelling and embedding of discourses on quality in early childhood education and care. <i>Ethnography and Education</i> , 20(3), 181–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2024.2414296	✓			NA
Ha, N.T.N., Tham, M. & Hurley, P. (2025). Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care in Australia: A Systematic Literature Review. <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i> , 53, 2193–2206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01735-4	✓		✓	Australia
Håkansson, J. (2016). Organising and leading systematic quality work in the preschool - preschool managers. <i>School Leadership & Management</i> , 36(3), 292–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1247043	✓			Sweden
Harrison, L. J., Waniganayake, M., Brown, J., Andrews, R., Li, H., Hadley, F., Irvine, S., Barblett, L., Davis, B. & Hatzigianni, M. (2024). Structures and systems influencing quality improvement in Australian early childhood education and care centres. <i>The Australian Educational Researcher</i> , 51(1), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-022-00602-8	✓		✓	Australia

Helmerhorst, K. O. W., Riksen-Walraven, J. M. A., Gevers Deynoot-Schaub, M. J. J. M., Tavecchio, L. W. C. & Fukkink, R. G. (2015). Child Care Quality in The Netherlands Over the Years: A Closer Look. <i>Early Education and Development</i> , 26(1), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2014.948784	✓		✓	Netherlands
Hooper, A., Hallam, R. & Skrobot, C. (2021). “Our quality is a little bit different”: How family childcare providers who participate in a Quality Rating and Improvement System and receive childcare subsidy define quality. <i>Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood</i> , 22(1), 76–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491198589	✓		✓	United States
Hunkin, E. (2016). Deploying Foucauldian genealogy: Critiquing ‘quality’ reform in early childhood policy in Australia. <i>Power and Education</i> , 8(1), 35–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757743815624114	✓			Australia
Hunkin, E. (2018). Whose quality? The (mis)uses of quality reform in early childhood and education policy. <i>Journal of Education Policy</i> , 33(4), 443–456. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1352032	✓			Australia
Jackson, J. (2015a). Constructs of quality in early childhood education and care: A close examination of the NQS assessment and rating instrument. <i>Australasian Journal of Early Childhood</i> , 40(3), 46–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911504000307	✓		✓	Australia
Jackson, J. (2015b). Embracing multiple ways of knowing in regulatory assessments of quality in Australian early childhood education and care. <i>The Australian Educational Researcher</i> , 42(4), 515–526. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-015-0180-5	✓		✓	Australia

Kasprzak et al. (2020). A State System Framework for High-Quality Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education. <i>A State System Framework for High-Quality Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education.</i> , 40(2) 97–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121419831766			✓	United States
Kinkead-Clark, Z. (2024). System quality in early childhood care and education in Jamaica: Implications for policy. <i>European Journal of Education</i> , 59(2), e12607. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12607	✓			Jamaica
Kragh-Müller, G., & Ringsmose, C. (2015). Educational Quality in Preschool Centers. <i>Childhood Education</i> , 91(3), 198–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2015.1047311	✓		✓	NA
Kulikovskaya, I., Chumicheva, R., Kudinov, L. & Guryeva, M. (2021). Assessing preschool education quality via the ECERS-R scales. <i>E3S Web of Conferences</i> , 273(2021), 12085. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127312085	✓			Russia
Layland, J., & Smith, A.B. (2015). Quality in Home-Based Child Care for Under-Two-Year Old Children in Aotearoa New Zealand: Conceptualising Quality from Stakeholder Perspectives. <i>New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies</i> , 50, 269–284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-015-0019-7	✓	✓		New Zealand
Lee, E. S. (2021). A mixed-methods study of Maryland’s monetary incentives to improve the quality of child care centers. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 55(2021), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.01.002	✓		✓	United States
Lee, J. Y., & Sung, J. (2023). Multiple determinants of interaction quality among childcare providers. <i>Child & Youth Care Forum</i> , 52(4), 955–982. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-022-09713-w			✓	South Korea
Lehrer, J. S., Lemay, L. & Bigras, N. (2015). Parental Perceptions of Child Care Quality in Centre-Based and Home-Based Settings: Associations with External Quality Ratings.		✓	✓	Canada

International Journal of Early Childhood, 47(3), 481–497. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-015-0147-8				
Li, K., Pan, Y., Hu, B., Burchinal, M., De Marco, A., Fan, X. & Qin, J. (2016). Early childhood education quality and child outcomes in China: Evidence from Zhejiang Province. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 36(2016), 427–438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2016.01.009	✓			China
Logan, H. (2017). Tensions in constructions of quality in Australian early childhood education and care policy history. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 25(4), 506–518. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2017.1331063	✓			Australia
Logan, H. (2018). Retaining meanings of quality in Australian early childhood education and care policy history: perspectives from policy makers. <i>Early Years</i> , 38(2), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2018.1432573	✓	✓		Australia
Lopez Boo, F., Dormal, M., & Weber, A. (2019). Validity of four measures of child care quality in a national sample of centers in Ecuador. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 14(2): e0209987 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209987			✓	Ecuador
Lundy, L., Murray, C., Smith, K., & Ward, C. (2024). Young children's right to be heard on the quality of their education: Addressing potential misunderstandings in the context of early childhood education. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i> , 00, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3968		✓		NA
Macha, K., Hildebrandt, F., Wronski, C., Lonnemann, J., & Urban, M. (2024). Making it explicit - Sustained shared thinking dialogue as a way to explore children's perspectives on quality in German early childhood education and care. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i> , 00, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4054		✓		Germany

