Transactions on Comparative Education (2024)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/trance.2024.060514
ISSN 2523-5818 Vol. 6 Num. 5

Policy Impact and Ideological Influences on Early Childhood Education in the United Kingdom: An Analysis of Key Reforms and Outcomes

Yinfei Wang

UCL Institute of Education, University College London, London, UK
qtnzyw0@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords: Educational policy, ideological influences, childhood outcomes

Abstract: This paper examines the profound impact of early childhood education policy within the United Kingdom, focusing on the interplay between policy, political ideology, and educational outcomes. As the bedrock of lifelong learning, early childhood education (ECE) has increasingly been recognized for its critical role in shaping children's futures. This paper explores the dominant discourses influenced by neoliberal ideology that have directed the evolution of early education policies in the UK. Through a detailed analysis of three pivotal policy initiatives, the 1999 Sure Start program, and the 2012 Early Years Foundation Stage reforms, this review assesses how political climates have sculpted educational directives. Utilizing both content and decision process analysis, the article evaluates the effectiveness of these policies in enhancing accessibility, affordability, and quality of early education, while also considering their impact on professional development and disadvantaged children. The findings aim to provide a nuanced understanding of the strengths and limitations of these policy measures, contributing to the ongoing discourse on optimizing early childhood educational practices and policies.

1. Introduction

Early childhood education is vital in shaping children's lives and prospects, serving as the foundation for their educational journey and overall well-being[1]. Recently, there has been a growing recognition of its importance globally and locally, leading to policies aimed at improving its quality and accessibility. This article explores the impact of political climate and ideology on UK early education policy, focusing on three key policies: the 1998 National Childcare Strategy, the 1999 Sure Start program, and the 2012 Early Years Foundation Stage reforms. It critically examines their origins, content, goals, and outcomes, particularly regarding accessibility, affordability, quality improvement, professional development, and the impact on disadvantaged children.

2. The focus of the UK government's early education policy development

Over the years, there has been a gradual global and local policy focus on ECEC. Governments and organisations share the responsibility of improving the quality of ECEC, promoting inclusion, access and increasing life chances and outcomes for children[2,3]. This is reflected in the various policy

interventions implemented in numerous countries, and a central aspect of these aspirations is workforce reform within ECEC, as governments believe that improvements in workforce quality can lead to high-quality ECEC. This is focused on providing quality ECEC services for children by improving the qualifications and specialisation of its diverse workforce[4]. The provision of ECEC services for young children and families in the UK has been transformed. Various strategic initiatives and policy development have been implemented by successive governments with the aim of enhancing the availability and quality of these services.

Faulkner & Coates[5] (2013) identified changes and policy developments that have occurred in ECEC in the UK, with an emphasis on expanding access and enhancing the quality of services, particularly for families in socially deprived areas. According to their research findings, the underlying objective of these policy changes is to tackle the issue of unequal access to Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC). The aim is to guarantee that children and families from disadvantaged backgrounds are afforded equal opportunities to avail themselves of high-quality ECEC services.

With the rise of neoliberalism, childcare is currently perceived as an assessable practice with high political significance[3,6]. A shift in the understanding of social issues, particularly child poverty, in the context of neoliberalism has been generated[3]. Child poverty is no longer seen as the result of systemic economic factors but is attributed to the environment and behaviour of the family. This perspective minimises the structural causes of poverty and lays the blame on individual families and parents. Additionally, it assumes that in the absence of assistance or support, poor parents inherit their cultural deficiencies, which could perpetuate crime and disadvantage through intergenerational 'cycles of deprivation'[7,8].

Nevertheless, when the New Labour Government assumed office in 1997, family life passed from being a private concern to a public matter. By recognising the impact of inequality and its detrimental social effects, parenting was thus reframed as a public issue rather than a private affair.

Neaum[2] (2016) argues that school readiness has become the focus of education policy in the UK in the context of neoliberalism. According to Wilshaw[9] (2015), school readiness refers to a child having the necessary physical, social and emotional skills to effectively navigate the classroom environment and also having the foundations to initiate academic development. The focus is on supporting children from disadvantaged backgrounds, which is defined through a social and economic perspective. This author emphasises the importance of ensuring that children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds are adequately prepared for school. From an economic perspective, investing in school readiness is perceived as a strategy to break the cycle of poverty and reduce social and economic inequalities. Children who have been equipped with the skills and competencies they need to succeed in school will be more likely to achieve positive educational outcomes, secure well-paying jobs and contribute to the economic development of society[10].

