

The Legalization of Preschool Education in China Under the Experience of American Rule of Law

YANG Jinhao, ZHANG Meihui, JI Hui*

Lyliang University, Lyuliang, China

Preschool education law is the key institutional arrangement to ensure the healthy development of preschool education. The construction of the rule of law in preschool education in the United States has undergone a century of evolution and formed a relatively complete legal system. It reflects the paradigm shift from “welfare relief” to “compensation for the weak” to “inclusive quality”, and presents the underlying logic from guaranteeing the right to survival to pursuing educational equity and then to achieving inclusive quality. This paper uses historical analysis and comparative research methods to systematically sort out the three stages of American preschool education legislation in the past century, extract the three core experiences of fair-oriented resource allocation, legalized government responsibility, and sustained economic investment. Under the background of the implementation of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” in June 2025, this paper summarizes the legislative process and core essence of the United States, and provides reference for the localization practice of the rule of law in preschool education in China.

Keywords: United States, pre-school education legislation, institutional change, education equity, paradigm shift, China mirror

Proposing the Problem

Preschool education is related to children’s physical and mental development, education quality and national quality. November 2024 “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” will come into force on June 1, 2025. China’s preschool education has entered a new era of “rule of law guidance” from the “policy-led” model. In the past 100 years, the study of preschool education legislation has gradually become an important field of international education law research (Qian, 2025). The United States has a hundred years of experience in the rule of law and has built a relatively complete legal system. Its experience has reference mirror value for China. Throughout the academic circle, the existing research focuses on all the pieces of American legislation, such as the main characteristics of “parental involvement” provisions (Liu, Pang, & Sha, 2008), teacher protection or compensation for vulnerable groups, and lacks a systematic review of the overall evolution logic of legislation.

Acknowledgements: The paper was funded by the 2025 National Grand Innovation Project “Bilingual Painting Lyuliang: Research on Parent-child Reading Picture Book Creation Integrating ‘Three Cultures’” (Project No.20251529).

YANG Jinhao, undergraduate student, Department of Teacher Education, Lyuliang University, Lyuliang City, Shanxi Province, China.

ZHANG Meihui, undergraduate student, Department of Teacher Education, Lyuliang University, Lyuliang City, Shanxi Province, China.

JI Hui* (corresponding author), Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education, Lyuliang University, Lyuliang City, Shanxi Province, China.

Under the macro framework of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China”, how to refine the supporting system, implement the government’s responsibility, and maintain the bottom line of inclusive education is still a realistic issue that needs to be studied urgently. This paper attempts to answer the centennial evolution of the rule of law in preschool education in the United States, what characteristics it presents in the process, and the underlying logic of the construction of the rule of law. More importantly, it is the practical exploration under the practice of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China”.

Three Stages of the Construction of the Rule of Law in a Century

The rule of law construction of preschool education in the United States is divided into three stages: welfare germination, weak compensation, and inclusive deepening (Qian, 2020; Zhang & Wang, 2010). It reflects the value leap from “protection of the right to life” to “education equity” to “inclusive quality”.

Welfare Phase: State Concern for Early Child Welfare and Education Sprouted (1912-1964)

At the beginning of the 20th century, the U.S. economy was unprecedentedly prosperous under the wave of free competition, but the gap between the rich and the poor continued to expand, and social contradictions became increasingly fierce. The development of industrialization has caused a large number of women to flock to the labor market, resulting in a surge in demand for childcare. In 1912, the Taft government established the U.S. Children’s Bureau. It marks the first time that the federal government has set up a special agency to focus on children’s affairs, laying an organizational foundation for subsequent legislation (Zhang & Wang, 2010). Driven by the progressive movement, social reformers have set their sights on child welfare. With the continuation of the reform wave, the law of protecting female workers and child workers was introduced, and the compensation system for industrial accidents was established. Some business giants turn to charity. In 1913, John D. Rockefeller registered and established the Rockefeller Foundation, which vigorously funded medical and health care and education under the guidance of the purpose of “promoting the well-being of mankind around the world”.

