



Variations in Pre-Primary Education Infrastructure Within and Across Administrative Sectors in Rwanda

Remy Pages

Executive Office on Early Learning, State of Hawai'i

Gilbert Munyemana

National Child Development Agency, Rwanda

This study investigates disparities in the quality of pre-primary education settings in Rwanda, focusing on differences across setting types—centre-based, community-based, and home-based—and examining the influence of socioeconomic status (SES) at the sector level. Using a dataset of 4,875 settings across 91 administrative sectors within seven districts, multilevel modeling estimates within- and between-sector variation in infrastructure quality from three latent factors: physical facilities, access to public infrastructure, and operational quality. Sector-level SES was operationalized as average years of schooling, providing an area-based measure of socioeconomic conditions. Findings reveal that centre-based settings, concentrated in higher-SES urban areas, consistently demonstrate higher infrastructure quality and are better equipped with physical facilities, access to public infrastructure, and operational resources compared to home-based settings. Home-based settings, prevalent in rural and lower-SES areas and often dependent on informal funding, lack essential resources, with quality deficits of 0.73 and 0.85 standard deviations (SD) in physical and operational quality, relative to centre-based settings. While SES is significantly associated with access to infrastructure across sectors, operational disparities remain largely tied to setting type. These results underscore structural disparities in Rwanda's pre-primary education landscape, with implications for policy interventions targeting equitable access to quality early childhood education through expanded support for home-based caregivers, funding innovations, and regulatory oversight.

VERSION: December 2024

**Variations in Pre-Primary Education Infrastructure Within and Across
Administrative Sectors in Rwanda**

Remy Pages^{1*} & Gilbert Munyemana²

¹Executive Office on Early Learning, State of Hawai'i

²National Child Development Agency, Rwanda

Author Note

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Remy Pages, Executive Office on Early Learning, 2759 South King Street Honolulu, Hawaii, 96826, USA.

Email: remy.pages@eoel.hawaii.gov

Abstract

This study investigates disparities in the quality of pre-primary education settings in Rwanda, focusing on differences across setting types—centre-based, community-based, and home-based—and examining the influence of socioeconomic status (SES) at the sector level. Using a dataset of 4,875 settings across 91 administrative sectors within seven districts, multilevel modeling estimates within- and between-sector variation in infrastructure quality from three latent factors: physical facilities, access to public infrastructure, and operational quality. Sector-level SES was operationalized as average years of schooling, providing an area-based measure of socioeconomic conditions. Findings reveal that centre-based settings, concentrated in higher-SES urban areas, consistently demonstrate higher infrastructure quality and are better equipped with physical facilities, access to public infrastructure, and operational resources compared to home-based settings. Home-based settings, prevalent in rural and lower-SES areas and often dependent on informal funding, lack essential resources, with quality deficits of 0.73 and 0.85 standard deviations (*SD*) in physical and operational quality, relative to centre-based settings. While SES is significantly associated with access to infrastructure across sectors, operational disparities remain largely tied to setting type. These results underscore structural disparities in Rwanda's pre-primary education landscape, with implications for policy interventions targeting equitable access to quality early childhood education through expanded support for home-based caregivers, funding innovations, and regulatory oversight.

Introduction

Access to quality early childhood care and pre-primary education is widely recognized as a critical potential determinant of children's long-term cognitive, socio-emotional, and educational outcomes (Berlinski et al., 2009; Heckman, 2006; Yoshikawa et al., 2013). As part of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically Goal 4.2, ensuring that all children have access to quality early childhood education by 2030 is a global priority (United Nations, 2015). This emphasis on high-quality early education is rooted in its potential to improve school readiness and academic outcomes, ultimately expanding lifelong opportunities, particularly for children from lower-resourced backgrounds or countries (Bietenbeck et al., 2019; Campbell et al., 2014; Duncan & Magnuson, 2013; Heckman, 2008; Patrinos & Psacharopoulos, 2020). While disparities in access to quality early childhood programs exist globally (Flood et al., 2022; A. Raikes et al., 2023; Rege et al., 2018), the challenges faced by young children in low- and middle-income countries are often more severe than those encountered in high-income countries (Britto et al., 2014; Krafft et al., 2024; Neuman & Powers, 2021).

In Rwanda, expanding access to pre-primary education has been a priority within the government's broader commitment to achieving universal education and aligning with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Ministry of Education, 2018). Significant progress has been made in recent years, with policies focused on increasing enrollment rates and improving the quality of early childhood education services (National Child Development Agency, 2022; UNICEF, 2024). However, disparities in both access and quality persist, particularly between urban and rural areas, where

infrastructure limitations pose a major challenge to realizing equitable education for all children (Ministry of Education, 2018; Sachs et al., 2024; UNICEF, 2024).

Rwanda's pre-primary education landscape consists of three main settings:

1. **Home-based:** An informal setting where a group of neighboring households designates one home to serve as a center for children's early learning during the day, providing care until parents pick their children up after work.
2. **Centre-based:** A formal early learning and development setting where children undergo sensory-motor, social-emotional, and cognitive-language development support, as well as training on school readiness by experienced caregivers.
3. **Community-based:** An improvised setting, normally arranged by members of the community, where temporary structures are turned into learning areas for young children.

Of the three, centre-based and home-based settings are currently the most prevalent, each presenting unique challenges and opportunities to promote equitable access to quality early learning (Ministry of Gender & Family Promotion, 2016).