However, Moss[11] (2014b) opposes school readiness as the current focus of education policy because the educational environment is mainly viewed as a place where technologies and methods are applied to children to achieve certain outcomes, such as obtaining a satisfactory score on standardized tests. Moss[11] (2014b) describes this perspective as instrumental: it sees education to an end, rather than valuing the broader aspects of learning and development. The policy is more concerned with achieving specific goals rather than considering the overall educational experience and the needs of the child as a whole. Therefore, the policy is more concerned with achieving specific goals instead of considering the overall educational experience and the needs of the child.

3. Dominant discourses in early education

3.1. The dominant discourse under neoliberal

The system of popular beliefs, ideas and values that shape and influence what is considered true and acceptable in a field or society is known as dominant discourses. According to Moss[11] (2014b), they determine what is thought, said and done, often rendering certain assumptions and values invisible whilst presenting subjective views as objective truths. These discourses establish what is considered self-evident and realistic, whilst questioning alternative perspectives that may be perceived as impractical or dubious. They have the power to shape reality and guide action by making them conform to certain ways of thinking and behaving. In doing so, however, they disregard and omit alternative perspectives and interpretations of the world, limiting the range of stories that can be told and the views that can be taken into account[6,11,12].

According to Moss[11] (2014b), the current dominant discourse in early childhood education in the UK, which involves the notions of quality and high returns, as well as market-driven approaches, bears a strong imprint of neoliberal ideology. Furthermore, this story emphasises the concept of 'parental choice', where parents are seen as consumers who can select the service provider that best suits their preferences and budget. Early childhood education is often referred to as ‘childcare’ in this narrative, emphasising providing safe supervision for children whilst parents are at work. Therefore, market stories are influenced by neoliberalism to treat education as a commodity and accentuate economic considerations[6,11,13].

On the other hand, the story of high-quality and high-return stresses early intervention and investment in early education. It asserts that by providing high-quality education and interventions in the early years, there will be significant returns and benefits over time. This story suggests that by focusing on early learning, the educational and employment outcomes of children will be improved, social problems will decrease and society will benefit. Moss[11] (2014b) argues that high-quality and high-return stories perceive education as a means of maximising individual and societal gains, highlighting the potential long-term advantages of investing in early childhood education.

These two stories view individuals and education as entities that can be measured, compared and evaluated based on costs and benefits. Neoliberal ideology influences these narratives and they shape the discourse and policy around early childhood education in the UK. The dominant discourse in early childhood education reflects a neoliberal perspective that perceives education as a commodity, focuses on economic factors and places individuals as participants in a market-driven system[10]. This view, in which children are seen only as reproducers of knowledge, identity and culture[11], influences policy, practice and ways of thinking in early childhood education.

3.2. Other discourses

Nevertheless, another discourse challenges dominant views and policies regarding children and childhood. The Pedagogical Recontextualisation Field (PRF)[14], rejects the instrumental view of the early years as a mere preparation of children for school. It is inspired by various influential philosophers and psychologists (Comenius, Rousseau, Piaget, Vygotsky and Dewey, among others) and early pioneers in the field of early childhood education (Pestalozzi, Froebel and Montessori), as well as contemporary projects such as the Reggio Emilia Municipal School[14]. Cultural diversity also plays an important role in ECEC and educators from or working with different communities, such as Te Whāriki, the national curriculum of the Māori community in New Zealand, bring their social culture to ECEC. They recognise and value the richness of portraying children as competent individuals, emphasising the significance of culture and language in children's learning and formation of identity. Farquhar[15] (2012) argued that Te Whāriki, as a curriculum for participatory democracy,

is based on the principles of reciprocity, sharing and negotiation between children and adults. This curriculum promotes collaborative learning through the involvement of the community, intergenerational conversations and the advancement of projects and investigations. Te Whāriki emphasises the value of dialogical relationships between children and adults; it nurtures a comprehensive understanding of the child as an interdependent individual within their family and community, an authentic and well-rounded learner imbued with confidence and capability. This alternative discourse challenges prevailing ideas about children and childhood, fostering a more holistic and socially orientated approach to early education[2,6,11,12]. This alternative discourse advocates an approach to early education that prioritizes the holistic well-being of each individual child and places importance on embracing cultural diversity, which is currently lacking in the UK context.