Under the pressure of the economic crisis in the 1930s, the Roosevelt administration signed the “Federal Emergency Relief Act” in 1933. The government funded the construction of emergency care schools nationwide to help economically disadvantaged families. This is the first pre-school child care program implemented by the federal government in the United States, laying the foundation for future pre-school institutional norms and teacher training (Qian, 2020). Two years later, the “Social Security Law” was promulgated and implemented in the form of subsidies. During the Second World War, the “Lanham Act” was introduced and a large number of childcare centers were established. During the operation, about 600,000 children were registered (Qian, 2020). In 1930, only 6,500 people were registered in the country. The huge leap in numbers shows the continuous improvement of preschool education and legislation. In 1964, American scholar Charles Hilberman found the lack of education for children in the slums, and put forward the idea of preschool compensatory education. In August of the same year, President Johnson pushed Congress to pass the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Stage of Supporting the Weak: The Formation and Compensation of Legislation (1965-2000)

In the 1960s, the civil rights movement was rising, and the voice of eliminating racial discrimination and poverty became stronger. Education is regarded as a key tool to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty and achieve social equality. The successful launch of the Soviet Union “Sputnik 1” on October 4, 1957 added new pressure to the United States and forced the federal government to innovate. In his State of the Union Address on January 4, 1965, President Johnson depicted a blueprint for a “great society”. In the same year, the “Beginning

Plan”—a pre-school education project that covers the United States and has the most lasting impact was launched. The project is aimed at children aged 0-5 in low-income families, providing comprehensive services such as education, health, nutrition, and parental participation, breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty and extending compensatory education to the early stage of education. As of 2023, the U.S. Congressional Statistics Beginnings Program serves 37 million to nearly 40 million children. In 1975, the Education for All Children with Disabilities Act was enacted. Four years later, the U.S. Department of Education became an independent Cabinet Department responsible for children’s education.

In the 1980s, although the Reagan administration promoted new federalism and reduced federal intervention, the “pro-weak” framework did not collapse. In 1981, the government introduced the “Beginning Plan Act”, which formally incorporated the beginning plan into the legal track and established its legal status as a permanent federal project. The bill clearly stipulates the federal government’s funding obligations, project implementation standards and operational norms of local institutions, and transforms the “weak compensation” from an emergency social experiment into a legally binding institutional arrangement. Since then, the federal government’s investment has continued to grow. The “principle of non-discrimination” in the Act takes into account both educational equity and educational inclusion.

The 1990s was a period of explosive development of science and technology, and the concept of equal opportunity in education was profoundly innovated. From “protecting equality of rights through law and promoting fairness of results through public policy” to the new wave of pursuing “all people can obtain high-quality education”. In March 1994, President Clinton signed and promulgated the “2000 Goals: American Education Act” to practice the new concept. In 2000, the “Early Learning Opportunity Act” was passed and signed by the US Congress. Compared with the 1965 “Early Start Act”, it found that its service objectives were broader, and through the active guidance of the federal government, a more universal and coordinated early learning system was established at the community level to serve all children aged 0-5 and their families, not just specific vulnerable groups. This bill is the cornerstone of the U.S. preschool education legislation towards the “inclusive stage”, with the background of “helping the weak”, but it has shown the momentum of transition to inclusive.

Inclusive Stage: “Exploration of Inclusive Transformation” (2000-Present)

After entering the 21st century, global competition has become increasingly fierce, and human capital has become the core competitiveness of the country. The research results of neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and development economics have completely changed people’s cognition of early education. The core feature of the inclusive stage is: “giving rights to all”, and the government has become the primary responsibility for ensuring the early development of children. The United States continues to deepen its development on the cornerstone of the “Goals 2000: American Education Act”, which, in addition to establishing the above-mentioned primary goals of preschool education, specifically provides for national leadership organizations that promote the development of preschool education, standards and evaluation of educational reform, and supervision (Sha, Pang, & Liu, 2007). In 2002, the “No Child Left Behind Act” (also known as the “Primary and Secondary Education Act”) was introduced. Its legislative purpose is to ensure that all children have fair, equal, and important opportunities to obtain high-quality education, reflecting the value orientation of fairness and quality. The content of pre-school education in the Act is mainly in Title I (Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies) (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002). The third part of Part B shows the “Fair