Centre-Based Pre-Primary Settings: Access, Quality, and Socioeconomic Barriers

Centre-based pre-primary settings, typically formal institutions located in urban areas, are generally regarded as providing higher-quality early education. These settings benefit from regulated standards, better access to resources, and structured curricula designed to support children's holistic development (Burchinal et al., 2010, 2014; Phillips et al., 2000). Additionally, they are often staffed by qualified caregivers with specialized training in early childhood development, enhancing the quality of education provided (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Pianta et al., 2009; Sylva et al., 2010), and feature

adequate infrastructure, including safe and stimulating environments equipped with age-appropriate learning materials (Britto et al., 2017; Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2016).

However, centre-based settings often require substantial financial contributions from families, limiting access for lower-income households (UNESCO, 2020; World Bank, 2018). In countries like Rwanda, where many families live below the poverty line, these financial barriers are particularly pronounced, making enrollment fees a significant obstacle for many households (Ministry of Education, 2018). Moreover, centre-based settings are primarily concentrated in higher-income, urban areas where families are more likely to afford these costs (Rao et al., 2021; World Bank, 2018). This economic and geographic concentration contributes to significant disparities in access to high-quality pre-primary education, with urban children from higher SES backgrounds disproportionately benefiting from the superior infrastructure and learning environments available in centre-based settings (UNESCO, 2020).

Home-Based Settings: An Accessible but Unequal Alternative

In contrast, home-based pre-primary settings are more prevalent in rural areas, where access to formal, structured care and education is limited (Lanigan, 2011; Moore et al., 2019). These settings typically involve informal care arrangements provided by community members or relatives, often with minimal fees that reduce financial barriers for low-income families. Offering a flexible, community-oriented approach to early childhood education, they are frequently perceived as more culturally relevant and accessible, especially in rural contexts where community ties are strong and formal institutions are scarce (Porter, Paulsell, Del Grosso, et al., 2010).

However, the quality of education in home-based settings is often inconsistent due to several challenges. Many of these settings lack formal structures, adequate learning materials, and trained caregivers, which can compromise children's developmental outcomes (Halle et al., 2009; Rusby et al., 2016). For instance, caregivers in home-based settings typically do not receive specialized training in early childhood development, and the environments may lack the educational materials or facilities needed to effectively support learning (Blau & Currie, 2006; H. Raikes et al., 2005). Additionally, these settings often depend on in-kind contributions from the community and external support, raising concerns about their sustainability and their capacity to provide a stable, quality educational experience over time (Bromer & Henly, 2009; Porter, Paulsell, Nichols, et al., 2010) That said, in Rwanda and other low- and middle-income countries, home-based pre-primary settings may offer relatively greater value than higher-income countries, where alternatives such as maternal care are often more accessible and better resourced (Bernal et al., 2019; Duncan et al., 2023; Justino et al., 2023).

Despite these limitations, home-based settings are likely to play a crucial role in providing access to pre-primary education in underserved areas, particularly in Rwanda, often referred to as “the country of a thousand hills.” In many rural or remote regions within Rwanda and other low- and middle-income countries, where access to formal, center-based settings is limited, home-based options may represent the only viable solution. However, the comparatively lower quality of these settings can exacerbate disparities in educational outcomes, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (Lu et al., 2020; McCoy et al., 2018). Children in home-based environments often experience

less structured learning and limited infrastructure, which may impact their developmental progress and underscore the need to bridge this quality gap.

The Role of Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status (SES) is likely to play a critical role in shaping access to and the quality of pre-primary education in Rwanda. Previous research suggests that SES, often measured by average years of completed schooling, influences not only access but also families' choices and perceptions of care quality (Black et al., 2017; Fuller et al., 2004; OECD, 2017). Higher SES families are more likely to have access to centre-based settings, where infrastructure and caregiver qualifications are typically superior. However, these settings are often unaffordable for lower-income families, creating barriers to access (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2016; Yoshikawa et al., 2016).

Thus, in addition to access, higher SES families tend to be more attuned to what constitutes a beneficial environment for child development, both at home and in educational settings (Bornstein & Bradley, 2014; Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). Better equipped to distinguish between various forms of care, these families are more likely to select those they believe will provide optimal developmental outcomes for their children. By contrast, lower SES families may have fewer options and tend to prioritize basic accessibility and affordability in their choices (Johnson et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2024). This dual impact of SES— shaping both access to quality infrastructure and pedagogical processes and the educational environment within the home—contributes to a "double inequality" (Krafft et al., 2024), further exacerbating disparities in child development outcomes (Carlin et al., 2019; Padilla & Ryan, 2020).

The Present Study

Despite the recognized importance of early childhood education, there is limited research on the potential disparities in accessing pre-primary education settings with high-quality infrastructure in low- and middle-income countries. Most existing studies have focused primarily on access, without fully examining how the quality of education varies across different setting types and regions (UNESCO, 2020; World Bank, 2018). This study seeks to address this gap by investigating disparities in both access to and the quality of pre-primary education across diverse urban and rural areas in Rwanda, emphasizing the contrast between centre-based and home-based settings and exploring the influence of areas' socioeconomic status (SES) in different areas.

To guide this investigation, the following research questions were addressed: 1) To what extent do access and enrollment differ across pre-primary settings in urban and rural areas? 2) How does infrastructure quality vary between different types of pre-primary settings? 3) What is the association between infrastructure quality and socioeconomic status across geographical areas? By addressing these questions, this study aims to provide empirical evidence to inform policy interventions that promote equitable access to quality pre-primary education in Rwanda and comparable contexts.

Method

Data

This study utilized data from a comprehensive 2023 mapping of pre-primary services in Rwanda, commissioned by the National Child Development Agency (NCDA) and conducted by Esri Rwanda. This mapping provided updated insights into the spatial distribution and quality of services, covering center-based, home-based, workplace, and emergency pre-primary settings. Data collection focused on five regions: Kigali Province,

which includes the districts of Gasabo, Kicukiro, and Nyarugenge, along with the districts of Nyanza (Southern Province), Nyamasheke (Western Province), Rulindo (Northern Province), and Rwamagana (Eastern Province).