4. Early education policy development under a New Labour government

Prior to the 1980s, ECEC in the UK was largely determined by market forces, with publicly funded ECEC for children from more economically disadvantaged families or with special educational needs, and private ECEC for families who could afford it since these services were not only expensive but also of varying quality[16]. Before the Labour government came to power in 1997, ECEC was considered an easily neglected area of public policy[17]. However, after the Labour government assumed office in 1997, New Labour saw education as the most effective means of achieving social justice, thus becoming a top priority for the government. As a result, the status of ECEC has risen[18] and is considered an essential means of increasing employment and reducing poverty, as well as a significant means of addressing other social issues through 'early intervention'[19].

The New Labour government (1997-2010) established a clear association between childcare and their broader strategy of using the 'Third Way' to address social issues, which intended to combine neoliberal and social democratic political ideas. The objective of this approach was to find a middle ground between free-market policies and social welfare initiatives to develop market-oriented policies, while maintaining a commitment to social justice and reducing inequality[3]. The Labour government drafted and launched the National Childcare Strategy in 1997, which put government intervention in the ECEC market on the agenda for the first time[20]. With this strategy, the government aspired to improve the quality of childcare in the UK and tackle child poverty. According to New Labour[1], the core of the National Childcare Strategy is to eliminate the transmission of poverty from childhood to adulthood by increasing the income of poor families and reducing the number of children growing up in households where adults do not work[1,18,21].

The main objectives of the National Childcare Strategy are to increase the availability and accessibility of childcare services for all families, particularly low-income families, and, at the same time, improve the quality of early education. It seeks to increase access to quality childcare for more children by promoting partnerships between the government, parents, and childcare providers.

Nevertheless, the quality and quantity of childcare services are heavily dependent on their workforce [21,22]. Simon et al. (2016)[23] indicate that one of the characteristics of high-quality childcare is the level of qualification of the staff. Whilst the National Childcare Strategy recognises the main role of early childhood educators in providing high-quality care, Benn [24](2000) argues that educators bear much of the burden of raising the standard of childcare services, yet they are not paid adequate wages. In this context, Cameron et al.[22] (2002) found that wages for childcare work were well below the national average earnings and that staff in childcare were in low-status jobs due to low educational attainment. These authors also found that this low value associated with low income was a critical factor driving childcare staff out of the sector. Whilst the private childcare market grew rapidly during the Conservative government[19], this situation became a strain on the

demand for new staff numbers, yet there was still a desire to provide a high-quality experience for children by employing a well-trained workforce. Therefore, the strategy recognised the relevance of improving the training of professionals in order to enhance the quality of childcare provision[17]. The strategy provides up to 50,000 training opportunities for individuals interested in working with children, enabling them to work towards obtaining a National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) or other recognized childcare qualifications, while further education colleges offer a diverse selection of childcare courses tailored to the specific requirements of childcare professionals[1].

The importance of involving families in childcare and education is also acknowledged by the National Childcare Strategy. It highlights the need to create strong partnerships between families and childcare providers, including offering greater opportunities for parents to participate in work, education and training so that they can access diverse and high-quality childcare[1]. This attempts to improve the level of education of parents so that they can pass on positive learning behaviours to their children[3].

5. Impact of the National Childcare Strategy

Since 1998, the implementation of the childcare strategy has ensured that four-year-olds have been entitled to 12.5 hours of free early education per week, whilst three-year-olds gained the same right in 2004[5,18]. According to Harker (1998), the National Childcare Strategy has yielded significant achievements in a short period: by 2004, access to early education for 3-year-olds increased to 90% (from 64% in 2001), and approximately all 4-year-olds (97% compared to 84% in 2001) were enrolled; attendance rates for 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds reached 89% and 97% respectively in 2007. It must be noted that the gap has considerably narrowed for low-income, non-working, single-parent families, children with special educational needs and deprived communities, yet disparities with more affluent groups persist[18]. Regardless of the success of the strategy to a certain extent, disadvantaged families, including single-parent families, low-income families and those residing in most deprived regions, still report more challenges in accessing early education services, primarily because of high costs and lack of local services[18,25,26]. Even though the government provides subsidies to fund early education through the New Opportunities Fund and lottery self-help[1], questions have been raised about its effectiveness, specifically whether the government-provided funds are sufficient to support the high-quality, affordable childcare that it aims to achieve [16,18,24]. In addition, the proposed childcare policy of New Labour focuses on improving the quality of early education for 3-4-year-olds, as well as promoting equal access to such education[20]. In practice, these policies also aimed to strengthen children's language and literacy skills, fostering their readiness for school.