Macha, K., Urban, M., Lonnemann, J., Wronski, C., & Hildebrandt, F. (2024). Children’s perspectives on quality in ECEC as a specific form of participation. <i>International Journal of Early Years Education</i> , 32(1), 246–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2023.2299267		✓		Germany
McLean, C., Mclsaac, J. L. D., Mooney, O., Morris, S. B., & Turner, J. (2023). A Scoping Review of Quality in Early Childhood Publicly-Funded Programs. <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i> , 51(7), 1267–1278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-022-01372-9	✓			NA
Merrill, B., Cohen-Vogel, L., Little, M., Sadler, J., & Lee, K. (2020). “Quality” assurance features in state-funded early childhood education: A policy brief. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> , 113, 104972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104972			✓	United States
Nirmala, K. (2015). Childcare Staff and Parents' Beliefs about Quality Care for Infants/Toddlers in Centre-Based Programs in Singapore. <i>Australasian Journal of Early Childhood</i> , 40(3), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911504000314		✓		Singapore
Otero-Mayer, A., Expósito-Casas, E., & Vélaz-de-Medrano, C. (2025). Understanding Key Factors in Quality Early Childhood Education Care for Children Under Three: Insights from Spanish Settings. <i>International Journal of Early Childhood</i> , 57(2), 505–525. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-024-00408-y		✓	✓	Spain
Paananen, M., Kumpulainen, K., & Lipponen, L. (2015). Quality drift within a narrative of investment in early childhood education. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 23(5), 690–705. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2015.1104043	✓			Finland

Palaiologou, I. (2023). Early childhood provision, practice and quality: the ambiguity of the meaning of quality. <i>International Journal of Early Years Education</i> , 31(4), 839–843. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2023.2275413	✓			NA
Perlman, M., Falenchuk, O., Fletcher, B., McMullen, E., Beyene, J., & Shah, P. S. (2016). A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of a Measure of Staff/Child Interaction Quality (the Classroom Assessment Scoring System) in Early Childhood Education and Care Settings and Child Outcomes. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 11(12): e0167660. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167660			✓	NA
Phillips, A., & Fenech, M. (2023). Educators' perceptions of Australia's early childhood education and care quality assurance rating system. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 31(6), 988–1000. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2023.2211758		✓		Australia
Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Nguyen, T. (2020). Measuring and improving quality in early care and education. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 51(2020), 285–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.10.013	✓		✓	United States
Pihlainen, K., Reunamo, J., Sajaniemi, N., & Kärnä, E. (2022). Children's negative experiences as a part of quality evaluation in early childhood education and care. <i>Early Child Development and Care</i> , 192(5), 795–806. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2020.1801667	✓	✓		Finland
Raikes, A., Devercelli, A. E., & Kutaka, T. S. (2015). Global Goals and Country Action: Promoting Quality in Early Childhood Care and Education. <i>Childhood Education</i> , 91(4), 238–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2015.1069151	✓			NA
Rege, M., Solli, I. F., Størksen, I., & Votruba, M. (2018) Variation in center quality in a universal publicly subsidized and regulated childcare system. <i>Labour Economics</i> , 55, pp. 230–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2018.10.003			✓	Norway

Reinke, S., Peters, L., & Castner, D. (2019). Critically engaging discourses on quality improvement: Political and pedagogical futures in early childhood education. <i>Policy Futures in Education</i> , 17(2), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318788001			✓	United States
Robinson, C. (2017). Constructing quality childcare: perspectives of quality and their connection to belonging, being and becoming. <i>International Journal of Whole Schooling</i> , 13(1), 50-64.		✓		Australia
Rodríguez-Carrillo, J., Mérida-Serrano, R., & González-Alfaya, M.E. (2020). ‘A teacher’s hug can make you feel better’: Listening to U.S. children’s voices on high-quality early childhood teaching. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 28(4), 504-518. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2020.1783925		✓		United States
Rogers, M., Dolidze, K., Mus-Rasmussen, A., Dovigo, F., & Doan, L. (2026). Early childhood educators’ understandings of quality in five countries: similarities and differences to policy. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 34(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2025.2484241		✓		Australia Canada Denmark Italy Georgia
Rouine, H., McDonnell, F., & Hanafin, S. (2022). Making a Difference: The Impact of Statutory Inspection on the Quality of Early Years Services. <i>Child Care in Practice: Northern Ireland Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Child Care Practice</i> , 28(2), 153–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2019.1701410			✓	Ireland
Rudoe, N. (2020). ‘We believe in every child as an individual’: Nursery school head teachers’ understandings of ‘quality’ in early years education. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i> , 46(5), 1012–1025. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3610	✓	✓		England