In addition to the 2023 mapping data, the study incorporated data from Rwanda's 2022 national census, specifically figures on the population of children and sector-level educational attainment. The census reported a total population of 13,246,394, with 1,071,139 children aged 3 to 5 years, accounting for 8.09% of the overall population. The data for this study were analyzed across 91 administrative sectors within the seven sampled districts, focusing on the availability and infrastructure quality of pre-primary education settings. In total, the dataset includes 4,875 pre-primary settings, servicing a total of 207,521 children aged 3 to 5 years.

Analytical Rationale

The analysis primarily contrasted urban and rural areas and focused on center-based and home-based settings, as these two types of settings were the most prevalent in our sample. Their distribution across sectors provided a valuable contrast between rural and urban areas, revealing potential disparities in infrastructure capacity and quality. A noticeable “competition” is apparent between these settings across sectors, with some areas predominantly favoring center-based settings and others showing a higher proportion of home-based settings (see Figure A.1 in the Appendix). This pattern likely reflects variations in availability, accessibility, and community preferences, highlighting differences in local needs and resources.

Outcome Variables: Infrastructure Quality Factors

An exploratory factor analysis of various binary and continuous indicators of infrastructure quality in pre-primary education settings identified a three-factor model with a strong fit. This analysis informed the decision to model these factors as confirmatory latent variables in the subsequent multilevel analysis. Using confirmatory latent factors offers a more robust framework than sum-score indexes, as it accounts for shared variance among indicators, thus enhancing the identification and precision of effects of interest (Cunha et al., 2021). The three latent factors are as follows:

1. **Basic Physical Facilities:** This factor includes indicators related to fundamental facilities within the settings, specifically the presence of a handwashing station, waste disposal, and piped water.
2. **Public Infrastructure Proximity:** This factor represents the proximity of public infrastructure to the settings, including health facilities, local government offices, and primary schools.
3. **Staff Quality & Operational Metrics:** This factor captures continuous variables related to staff qualifications and operational capacity within the settings, specifically the proportion of qualified educators, the number of operational hours per day, and the number of operational days per week.

These latent factors provide a structured approach to understanding infrastructure quality across pre-primary education settings in Rwanda.

Socioeconomic Status

For each administrative sector, socioeconomic status (SES) was operationalized by the average years of completed schooling among residents aged 12 or older. This

measure of educational attainment serves as a good proxy for SES, showing a strong negative correlation with the Multidimensional Poverty Index (Pearson's $r = -0.89$), which is based on multiple non-monetary indicators and calculated as the product of poverty incidence and intensity (Alkire et al., 2021).

Empirical Strategy

This study employed a multilevel analysis to capture meaningful variation in infrastructure quality across pre-primary education settings at both the within- and the between-sector levels. Clustering at the district-level, with only seven districts, would have lack both the necessary statistical power and granularity, making sector-level analysis essential. To address the over-representation of sectors in Kigali Province (35 out of 91 sectors), a binary indicator for the province was included in the models.

The analysis modeled three distinct, correlated latent infrastructure factors— basic physical facilities; public infrastructure proximity; staff quality and operational metrics—that were presented in detail in the Outcome Variables section. By modeling these factors as confirmatory latent variables simultaneously, we maintain the specificity of each dimension of infrastructure quality they represent. The measurement of each factor was specified as follows:

$$\text{Physical Facilities}_{ij} = \lambda_1(\text{Handwashing}) + \lambda_2(\text{Waste Disposal}) + \lambda_3(\text{Piped Water}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

$$\text{Public Infrastructures}_{ij} = \lambda_5(\text{Health Facility}) + \lambda_6(\text{Government Office}) + \lambda_7(\text{School}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

$$\text{Operations}_{ij} = \lambda_8(\text{Qualified Staff}) + \lambda_9(\text{Operational Hours}) + \lambda_{10}(\text{Operational Days}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

Each λ represents the factor loading for its respective indicator, and ε_{ij} is a vector of indicators' measurement error terms for each factor.

The structural model contrasts center-based settings (reference group) with home-based and community-based settings across sectors and was formalized as follows:

Level 1 (Within-Sector):

$$\text{Infrastructure Factor}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1(\text{Home}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{Community}_{ij}) + r_{ij}$$

Level 2 (Between-Sector):

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{SES}_j) + \gamma_{02}(\text{Kigali}_j) + u_{0j}$$

$$\beta_1 = \gamma_{10}$$

$$\beta_2 = \gamma_{20}$$

In this model, Infrastructure Factor $_{ij}$ vector represents each latent infrastructure factor for the i -th setting in the j -th sector. Coefficients β_1 and β_2 capture the within-sector differences in infrastructure quality for home-based and community-based settings, respectively, relative to centre-based settings, with positive values indicating higher quality and negative values indicating lower quality. The parameter γ_{01} represents the effect of SES, proxied by educational attainment, on infrastructure quality, while γ_{10} and γ_{20} capture sector-level effects of home-based and community-based settings, respectively, on infrastructure quality compared to centre-based settings.

By modeling the latent factors collectively while allowing each to retain its distinct dimensionality, the analysis enhances our understanding of how local socioeconomic conditions and setting types correlate with specific aspects of pre-primary infrastructure quality across Rwanda.