The Labour Government also introduced three new policy priorities: universal access to Early Years, increased access to Childcare and Sure Start and CC(Childcare Centre) s for disadvantaged children and their families[19]. In 1998, Sure Start was announced as a cross-sectoral strategy part of a government policy intended to improve the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual health of young children through enhanced services. This strategy aims to improve the future prospects of children under four and their families in areas of identified need. It advocates for increased access to early education, play, healthcare, family assistance, and parenting guidance by providing comprehensive support, and it seeks to address inequalities and improve outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged children[27-29]. The Sure Start actively involves parents and children, fostering comprehensive development and school readiness. It aims to improve educational performance, and reduce unemployment, crime rates, and teenage pregnancies, recognising the significance of early intervention in shaping children's future prospects[28].

Nevertheless, the impact of Sure Start Local Programmes (SSLPs) has varied during the implementation of the policy. Reading[30] (2006) found that these programmes did have a positive

impact on teenage mothers, improving their parenting skills and the social functioning of their children. Even though the early childhood policy of New Labour attempts to foster social mobility, economic well-being, and social justice for underprivileged children, an inequitable disparity in access to early education and affordable, high-quality childcare remains, for instance, a 2013 government report showed that less than 50% of children aged 0-14 in deprived areas use formal childcare services[31].

In 2003, the SSLP was replaced by Sure Start CC, which varies based on the services they offer in different fields. The three new policy developments were incorporated into the National Childcare Strategy, which was updated by Treasury in 2004. They were also associated with the Every Child Matters (ECM) Children's Policy, which became a core component of social policy during the Labour Executive and ended in 2010[19].

6. Coalition Government policy on early education

Since the Coalition Government came to power in 2010, there has been a shift in policy focus towards greater attention to educational standards and a reduction in the emphasis on children's services included in the ECM agenda. There are two key features of the coalition government's approach to children's services. First, the main focus of the government was on deficit reduction, which involved significant cuts in public spending. This emphasis on reducing the budget deficit has implications for all sectors, including children's services. Second, there has been a substantial change in the approach to children's services in comparison to the Labour government's ECM agenda, which included a wide range of policies and initiatives aimed at improving outcomes for children and promoting their well-being. Under the coalition government, however, the focus of early years policy has changed, the ECM agenda is no longer the central focus, and the focus on standards and restructuring within the school system has narrowed. The renaming of the department responsible for children's services constitutes an example of this shift. The Ministry of Children, Schools and Families was renamed the Department for Education in 2010 but remained responsible for services relating to children and youth, including child welfare and ECEC. Since 2010, four major developments have taken place in ECEC, namely, the expansion of early education, the increased focus of CC on families with vulnerable children, making childcare more affordable and better, and the revision of the EYFS[19].

As the dominant discourse in early education is increasingly influenced by neoliberal ideologies and global free market concepts[11], this discourse revolves around stories of achieving quality and high returns. It tends to adopt a narrow understanding of education and learning and prioritises the assessment of children's performance based on standardised tests and predefined developmental or learning outcomes[12]. Ball[32] (2021) suggests that in the new paradigm of public service organisations, where learning is redefined as a cost-effective policy outcome and achievement is measured through productivity targets, consideration of cost-effectiveness and productivity goals as key indicators of success are prioritised. This discourse continues to influence current early education policy. In 2012, the coalition government simplified the EYFS introduced in 2008 to standardise the quality of education in the early years' system[33], placing greater emphasis on the role of ECEC in ensuring 'school readiness'. This early education policy does not prioritize the cultivation of a love for reading, writing, and mathematics in children. The teaching approach employed under this policy places undue pressure on young children to acquire the knowledge they may not be developmentally ready for. As a result, learning becomes shallow and centred around standardized tests, rather than fostering a solid foundation for future learning and deeper understanding[10].

Even though the coalition government still focuses on early education in their policy discussions, their discourse has shifted under the influence of neoliberalism towards prioritising the fundamentals

of economic well-being. According to Lloyd[33] (2015), this change has become the main driver behind early childhood policy decisions. Government priorities and decisions on early childhood policy are thus increasingly influenced by economic considerations and the potential economic returns associated with investments in early education. Unfortunately, in this context, school leaders often prioritize and safeguard the performance outputs and rankings of schools, rather than prioritizing the rights and needs of disadvantaged families and children. As a result, social stratification persists, exacerbating existing inequalities within society[10].