Education Starting Point” project (Liu, 2013) and the “Early Reading Project” (Wu, 2008). In addition, there are the “Preschool Special Education Grant Act” to fund special education services for state-year-old children, the “Infant and Family Special Education Grant Act” to assist the state government in serving children with disabilities, and the “Preschool Teacher Professional Development Act” to train a large number of workers and nursing staff. U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan pointed out: “No Child Left Behind Act” is “top-down enforcement”, and the bill provides “flexibility to allow local solutions”. The Title I—A pre-school provision states that school districts receiving Title I funds can provide early education services for children aged 3-5 years from low-income families, and the bill includes funds earmarked for pre-school development grants to improve access to high-quality early learning for low-income and vulnerable children and enhance their long-term development (Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, 2015). The law continues to maintain a focus on fairness, requiring states to set goals to narrow the achievement gap for students with high needs, including from low-income families, English learners, and students with disabilities. In December 2007, the “Start Plan” was updated to the “Improved Start School Readiness Act”. The law includes 22 articles, mainly related to financially funded projects, allocation ratio, project implementation standards, implementation methods, project management, project technical support and training, and research and evaluation (Qian, 2020). In the same year, the “American Competition Law” was enacted and implemented through the establishment of the Early Learning Challenge Fund. Qian (2020, pp. 16-23) pointed out that the Obama administration’s attitude towards preschool education reflects the pursuit of “high quality”. In 2015, President Obama signed the “Every Student Succeeds Act”, which became an important watershed in the K-12 education policy of the United States. It not only ended the federal mandatory and punishment-oriented model of the times, but also made the expenditure per student transparent and open, increased the protection of juvenile justice and foster children, and filled the previous gap. In September 2025, Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton introduced the Universal Pre-school and Early Childhood Education Act 2025, the two main elements of which are the provisions of Article II, Section C, Section 2, “Allow every child in the state aged 3 or 4 to voluntarily enroll in the program by their parents, regardless of income status, and have the option of enrolling a child in a kindergarten school”; and Part D of the same paragraph: “The federal government bears no more than 80 % of the cost” (Universal Prekindergarten and Early Childhood Education Act of 2025, 2025). In the same month, Senator Elizabeth Warren and other co-sponsors of the “Every Community Child Care Act” proposed a “universal, comprehensive” child care and early learning system that provides full-time services to all children under compulsory school age, and explicitly entitles eligible children to participate without financial caps (Child Care for Every Community Act, S. 2939, 119th Cong., 2025). The introduction of two bills in the United States in 2025 also reflects the legislative trend in this direction. Although the prospects for the passage of these two bills are still unclear—according to Congress.gov tracking, its legislative progress remains in the committee’s consideration stage, and the probability of passing the assessment is only 1%—but the content of its proposal itself reflects the policy shift worthy of attention. It is worth noting that the integration of kindergarten and childcare has become the development trend of international preschool education. OECD countries generally take 0-6 years old child care education as a whole to observe (Feng & Shan, 2025).

The Deep Perspective Under the Three-Stage Process

There is a logical line hidden behind the seemingly numerous legal changes in the course of the rule of law in the United States over the past century. Preschool education has gradually risen from “family private affairs”

to “national responsibility”, from the vassal of social welfare to an important part of the public education system. In addition, three secondary lines throughout can be extracted. First, the promotion of the legal status of preschool education. Preschool education in the welfare stage is positioned as a subsidiary project of social relief. In the stage of helping the weak, it enters the federal legislative vision in the form of “compensatory education”, and its position changes from “vassal of social relief” to “front end of public education”. Second, the deepening of the connotation of educational equity. The concept of fairness in the welfare stage stays at the level of “external fairness” (guaranteeing the right to survival), and the stage of helping the weak promotes fairness to “internal fairness” (bridging the development gap through compensatory education). The inclusive stage has further jumped to “substantive fairness” (preschool education is the right of all people). The provisions of the 2025 bill, such as “no income limit” and “no right to cap funds”, are the legislative expression of this concept transition. Third, the institutionalization of financial security mechanism. The source of funds has changed from “emergency allocation” to “special allocation” and then to “rights protection”, which reflects the willingness to change from “temporary emergency” to “special investment” and then to “rights protection”. The four logical lines interweave and support each other, and jointly outline the deep deduction picture of American preschool education legislation.