Results

Patterns of Pre-Primary Enrollment

Table 1

Enrollment by Settings, within Districts (Province)

	Setting type	Number of children enrolled	Number of settings	Enrollment within setting type (%)
<i>Gasabo (Kigali)</i>	Centre	36,539	411	78%
	Community	4,644	116	9%
	Home	5,348	276	11%
<i>Kicukiro (Kigali)</i>	Centre	17,735	189	72%
	Community	4,304	89	17%
	Home	2,445	86	9%
<i>Nyarugenge (Kigali)</i>	Centre	13,014	128	69%
	Community	2,066	47	10%
	Home	3,735	159	19%
<i>Nyamasheke (West)</i>	Centre	16,356	229	47%
	Community	4,128	204	11%
	Home	14,242	966	41%
<i>Rulindo (North)</i>	Centre	17,698	144	62%
	Community	1,707	64	6%
	Home	9,002	611	31%
<i>Nyanza (South)</i>	Centre	16,164	123	69%
	Community	1,541	52	6%
	Home	5,666	357	24%
<i>Rwamagana (East)</i>	Centre	18,128	146	58%
	Community	5,131	109	16%
	Home	7,928	369	25%
Total	Center	135,634	1,370	65%
	Community	23,521	681	11%
	Home	48,366	2,824	23%
		207,521	4,875	100%

Table 1 reveals significant variation in pre-primary enrollment across different types of settings. Centre-based settings hold the highest overall enrollment, accounting for 65% of total pre-primary enrollment, serving 135,634 children across 1,370 centers. Home-based settings follow, with 23% of enrollment (48,366 children in 2,824 centers), while community-based settings account for 11% (23,521 children in 681 centers). This dominance of centre-based settings underscores their substantial role, particularly in urban areas. Within individual districts, centre-based settings have the highest enrollment percentages across all regions, especially in urban districts within Kigali Province, such

as Gasabo (78%). In contrast, rural districts like Nyamasheke show a higher proportion of children in home-based settings (41%), indicating a strong reliance on informal structures where access to centre-based services may be limited. These descriptive counts highlight a clear urban-rural divide in pre-primary education: urban areas primarily depend on centre-based settings, whereas rural areas increasingly rely on home-based structures as essential access points.

Pre-Primary Enrollment Rate: Gasabo & Nyamasheke


A closer examination of enrollment rates in the urban district of Gasabo and the rural district of Nyamasheke highlights contrasting dynamics that exemplify how urban and rural contexts shape access to pre-primary education in Rwanda. Figure 1 reveals notable differences in cross-sector enrollment rates within these two districts. In Gasabo, the eligible child population ranges from 810 in Kimihurura to 10,662 in Kinyinya, totaling 68,986 children aged 3 to 5 years. Urbanized sectors, such as Ndera, Nduba, and Gisozi, centre-based settings account almost exclusively for the pre-primary enrollments (within-sector rates of 50%, 60%, and 66%, respectively, of sectors' eligible children population). Notably, Kimironko and Kimihurura show rates of 109% and 128%, likely due to influx of children from neighboring areas. In contrast, peripheral sectors like Rusororo and Gikomero also rely on home-based settings (with enrollment rates of 25% and 24%, respectively).

Nyamasheke, with an eligible population ranging from 1,595 in Mahembe to 3,533 in Kagano (totaling 37,449 children), demonstrates different dynamics, with a stronger reliance on home-based settings. Sectors like Kagano, Kanjongo, and Karengera show home-based enrollment rates of 43%, 33%, and 45%, respectively, while Bushenge

reaches 90%. Despite the predominance of home-based settings, Nyamasheke still shows moderate enrollment in centre-based settings (34% to 62% across sectors), illustrating the district’s more limited but present access to formal centers amid its rural context.

Figure 1

Enrollment Rates across Pre-Primary Setting



Infrastructure Quality Average Differences

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Quality Indicators & SES Proxy, by Setting Type

	Centre	Community	Home	Centre vs. Home	ICC
Handwashing station	0.93 (0.25)	0.79 (0.41)	0.68 (0.47)	0.25 ($d = 0.61$)	0.38
Piped water	0.80 (0.40)	0.35 (0.48)	0.23 (0.42)	0.57 ($d = 1.39$)	0.40
Waste disposal	0.92 (0.27)	0.75 (0.44)	0.68 (0.47)	0.24 ($d = 0.58$)	0.51
Health facility	0.87 (0.34)	0.75 (0.43)	0.69 (0.46)	0.18 ($d = 0.42$)	0.41
Government office	0.92 (0.27)	0.89 (0.32)	0.78 (0.41)	0.14 ($d = 0.37$)	0.46
Primary school	0.96 (0.19)	0.86 (0.34)	0.82 (0.38)	0.14 ($d = 0.43$)	0.35
Qualified educators	0.45 (0.43)	0.26 (0.40)	0.10 (0.27)	0.36 ($d = 1.07$)	0.42
Operational hours	5.06 (1.63)	4.23 (1.00)	3.84 (0.78)	1.22 ($d = 1.08$)	0.34
Operational days	4.99 (0.36)	4.35 (1.36)	3.83 (1.56)	1.16 ($d = 0.89$)	0.35
SES/Educational attainment	6.21 (1.73)	5.65 (1.52)	4.99 (1.03)	1.22 ($d = 0.94$)	
<i>N</i>	1,370	681	2,824		

Notes. All mean differences between Centre and Home had p -value $< .0001$. Cohen's d is a measure of effect size that indicates the standardized difference between two group means, where the mean difference is divided by the standard deviation pooled across the Centre and Home settings. ICC: Intra Class Correlations.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics on key infrastructure and operational metrics, highlighting considerable differences across pre-primary setting types. Centre-based settings exhibit superior infrastructure, with 93% having handwashing stations, 80% having piped water, and 92% having waste disposal facilities. In comparison, home-based settings display lower figures: 68% with handwashing stations, 23% with piped water, and 68% with waste disposal facilities. The substantial effect sizes (e.g., piped water, Cohen's $d = 1.39$; handwashing stations, $d = 0.61$) reflect the disparity in basic facilities. For proximity to public resources, centre-based settings show advantages: 87% are near health facilities and 96% are near primary schools, compared to 69% and 82% for home-based settings, respectively. Differences are most marked in proximity to government offices (92% in centre-based vs. 78% in home-based; $d = 0.37$).