Whilst the revised EYFS simplifies the assessment process and reduces the early learning goals from 69 to 17, it focuses on developing children's knowledge skills in literacy and mathematics. Moss [34](2008) argues that early childhood education should be diverse and holistic, that an excessive emphasis on literacy and mathematics subverts the meaning of education, and that in this context, academic failure is perceived as an individual problem[35]. Disadvantaged families and children's rights are not valued in this market economy and children are forced to make ready for school. Under the dominant neoliberal discourse, the instrumental view of early education is reinforced and the emphasis is placed on imparting knowledge to children, their acquisition of this knowledge, and evaluating their progress through assessment and inspection. Neaum[2] (2016) states that the instrumental perspective of early education involves a focus on explicit learning outcomes and assessments. As a result, policy exerts a significant influence on teaching practice in this context.

As previously mentioned, dominant discourses shape what and how children are taught, and the assessment of their progress serves to reinforce these expectations. This cycle of policy-driven change results in modifications in the pedagogy of early education[2]. Furthermore, this change has led to a shift in professionalism among the early childhood education workforce toward ethics of performance[36]. The reform has resulted in a demand for professionalization that mainly focuses on teachers' behaviours rather than their inclination and reflection on educational pedagogy[37]. Bodman et al.[38] (2012) indicate that the professional status of teachers has been undermined as a result of the implementation of performance and accountability mechanisms in teacher standards.

Lloyd[33] (2015) found that most ECEC-related policies under the coalition government have aggravated the economic situation of families with young children because of the marketisation of education and the reduction in funding. Additionally, an analysis of early education performance since 2013 shows that in reality, little progress has been made in closing the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children[10]. However, Lloyd & Potter (2014) argue that even universal quality early education does not 'prevent' the adverse effects of child poverty. However, only high-quality ECEC has a lasting positive effect on children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Therefore, it is essential to offer early education of high quality that is affordable to ensure the promotion of social equity.

7. Conclusion

This paper examines the impact of UK early education policies influenced by neoliberalism and high-return discourses. Key initiatives analyzed include the 1998 National Childcare Strategy[20]; the SSLPs aimed at supporting vulnerable children and families; and the updated EYFS framework of 2012, which replaced the 2008 version[19].

New Labour aimed to combat child poverty through high-quality, affordable ECEC services, enhancing children's development and educational outcomes[31]. However, implementation has yielded limited results. Coalition policies prioritize school readiness within a neoliberal framework, often overlooking comprehensive child development Moss[11] (2014b) . Ongoing efforts must focus on accessibility, affordability, quality, and professional development in ECEC.

References

[1] Great Britain Parliament House of Commons. (1997). Meeting the childcare challenge : A framework and consultation document. House of Commons?

[2] Neaum, S. (2016). School readiness and pedagogies of competence and performance: Theorising the troubled relationship between early years and early years policy. International Journal of Early Years Education, 24(3), 239-253.

[3] Simpson, D., Lumsden, E., & McDowall Clark, R. (2015). Neoliberalism, global poverty policy and early childhood education and care: A critique of local uptake in england. Early Years, 35(1), 96-109.

[4] Kay, L., Wood, E., Nuttall, J., & Henderson, L. (2021). Problematising policies for workforce reform in early childhood education: A rhetorical analysis of england's early years teacher status. Journal of Education Policy, 36(2), 179-195.

[5] Faulkner, D., & Coates, E. A. (2013). Early childhood policy and practice in england: Twenty years of change. International Journal of Early Years Education, 21(2-3), 244-263.

[6] Moss, P. (2018). Alternative narratives in early childhood: An introduction for students and practitioners. Routledge.

[7] Gillies, V. (2008). Childrearing, class and the new politics of parenting. Sociology Compass, 2(3), 1079-1095.

[8] Sullivan, A., Ketende, S., & Joshi, H. (2013). Social class and inequalities in early cognitive scores. Sociology, 47(6), 1187-1206.

[9] Wilshaw, M. (2015). The annual report of her majesty's chief inspector of education, children's services and skills 2014/15. Williams Lea Group

[10] Roberts-Holmes, G., & Moss, P. (2021). Neoliberalism and early childhood education: Markets, imaginaries and governance. Routledge.

[11] Moss, P. (2014). Transformative change and real utopias in early childhood education: A story of democracy, experimentation and potentiality. Routledge.

[12] Moss, P. (2017). Power and resistance in early childhood education: From dominant discourse to democratic experimentalism. Journal of Pedagogy, 8(1), 11-32.