Three Core Under the Course of a Hundred Years of Legal System

Education Equity: Legal Empowerment of Vulnerable Groups

Educational equity is the soul of preschool education legislation and the core value orientation of preschool education legislation. An important object of educational equity is vulnerable groups. This term first appeared in the American Civil War. Based on the perspective of fairness, it is found that the legislation of compensatory education for vulnerable groups in the United States is divided into three stages: external fairness, internal fairness, and substantive fairness, and presents different stage characteristics. Legislation must ensure the substantive implementation of the right to education for vulnerable children, which is the bottom line of educational justice (Wang, 2012). In the face of the practical problem of the educational gap between vulnerable groups and their peers in favorable conditions, American law helps vulnerable children to get rid of the realistic situation of excessive vulnerability by giving them the external intervention of institutional gifts, so as to expand their possibility and potential learning space, so that their abilities and skills can be more fully cultivated and more social resources can be obtained. American liberal thinker John Rawls put forward “the principle of equal freedom” and “the principle of equal opportunity and difference” in his “theory of justice”. In the principle of difference, it recognizes the existence of social and economic inequality, but stipulates that its only justification is to benefit the most vulnerable groups in society. Under the principle of difference, he thinks about the unequal arrangement of society and economy—that social resources should be tilted to the most disadvantaged. A series of laws established by the US government to apply this principle to the field of education have institutional assistance for disadvantaged children, which is a concrete manifestation of the concept of fairness. It can be said that the value orientation of American preschool education legislation is deeply influenced by Rawls’ theory. The evolution from external equity to substantive equity always reflects the main line of value of “educational equity”. Rawls’ principle of difference not only provides a solid philosophical foundation for compensatory legislation such as the Beginning Plan, but also makes “leaning to the most disadvantaged” the core value orientation of American preschool education legislation.

Welfare State: Dynamic Adjustment of Responsibility Boundary

The welfare state theory provides an important analytical framework for understanding the role of government in child welfare and reveals the transformation of welfare concepts under the continuous adjustment of government responsibility boundaries. The centennial evolution of preschool education legislation in the United States reflects the dynamic transformation of the concept of the welfare state from “residual” to “institutional” to “developmental”. Zhang and Wang (2010) pointed out that the American preschool education under the intervention of the federal government has experienced three stages of development since the 20th century: the germination period with the pursuit of social welfare as the value orientation, the expansion period with the aim of equal opportunity and intellectual development, and the deepening period characterized by equal emphasis on fairness and quality.

Based on the analysis of Esping-Anderson’s welfare system theory, it is found that the United States belongs to the typical liberal welfare system. Its core features include: emphasizing the leading role of the market mechanism, providing welfare with asset survey-based relief, and government intervention following the principle of “minimization”. Federal intervention mainly takes the form of special allocations, emphasizing local autonomy and market competition mechanisms. Under the premise of maintaining market mechanism and local autonomy, the legislative evolution since the 1960s has gradually strengthened the federal government’s national regulation on the quality of preschool education through system design such as standard guidance, performance accountability, and competitive appropriation. On the basis of the “mixed model of market mechanism and state intervention”, the American liberal welfare system is unique in the field of preschool education. It is different from the universal welfare of the Nordic social democratic system and the corporatist arrangement of the conservative system in continental Europe. It respects the market and local traditions while constructing the national quality framework and fair red line through legislation.

Capital Investment: Scale Growth and Institutional Projection

The U.S. economy attaches great importance to and supports preschool education from a long-term development perspective, and regards preschool education as an investment in the future (Chen & Fang, 2001). The U.S. government’s “Beginning Plan” was implemented from 1965, mainly for children from low-income families. Costs jumped from \$ 96.4 million to \$ 1.07 billion between 1965 and 1985 (Zhang & Wang, 2010), and to \$ 1.552 billion in 1990; in 1999, it reached US\$ 4.658 billion, three times the amount in 1990; by 2005, allocations had reached \$ 6.843 billion, four times the level in 1990. From the per capita point of view, the government’s investment in 1992 was \$ 3,415 per child; in 2004, it reached \$ 7,222.