Staff qualifications and operational characteristics further emphasize the gaps. In centre-based settings, 45% of educators are qualified, while only 10% of educators in home-based settings hold qualifications ($d = 1.07$). Centre-based settings also operate longer hours per day (5.06 vs. 3.84 hours; $d = 1.08$) and more days per week on average. Community-based settings, positioned between centre- and home-based in infrastructure quality, show limited staff qualifications (26% qualified) and shorter hours, suggesting resource limitations similar to home-based settings but with slightly better infrastructure.

These findings underscore socioeconomic disparities, as settings in higher-SES sectors are generally better equipped. Educational attainment, a proxy for SES, averages 6.21 years in sectors with a larger concentration of centre-based settings compared to 4.99 years in those predominantly featuring home-based settings ($d = 0.94$).

Sector-Level Variability

Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) from Table 2 reveal the extent of sector-level variation in infrastructure quality. For instance, the ICC for waste disposal is 0.51, indicating that 51% of the variance in waste disposal availability is due to between-sector differences, with the remaining 49% is attributed to variation within sectors. High ICC values for key indicators, such as proximity to government offices (0.46) and qualified educators (0.42), suggest that sector-level factors significantly shape infrastructure quality. These ICCs underscore the importance of a multilevel approach, allowing us to account for both sector-level and within-sector differences across Rwanda's pre-primary settings.

Multilevel Regression Models

Table 3

Infrastructure Quality Factors on Pre-Primary Settings and Sector-Level SES

	Level 1 (Within-Sector)			Level 2 (Between-Sector)					
	Physical Facilities	Public Infrastructures	Operations	Physical Facilities	Public Infrastructures	Public Infrastructures	Public Infrastructures	Operations	Operations
Home	-0.73 [-.77; -.70] $p < .001$	-0.30 [-.35; -.25] $p < .001$	-0.85 [-.88; -.81] $p < .001$	-0.94 [-1; -.77] $p < .001$	-0.33 [-.64; -.06] $p = .02$	-0.38 [-.63; -.06] $p = .02$	0.08 [-.24; -.35] $p = .60$	-0.83 [-1; -.63] $p < .001$	-0.70 [-.95; -.31] $p < .001$
Community	-0.48 [-.52; -.44] $p < .001$	-0.17 [-.22; -.12] $p < .001$	-0.35 [-.39; -.31] $p < .001$	-0.26 [-.48; -.05] $p = .02$	-0.12 [-.28; .05] $p = .13$	0.04 [-.24; .32] $p = .80$	0.05 [-.20; .32] $p = .70$	-0.28 [-.52; -.03] $p = .03$	-0.21 [-.51; .09] $p = .19$
SES					0.54 [.42; .64] $p < .001$	0.21 [.05; .36] $p = .01$		0.11 [-.11; .33] $p = .36$	
R^2	.46	.08	.58	.67	.79	.17	.41	.51	.43
N	4,875 settings; 91 clusters (administrative sectors)								

Notes. Centre-based pre-primary settings are the reference category. SES: proxied by sector-level average years of completed schooling among residents aged 12 or older. 95% confidence intervals are displayed within brackets.

Table 3 reveals substantial disparities in infrastructure quality across pre-primary settings and highlights the impact of sector-level SES. At the within-sector level, which isolates differences in infrastructure quality between setting types while controlling for sector characteristics, home-based settings consistently demonstrated lower infrastructure quality compared to centre-based settings. For physical facilities, home-based settings were 0.73 *SD* below centre-based settings (95% CI: [-0.77; -0.70], $p < .001$; R-squared = .46), suggesting a marked deficiency in essential resources such as handwashing stations, waste disposal, and piped water—critical for health and hygiene. Operational quality showed an even larger gap, with home-based settings trailing by -0.85 *SD* compared to

centre-based settings (95% CI: [-0.88; -0.81], $p < .001$, R-squared = .58), reflecting reduced operating hours, fewer operational days, and lower qualified staff availability. In contrast, public infrastructure proximity showed a smaller effect, with home-based settings 0.30 *SD* lower than centre-based settings (95% CI: [-0.35; -0.25], $p < .001$), and with only minimal variance explained by setting type (R-squared = .08). These patterns suggest that within sectors, home-based settings are structurally disadvantaged, especially regarding physical facilities and operational resources.

The between-sector results further reveal substantial disparities in infrastructure quality across settings types, with centre-based settings maintaining a significant advantage over home-based and community-based settings, especially in physical facilities and operational metrics. Without controlling for SES, home-based settings scored 0.94 *SD* lower in physical facilities quality than centre-based settings (95% CI: [-1.00; -0.77], $p < .001$), with only a slight reduction in effect when SES was included (0.83 *SD*; 95% CI: [-1.00; -0.63], $p < .001$). Community-based settings also showed lower physical facilities quality relative to centre-based settings, although with a smaller and less precise effect size of 0.26 *SD* (95% CI: [-0.48; -0.05], $p = .02$), which diminished further and became non-significant with SES included (-0.12 *SD*; 95% CI: [-0.28; 0.05], $p = .13$). The explained variance for physical facilities quality between sectors was relatively high, with an R-squared of 0.67 without SES and increasing to 0.79 with SES, suggesting that setting type and SES together account for much of the variance in access to physical facilities.