[13] Moss, P. (2007). Meetings across the paradigmatic divide. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 39(3), 229-245.

[14] Bernstein, B. (2000). Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique. Rowman & Littlefield.

[15] Farquhar, S. (2012). Narrative identity and early childhood education. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44(3), 289-301.

[16] La Valle, I., & Smith, R. (2009). Good quality childcare for all? Progress towards universal provision. National Institute Economic Review, 207, 75-82.

[17] Ball, S. J., & Vincent, C. (2005). The 'childcare champion'? New labour, social justice and the childcare market. British Educational Research Journal, 31(5), 557-570.

[18] Harker, L. (1998). A national childcare strategy: Does it meet the childcare challenge? Political Quarterly, 69(4), 458–463.

[19] Moss, P. (2014). Early childhood policy in england 1997–2013: Anatomy of a missed opportunity. International Journal of Early Years Education, 22(4), 346-358.

[20] Lewis, J. (2003). Developing early years childcare in england, 1997–2002: The choices for (working) mothers. Social Policy & Administration, 37(3), 219-238.

[21] Coates, E., Faulkner, D., Aubrey, C., Bertram, T., Broadhead, P., Castle, D., ... Wild, M. (2012). The changing face of early childhood policy and practice in england over the past twenty years: An expert seminar. http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/id/eprint/5785

[22] Cameron, C., Mooney, A., & Moss, P. (2002). The child care workforce: Current conditions and future directions. Critical Social Policy, 22(4), 572-595.

[23] Simon, A., Owen, C., & Hollingworth, K. (2016). Is the 'quality'of preschool childcare, measured by the qualifications and pay of the childcare workforce, improving in britain? American Journal of Educational Research, 4(1), 11-17.

[24] Benn, M. (2000). New labour and social exclusion. Political Quarterly, 71(3), 309–318.

[25] Butt, S., Goddard, K., & La Valle, I. (2007). Childcare nation?: Progress on the childcare strategy and priorities for the future. Daycare Trust.

[26] Kazimirski, A., Smith, R., Butt, S., Ireland, E., & Lloyd-Reichling, E. (2007). Childcare and early years survey 2007: Parents' use, views and experiences. https://repository.uel.ac.uk/item/866qw

[27] Barnes, J., Belsky, J., Broomfield, K. A., Dave, S., Frost, M., Melhuish, E., & National Evaluation of Sure Start Research, T. (2005). Disadvantaged but different: Variation among deprived communities in relation to child and family well-being. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46(9), 952-962.

[28] Glass, N. (1999). Sure start: The development of an early intervention programme for young children in the united kingdom. Children & society, 13(4), 257-264.

[29] Schneider, J., Ramsay, A., & Lowerson, S. A. (2006). Sure start graduates: Predictors of attainment on starting school. Child: Care, Health and Development, 32(4), 431-440.

[30] Reading, R. (2006). The national evaluation of sure start research team effects of sure start local programmes on children and families: Early findings from a quasi-experimental, cross sectional study. Health & Development, 32(6), 753–754.
[31] Lloyd-Reichling, E., & Potter, S. (2014). Early childhood education and care and poverty. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/219374023.pdf
[32] Ball, S. J. (2021). The education debate. Policy Press.
[33] Lloyd-Reichling, E. (2015). Early childhood education and care policy in england under the coalition government. London Review of Education, 13(2), 144-156.
[34] Moss, P. (2008). What future for the relationship between early childhood education and care and compulsory schooling? Research in Comparative and International Education, 3(3), 224-234.
[35] Vandenbroeck, M., De Stercke, N., & Gobeyn, H. (2012). What if the rich child has poor parents?: The relationship from a flemish perspective. In P. Moss, L. Balduzzi, J. Bennett, M. Carr, G. Dahlberg, H. Gobeyn, P. Haug, S. L. Kagan, A. Lazzari, N. D. Stercke, & M. Vandenbroeck (Eds.), Early childhood and compulsory education (pp. 174-191). Routledge.
[36] Barnett, R. (2008). Critical professionalism in an age of supercomplexity. In B. Cunningham (Ed.), Exploring professionalism. Institute of Education, University of London.
[37] Evans, L. (2011). The 'shape'of teacher professionalism in england: Professional standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 white paper. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 851-870.
[38] Bodman, S., Taylor, S., & Morris, H. (2012). Politics, policy and professional identity. English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11(3), 14-25.