The U.S. government’s sustained and stable funding has provided the most basic guarantee for preschool education (Wu & Lin, 2010). The Obama administration signed the “0~5 Education Plan”, in which the government allocated \$10 billion to fund universal pre-school education in states. The difference between the Head Start Program and the “0-5 Years Education Program” is that the former federal government directly allocates money to local public or non-profit institutions, while the latter adopts “competitive appropriation”, requiring states to formulate plans that meet federal quality standards and take out matching funds to obtain appropriations. The investment in preschool education in the United States presents the characteristics of “multiple compound”, which is mainly reflected in three kinds of institutional arrangements: one is the “direct allocation” of the beginning plan for vulnerable groups; the second is to adopt the “voucher system with market selection” child care and development fixed allocation method for low- and middle-income families, including

goal setting, allocation projects and proportions, project planning and application, project management and summary, etc.; the third is to adopt “competitive appropriation” to the state government. The “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act” established the “Competitive Optimality” project and the “Competitive Optimality-Early Learning Challenge Fund” project, which invested USD 500 million and was obtained by competition among states. The federal funding can be obtained if the states increase their efforts in pre-school education at the request of the federal government, provide high-quality education programs for poor, minority families and children, and win in comparison with other states (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Such diversified investment methods reflect the game between the market and the will of the state under the liberal welfare system.

Inspiration to the Construction of Preschool Education Rule of Law in China

A systematic comparison of the institutional environment on which the legalization of preschool education in China and the United States depends is as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Comparison of the Core Institutional Environment of the Rule of Law in Preschool Education Between China and the United States

Comparative Dimension	USA	China
Political institutions	Federalism, the right to education belongs to the state government, federal intervention is bound by the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution.	The unitary system, the unification of central and local powers and responsibilities, and the national effectiveness of education legislation.
Welfare tradition	Liberal welfare system, residual type, asset investigation type, market mechanism leading.	Developing countries, government-led welfare, in recent years, emphasizing the “inclusive”.
Orientation of preschool education	It has been a vassal of social welfare for a long time, and has transformed to the front end of public education in recent years.	The new law is clearly defined as “an integral part of the national education system” and “an important social welfare undertaking”.
Financial input mechanism	Special allocation + competitive allocation + voucher system, diversified but fragmented.	“Government investment is the main, family reasonable burden”, inclusive orientation.
Teacher guarantee	The federal special funding is implemented by local governments, and the treatment of teachers is low and the turnover rate is high.	Legal provisions in principle, but the lack of mandatory protection mechanism.
Historic stage	Has completed the “weak compensation”, a difficult transition to “inclusive quality”.	It is in the initial transition period from “policy-led” to “rule of law-led”.

Throughout the historical experience of the centennial evolution of American preschool education legislation, it is found that it is not only a history of institutional change from “welfare relief” to “compensation for the weak” to “inclusive quality”, but also an institutional experiment on the two core values of “fairness” and “quality”. The “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” was formally implemented in June 2025. The revision and optimization of the law is a slow journey. This paper puts forward three enlightenments as follows :

Adhere to the Background of “Public Welfare” and “Fairness”

Adherence to the “public welfare” and “fairness” should always be the core value orientation of preschool education legislation (Liu, Pang, & Sha, 2008). Pang and Han (2010) pointed out that public welfare is the fundamental nature of preschool education. The public welfare of preschool education first stems from the provisions of Article 19 of the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China on the development of socialist education in the country. Articles 3 and 6 of the “Preschool Education Law” further clarify the public welfare

attributes and inclusive orientation of preschool education (Zhan & Du, 2025). Looking back at the century-old legislative process of the United States, whether it is the three-stage transformation from “external fairness” to “internal fairness” to “substantive fairness”, or the transition from “filling vacancies” to “helping the weak” and finally realizing “universal benefits”, it reflects these two core pursuits. The “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” has made it clear that “preschool education is an integral part of the national education system and an important social public welfare cause”. The government is required to reasonably determine the coverage rate of inclusive kindergartens in the layout planning of kindergartens. In practice, the investment mechanism of “government investment, reasonable family burden” and the establishment of “preschool education funding system” are adopted to reflect the legislative spirit of reducing family burden. Drawing on the experience of the United States, we will further strengthen the concept of “public welfare priority” in the implementation of the law, so that multiple links such as policy implementation, financial investment, and resource allocation abide by the “rigid constraints” of “fairness”. It is necessary to be vigilant that the label of “non-compulsory education” may lead to the weakening of government responsibility. The implementation should focus on rural, migrant and vulnerable children. It is recommended to set up a compensation fund for vulnerable groups to provide free admission, nutrition and transportation subsidies; build a service mode that is suitable for China to adhere to “public welfare” and “fairness”.