The between-sector results for public infrastructure (Table 3) show that centre-based settings maintained an advantage over home-based settings, though with a smaller

effect size than observed for physical facilities. Without SES as a control, home-based settings scored 0.38 *SD* lower than centre-based settings in proximity to public infrastructure (95% CI: [-0.63; -0.06], $p = .02$). This effect vanished when SES was included (0.08 *SD*; 95% CI: [-0.24; 0.35], $p = .60$), underscoring sector-level SES as a significant determinant of public infrastructure access near home-based settings. The SES effect itself is 0.21 *SD* (95% CI: [0.05; 0.36], $p = .01$), indicating that higher-SES sectors generally offer have better access to public resources like health facilities and schools. This pattern held consistently across provinces, as the model controlled for Kigali (Rwanda's capital), where public infrastructure is inherently more concentrated. Community-based settings showed negligible differences from centre-based settings in public infrastructure access, both with and without SES included. The between-sector *R*-squared for public infrastructure was relatively modest, increasing from 0.17 without SES to 0.41 with SES, suggesting SES as a more significant contributor to public infrastructure access across sectors.

The between-sector analysis for operational quality (Table 3) showed marked disparities, with home-based settings continuing to lag behind centre-based settings. Without SES, home-based settings scored 0.83 *SD* lower on operational quality (95% CI: [-1.00; -0.63], $p < .001$), highlighting limitations in qualified staff availability, operational hours, and days. When SES was added to the model, the gap only slightly narrowed to 0.70 *SD* (95% CI: [-0.95; -0.31], $p < .001$), suggesting that SES has a somewhat lesser influence on operational quality than on other infrastructure factors. Community-based settings also displayed lower operational quality than centre-based settings (0.28 *SD*; 95% CI: [-0.52; -0.03], $p = .03$), though this difference was no longer

statistically different from zero once SES was included (0.21 *SD*; 95% CI: [-0.51; 0.09], $p = .19$). The R-squared values for operational quality across sectors were relatively high at 0.51 without SES and 0.43 with SES included, indicating that setting type already captures a substantial portion of the variance in operational quality and that the added shared variance with SES may have slightly diluted the unique explanatory power of setting type (given that operational resources, staff availability, and schedules are often directly tied to whether a setting is centre-based or home-based).

Discussion

This study examined disparities in infrastructure quality across different pre-primary education settings in Rwanda—specifically, centre-based, community-based, and home-based settings—and assessed the role of sector-level socioeconomic status (SES) associated with these disparities. Using a multilevel analytical approach, the analysis separated within-sector differences between setting types and evaluated the influence of SES at the between-sector level.

The findings indicate that home-based settings consistently demonstrated lower infrastructure quality compared to centre-based settings across all measured factors: physical facilities, proximity to public infrastructure, and operational quality. For example, home-based settings scored 0.73 standard deviations (*SD*) below centre-based settings in physical facilities and 0.85 *SD* lower in operational quality. These deficits highlight notable resource gaps, like waste disposal, piped water, operating hours, and qualified staff.

At the between-sector level, higher SES was linked to better physical facilities and enhanced access to public infrastructure across all setting types. Although including

SES in the models partially reduced the disparities between home-based and centre-based settings for physical facilities and public infrastructure access, significant gaps remained. For operational quality, SES had a limited effect, suggesting that pre-primary education setting type is the predominant factor influencing this domain.

These results underscore the structural disadvantages faced by home-based settings in Rwanda. The persistent quality gaps, even after adjusting for SES, imply that children attending home-based settings may lack access to critical resources essential for early childhood development. These outcomes resonate with research on “double inequality” in early childhood education, where both access to and quality of infrastructure favor children from higher socioeconomic backgrounds (Britto et al., 2017; Krafft et al., 2024). The substantial deficits in physical and operational resources within home-based settings underscore the structural barriers that low-SES children face, often attending settings that, while accessible, lack essential quality indicators (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2016).

Sector-level SES effects, especially on public resources, reinforce evidence suggesting that high-SES sectors often benefit from greater social and physical capital, thereby deepening disparities for children in low-SES, often rural, areas where access to quality resources remains limited (A. Raikes et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2020). However, the continued quality gaps in home-based settings within high-SES areas imply that improving SES alone may be insufficient to bridge these disparities. Prior studies highlight the need for targeted investments that go beyond physical infrastructure improvements to address quality through direct regulation and resource allocation (Heckman, 2006; Yoshikawa et al., 2013).

Furthermore, the operational quality gaps reflect SES's limited influence on staffing and operational structures across settings. The minimal effect of sector-level SES on operational quality in home-based settings suggests that these environments may be particularly vulnerable to resource constraints beyond local socioeconomic conditions, lacking the robust staffing and extended schedules seen in centre-based settings (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Phillips et al., 2000; H. Raikes et al., 2005). This emphasizes the importance of differentiated policy responses, where formal regulatory standards and financial support systems could play a critical role in addressing the unique barriers faced by home-based settings.

Collectively, these insights contribute to the broader discourse on early childhood inequality. They illustrate how setting-specific disparities reflect and reinforce existing social and economic divides. They underscore an urgent need for structural reforms that prioritize equity in infrastructure quality, ensuring that all children, particularly those from low-SES backgrounds, have access to high-quality early learning environments is essential as a crucial step toward mitigating deep-seated inequalities (Black et al., 2017; Yoshikawa et al., 2016).