Siraj, I., Howard, S. J., Kingston, D., Neilsen-Hewett, C., Melhuish, E. C., & de Rosnay, M. (2019). Comparing regulatory and non-regulatory indices of early childhood education and care (ECEC) quality in the Australian early childhood sector. <i>The Australian Educational Researcher</i> , 46(3), 365–383. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00325-3	✓		✓	Australia
Soliday Hong, S. L., Sabol, T. J., Burchinal, M. R., Tarullo, L., Zaslow, M., & Peisner-Feinberg, E. S. (2019). ECE quality indicators and child outcomes: Analyses of six large child care studies. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i> , 49(2019), 202–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.06.009	✓		✓	NA
Sollars, V. (2020). Defining quality in early childhood education: parents. <i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i> , 28(3), 319–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2020.1755488		✓		Malta
Sollars, V. (2022). Reflecting on ‘quality’ in early childhood education: practitioners’ perspectives and voices. <i>Early Years</i> , 42(4–5), 613–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2020.1849034		✓		Malta
Størksen, I., Lenes, R., ten Braak, D., McClelland, M., & Golinkoff, R. M. (2025). Quality in Norwegian Early Childhood Education and Care: Progress, Persistent Challenges, and Recommendations for the Future. <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i> , 53(7), 2631–2640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01770-1	✓			Norway
Sumsion, J., Harrison, L., Letsch, K., Bradley, B. S., & Stapleton, M. (2018). Belonging in Australian early childhood education and care curriculum and quality assurance: Opportunities and risks. <i>Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood</i> , 19(4), 340–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949118796239	✓	✓		Australia

Taing, V. (2023). From Rights Claims to Quality Frames in US Child Care Advocacy. <i>The Sociological Quarterly</i> , 64(4), 587–605. https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2023.2198574	✓			United States
Tebet, G. G. D. C., Lopes dos Santos, N., Costa, J., Santos, B. L., Pontes, L. C. B., de Oliveira, S., & Ângela D'Andrea, M. (2020). Babies' transition between family and early childhood education and care: a mosaic of discourses about quality of services. <i>Early Years</i> , 40(4-5), pp. 429–448. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2020.1825341	✓			Brazil
von Suchodoletz, A., Lee, D. S., Henry, J., Tamang, S., Premachandra, B., & Yoshikawa, H. (2023). Early childhood education and care quality and associations with child outcomes: A meta-analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 18(10): e0293056. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0293056	✓		✓	NA
Waters-Davies, J., Tyrie, J., Chicken, S., Knight, C., & Grout, E. (2025). Belonging, community and capability: listening to the voices of young children to realise process quality in early childhood curriculum enactment in Wales. <i>Education 3-13</i> , 53(8), 1410–1423. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2023.2276854		✓		Wales
Werner, C.D., Linting, M., Vermeer, H.J., & Van Ijzendoorn, M.H. (2015). Noise in center-based child care: Associations with quality of care and child emotional wellbeing. <i>Journal of Environmental Psychology</i> , 42, pp. 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.05.003			✓	Netherlands
Winslow, R., Green, E., & Penman, F. R. (2025). Considerations of quality: examining theoretical perspectives informing infant and toddler pedagogy in Aotearoa/New Zealand. <i>Early Years</i> , 45(2), 289–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2024.2347944	✓	✓		New Zealand

Wong, J. M. S., & Rao, N. (2022). Pursuing quality in early childhood education with a government-regulated voucher: views of parents and service providers in Hong Kong. <i>Journal of Education Policy</i> , 37(1), 39–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1764628	✓	✓		China (Hong Kong)
Wright, L. H. V., Rizzini, I., Gwele, M., McNair, L., Porto, C. L., Orgill, M., Tisdall, E. K. M., Bush, M., & Biersteker, L. (2023). Conceptualising quality early childhood education: Learning from young children in Brazil and South Africa through creative and play-based methods. <i>British Educational Research Journal</i> , 00, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3940	✓			Brazil South Africa
Wysłowska, O., & Slot, P. L. (2020). Structural and Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care Provisions in Poland and the Netherlands: A Cross-National Study Using Cluster Analysis. <i>Early Education and Development</i> , 31(4), 524–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2020.1734908	✓		✓	Poland Netherlands
Yang, Y., Rao, N., & Sun, J. (2024) From Pre-Service Preparation to Professional Development: Early Childhood Teachers' Learning Experiences, ECE Quality, and Child Development in China. <i>Early Education and Development</i> , 35(5), pp. 1080–1102. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2024.2336659	✓		✓	China