Power and Responsibility List and Dual-Track System Construction

The “legalization of government responsibility” in the American experience has direct reference value for our country. The United States has raised the federal government’s funding obligations for vulnerable children from temporary projects to statutory responsibilities through legislation such as the Startup Plan Act. The relationship between central and local powers and responsibilities in China is more concentrated, which provides institutional advantages for building a clearer and more rigid list of powers and responsibilities than the United States. Article 5 of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” stipulates: “The development of preschool education adheres to the government-led, government-run, vigorously develops inclusive preschool education, and encourages, guides and regulates the participation of social forces”. Article 6 stipulates the responsibility of the government and the principle of resource allocation, but the legal principle is transformed into governance efficiency. The key is to build a set of institutional systems that are in line with the characteristics of China’s administrative system, clear rights and responsibilities, and coordinated operation. China’s population distribution space and educational resources are significantly different. The formulation of appropriate rights and responsibilities system for educational resources in the central and western regions and vulnerable groups is an important part of realizing “public welfare” and “fairness”. The central finance can build an open and transparent “detailed list of responsibilities” to clarify the proportion and intensity of investment at the central, provincial, municipal, and county levels; focus on supporting the central and western regions and vulnerable groups, local finance to bear the main responsibility for investment; build a dual-track model of “inclusive benchmark + special subsidy”. The first is to maintain the “background” through government funding to ensure the inclusive development of kindergartens. Secondly, the purpose of setting up the special subsidy project of “improving quality and creating excellence” is to encourage innovation in the expansion of local resources, the guarantee of teachers “treatment and the improvement of curriculum quality”, and to stimulate the impetus of local reform through “awarding instead of subsidy”. Strive to achieve inclusive system construction under fairness and efficiency.

Sequential Growth in Localized Soil

On the one hand, we can follow the gradual logic of “compensation priority-expanding coverage-inclusive quality” to advance steadily. He and Yuan (2025) proposed a phased strategy that can follow the “gradual expansion of years, gradual expansion of institutions, and gradual expansion of projects” (pp. 128-135). In the case of reasonable control of resources, we should give priority to the welfare of the most vulnerable groups, and then gradually expand the coverage, and finally push the system to the whole country to achieve inclusive benefits. In the face of the uneven development of China’s eastern, central and western regions and the obvious gap between urban and rural areas (Pang et al., 2019), it is not appropriate to adopt a “one-size-fits-all” approach. With the support of the national rural revitalization policy, we can set up pilot projects in key counties and floating population concentration areas, and take the lead in implementing institutional arrangements such as free admission of vulnerable children, nutritional subsidies, and transportation security; on the basis of the maturity of the pilot, we will gradually expand the coverage of inclusive preschool education resources.

On the other hand, optimizing the guarantee of teaching staff construction has become a key breakthrough. We can learn from the experience of American legislation to protect teachers (Sha, 2015). One of the biggest shortcomings faced by China is the insufficient number and low treatment of teachers. The realization of the break can improve the salary level and welfare treatment of teachers and other ways to enhance the attraction of preschool education for outstanding talents, and optimize the investment structure of preschool education (Hu & Tang, 2022); the requirement that the average wage income level of public kindergarten teachers should not be lower than that of local compulsory education teachers should be included in the key monitoring indicators of law implementation, and a provincial-level overall wage guarantee mechanism for preschool teachers should be established. At the same time, we will accelerate the improvement of the professional title evaluation and employment sequence of preschool teachers and enhance the attractiveness of the post.