Limitations

While this study's sample, covering seven districts and 91 sectors, offers an insightful overview of pre-primary infrastructure quality across a substantial portion of Rwanda, it does not represent the entire country. Consequently, the findings may not fully reflect the diversity and specific challenges of districts not included in the sample. Variations in socioeconomic status, cultural norms, and regional policies likely influence the types, quality, and accessibility of pre-primary settings in other areas. This limitation

suggests that the findings are not entirely generalizable to the national level and could overlook unique needs or challenges in unstudied regions. Future research could expand on this study by including additional districts to gain a more nuanced understanding of infrastructure quality across all regions of Rwanda.

Additionally, the study's focus on infrastructure quality captures essential aspects of a quality learning environment but does not address all quality dimensions. Key qualitative aspects, such as caregiver-child interactions, curriculum content, staff qualifications beyond credentials, and child developmental outcomes, were beyond this study's scope. Furthermore, elements related to pedagogical practices and emotional support provided within these settings were not evaluated, while there is some evidence that these dimension have a positive impact on child development (Ulferts et al., 2019). While robust infrastructure is essential, it alone does not fully define quality in early education. Future studies should incorporate observational and evaluative measures of pedagogy and processes to provide a more comprehensive assessment of pre-primary setting quality.

Implications & Future Directions

The findings from this study underscore significant policy challenges and potential directions for enhancing Rwanda's pre-primary education sector.

Funding Streams and Sustainability

The financial landscape across pre-primary settings in Rwanda reveals notable disparities, underscoring quality discrepancies between settings. As illustrated in Figure A.2 of the Appendix, approximately 58% of centre-based settings rely primarily on fees alone or a combination of fees and government subsidies, while another 9% operate

solely on government funds. This reliance on formalized funding sources aligns with the higher infrastructure and operational standards in these settings, yet it imposes a considerable financial burden on families. For low-income households, these costs may limit access, challenging the goal of equitable early childhood education (Hahn & Barnett, 2023).

In contrast, home-based settings display a broader dependency on in-kind contributions, with 484 out of 2,146 settings supported solely through in-kind contributions (Figure A.2 in the Appendix). These sources are frequently supplemented by owner support or modest fees, funding schemes which accounts for about 42 % of the settings, reflecting a less formalized financial structure that introduces funding volatility. This reliance on non-monetary and external support underscores the vulnerability of home-based settings, particularly in low-SES areas where fee-based income may be less predictable. Notably, around 16% of home-based settings rely exclusively on family fees for operating costs, highlighting that fee-based funding remains significant even among lower-resource settings.

Consequently, these financial dynamics likely contribute to a structurally uneven landscape in which funding variability influences both the stability and quality of pre-primary services across settings, ultimately impacting the children served. Given these dynamics, early childhood development policymakers could consider expanding formal financial support for home-based settings to meet basic infrastructure standards, fostering greater consistency and quality across settings.

Operational Disparities

Our study's findings underscore significant disparities in operational quality across pre-primary setting types, with centre-based settings generally offering longer, more consistent schedules compared to home-based settings. This consistency likely stems from the higher infrastructure standards and more formalized funding streams characteristic of centre-based environments. These operational differences reflect distinct capacities to meet family needs and support children's development. Centre-based settings typically provide extended hours, more qualified staff, and operate more days per week, fostering a structured environment that supports stable routines crucial for early development (LePage et al., 2005). In contrast, home-based settings, with more flexible yet limited schedules, may lack consistency, potentially affecting children's learning experiences and long-term developmental outcomes. Addressing these operational disparities—through expanded caregiver training and resource allocation—could promote a more equitable and robust pre-primary education system in Rwanda, better aligning with the needs of diverse families (Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, 2015).

Workforce Development and Professionalization of Home-Based Care

One of a potentially promising policy directions is the integration of home-based caregivers into the formal pre-primary workforce. Home-based settings often operate with minimal resources yet demonstrate strong ties to local communities, representing a largely untapped potential for workforce expansion. By offering targeted professional development, training, and support, policymakers could empower home-based caregivers with the skills necessary to deliver quality early childhood care and education (Clarke-

Stewart et al., 2002). This approach would not only raise the quality of education in home-based settings but also foster career pathways for caregivers, contributing to a more robust and professionalized pre-primary education workforce in Rwanda. Over time, with adequate resources and regulatory support, some home-based settings could transition into more formalized institutions, enhancing both the capacity and quality of pre-primary services across the country. This transition would not only expand access to high-quality education but also help address the current workforce shortages in the sector by creating formal roles and professional opportunities for home-based caregivers (for an overview regarding Early Childhood Development workforce policy at scale, see Yoshikawa et al., 2018).

Future Research Directions

While this study highlights key disparities in infrastructure quality across pre-primary settings and underscores the potential for workforce development and operational improvements, further research is essential to build a more comprehensive understanding of these issues. Longitudinal studies that examine the impact of different pre-primary settings on child development outcomes over time would provide invaluable evidence for refining and prioritizing these policy directions (Duncan et al., 2023). Moreover, targeted studies on barriers to accessing quality Early Childhood Development services, particularly in rural and lower-SES areas, would offer a clearer view of the contextual challenges faced by families and settings alike, ensuring that policy interventions are effectively tailored to the local landscape (McCoy et al., 2018; A. Raikes et al., 2023).

Conclusion

This study sheds light on disparities in pre-primary infrastructure in Rwanda, emphasizing how structural and socioeconomic factors impact access to quality early learning environments. Addressing these gaps—through practical steps such as targeted funding, operational support, and workforce development—could help reduce inequities and strengthen pre-primary education in underserved areas. Further policy and research efforts may focus on the specific infrastructure and resource gaps identified here, ensuring that sustainable improvements expand access to quality early education for children across Rwanda.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests to disclose.