Conclusion

The one-hundred-year history of the rule of law in preschool education in the United States is essentially an institutional evolution of “fairness” and “responsibility”: preschool education has risen from private family affairs to national obligations, from the vassal of social welfare to the front end of the public education system. As Yu (2024) said, in the final analysis, the modernization of preschool education is to realize the modernization of human beings, and legislation is the premise and guarantee. The implementation of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China” is a key step in promoting preschool education from “early childhood education” to “early childhood education” with the power of the rule of law. To transform the macro framework of legal texts into the micro practice of governance effectiveness, we should not only abide by the rigid constraints of public welfare and fairness, but also clarify the construction of power and responsibility in the system design, and explore the localization adaptation path under implementation. The concerted efforts of all parties in the society can help the steady progress of the legalization of preschool education in China.

References

- Chen, H. Y., & Fang, M. (2001). America attaches great importance to the development of preschool education and its enlightenment. *Preschool Education Research*, (2), 74-76.
- Child Care for Every Community Act, S. 2939, 119th Cong. (2025). (Introduced) [EB/OL].(2026-04-07).<https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/senate-bill/2939>
- Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95, 129 Stat. 1802 (2015).

- Feng, J. Y., & Shan, C. P. (2025). Under the background of the implementation of the “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China”, the cultivation of integrated talents in colleges and universities: Connotation and supply path. *Preschool Education Research*, (10), 57-68.
- He, H. F., & Yuan, Q. H. (2025). The basic logic, realistic possibility and practical direction of implementing free preschool education. *Hubei Social Sciences*, (10), 128-135.
- Hu, Y. M., & Tang, Y. P. (2022). Forecast of preschool education investment and allocation in China from 2020 to 2035—Based on a comparative study with OECD countries with high returns on preschool education investment. *Journal of Capital Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, (4), 139-152.
- Law of the People’s Republic of China on Preschool Education. Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress, 2024-11-08.
- Liu, C. H. (2013). Analysis of the evolution and current legal structure of federal preschool education legislation in the United States. *Basic Education Reference*, (21), 70-74.
- Liu, X. R., Pang, L. J., & Sha, L. (2008). Respecting parents “rights and promoting parents” participation-Inspiration from American preschool education law. *Preschool Education Research*, (3), 3-8.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Pang, L. J., & Han, X. Y. (2010). Chinese Preschool education legislation: Thinking and process. *Journal of Beijing Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, (5), 14-20.
- Pang, L. J., Wang, H. L., He, H. F. et al. (2019). Accelerating legislation to provide legal protection for the development of preschool education. *Chinese Journal of Education*, (1), 1-6.
- Qian, Y. (2025). China’s preschool education legislation from an international perspective: Towards high-quality inclusive. *Preschool Education Research*, (1), 34-41.
- Qian, Y. (2020). Development, experience and enlightenment of American preschool education legislation. *Journal of Educational Science, Hunan Normal University*, 19(3), 16-23.
- Sha, L., Pang, L. J., & Liu, X. R. (2007). Strengthening the government’s responsibility in the development of preschool education through legislation—The experience of the United States and its enlightenment to China. *Preschool Education Research*, (2), 3-9.
- Sha, L. (2015). Legislative protection of high-quality preschool teachers: American experience and enlightenment. *Modern Education Management*, (10), 124-128.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. ERIC No. ED509799.
- Universal Prekindergarten and Early Childhood Education Act of 2025, H.R. 5524, 119th Cong. (2025). (Introduced)[EB/OL]. (2026-04-07). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/5524>
- Wang, J. W. (2012). Legislation should be made to ensure the right of disadvantaged children to equitable access to education—And the enlightenment of American preschool education legislation to China. *Ethnic Education Research*, 23(4), 89-92.
- Wu, Q., & Lin, X. B. (2010). Inspiration of American preschool education development experience to China. *Education Exploration*, (11), 155-156.
- Wu, Q. (2008). Educational equity orientation of the American beginnings program and its implications. *Early Childhood Education (Education Science Edition)*, (6), 52-55.
- Yu, Y. P. (2024). Ensuring the sustainable development of preschool education with the rule of law. *People’s Education*, (11), 46-49.
- Zhan, Z. L., & Du, J. X. (2025). The system construction and implementation path of “Preschool Education Law of the People’s Republic of China”. *Journal of Hebei Normal University (Education Science Edition)*, 27(1), 21-31.
- Zhang, Y., & Wang, X. Y. (2010). Development and enlightenment of american preschool education under federal intervention since the 20th century. *Foreign Education Research*, 37(3), 43-47.