Funding

Remy Pages was funded by a Fulbright Public Policy Fellowship (award number PS00355715), while conducting the work at the National Child Development Agency (NCDA) in Rwanda. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Fulbright Program.

Authors' contributions

Remy Pages: conception; empirical strategy and data analysis; writing and writing revisions. Gilbert Munyemana: data collection design; writing revisions.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to Assumpta Ingabire, Henry Cyemezo, Diane Iradukunda, Emmanuel Mucangando, and NCDA data and evaluation research team for their helpful feedback on an earlier version of this project.

References

- Alkire, S., Kanagaratnam, U., & Suppa, N. (2021). *The global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) 2021* (OPHI MPI Methodological Note 51). Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, University of Oxford.
https://ophi.org.uk/sites/default/files/2024-03/OPHI_MPI_MN_51_2021_4_%282022%29.pdf
- Berlinski, S., Galiani, S., & Gertler, P. (2009). The effect of pre-primary education on primary school performance. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93(1), 219–234.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.09.002>
- Bernal, R., Attanasio, O., Peña, X., & Vera-Hernández, M. (2019). The effects of the transition from home-based childcare to childcare centers on children’s health and development in Colombia. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47, 418–431.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.08.005>
- Bietenbeck, J., Ericsson, S., & Wamalwa, F. M. (2019). Preschool attendance, schooling, and cognitive skills in East Africa. *Economics of Education Review*, 73, 101909.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.101909>
- Black, M. M., Walker, S. P., Fernald, L. C. H., Andersen, C. T., DiGirolamo, A. M., Lu, C., McCoy, D. C., Fink, G., Shawar, Y. R., Shiffman, J., Devercelli, A. E., Wodon, Q. T., Vargas-Barón, E., & Grantham-McGregor, S. (2017). Early childhood development coming of age: Science through the life course. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31389-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7)
- Blau, D., & Currie, J. (2006). Pre-school, day care, and after-school care: Who’s minding the kids? *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, 2, 1163–1278.

- Bornstein, M. H., & Bradley, R. H. (Eds.). (2014). *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607027>
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic Status and Child Development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 371–399. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135233>
- Britto, P. R., Lye, S. J., Proulx, K., Yousafzai, A. K., Matthews, S. G., Vaivada, T., Perez-Escamilla, R., Rao, N., Ip, P., Fernald, L. C. H., MacMillan, H., Hanson, M., Wachs, T. D., Yao, H., Yoshikawa, H., Cerezo, A., Leckman, J. F., & Bhutta, Z. A. (2017). Nurturing care: Promoting early childhood development. *The Lancet, 389*(10064), 91–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31390-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31390-3)
- Britto, P. R., Yoshikawa, H., van Ravens, J., Ponguta, L. A., Reyes, M., Oh, S., Dimaya, R., Nieto, A. M., & Seder, R. (2014). Strengthening systems for integrated early childhood development services: A cross-national analysis of governance. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1308*(1), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12365>
- Bromer, J., & Henly, J. R. (2009). The work–family support roles of child care providers across settings. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 24*(3), 271–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.04.002>
- Burchinal, M., Vandergrift, N., Pianta, R., & Mashburn, A. (2010). Threshold analysis of association between child care quality and child outcomes for low-income children in pre-kindergarten programs. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 25*(2), 166–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.10.004>

- Burchinal, M., Vernon-Feagans, L., Vitiello, V., & Greenberg, M. (2014). Thresholds in the association between child care quality and child outcomes in rural preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *29*(1), 41–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2013.09.004>
- Campbell, F., Conti, G., Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Pungello, E., & Pan, Y. (2014). Early childhood investments substantially boost adult health. *Science*, *343*(6178), 1478–1485. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248429>
- Carlin, C., Davis, E. E., Krafft, C., & Tout, K. (2019). Parental preferences and patterns of child care use among low-income families: A Bayesian analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *99*, 172–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.02.006>
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Vandell, D. L., Burchinal, M., O'Brien, M., & McCartney, K. (2002). Do regulable features of child-care homes affect children's development? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *17*(1), 52–86.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(02\)00133-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(02)00133-3)
- Cunha, F., Nielsen, E., & Williams, B. (2021). The Econometrics of Early Childhood Human Capital and Investments. *Annual Review of Economics*, *13*(1), 487–513.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080217-053409>
- Duncan, G., Kalil, A., Mogstad, M., & Rege, M. (2023). Investing in early childhood development in preschool and at home. In E. A. Hanushek, S. Machin, & L. Woessmann (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–91). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hesedu.2022.11.005>

- Duncan, G., & Magnuson, K. (2013). Investing in preschool programs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(2), 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.2.109>
- Flood, S., McMurry, J., Sojourner, A., & Wiswall, M. (2022). Inequality in early care experienced by us children. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 36(2), 199–222. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.36.2.199>
- Fuller, B., Kagan, S. L., Loeb, S., & Chang, Y.-W. (2004). Child care quality: Centers and home settings that serve poor families. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 19(4), 505–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2004.10.006>
- Hahn, R. A., & Barnett, W. S. (2023). Early Childhood Education: Health, Equity, and Economics. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 44(Volume 44, 2023), 75–92. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-071321-032337>
- Halle, T., Forry, N., Hair, E., Perper, K., Wandner, L., Wessel, J., & Vick, J. (2009). *Disparities in early learning and development: Lessons from the early childhood longitudinal study – birth cohort (ECLS-B)*. Child Trends. <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/2009-52DisparitiesELExecSumm.pdf>
- Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science*, 312(5782), 1900–1902. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1128898>
- Heckman, J. J. (2008). Schools, Skills, and Synapses. *Economic Inquiry*, 46(3), 289–324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2008.00163.x>

- Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. (2015). *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation* (L. Allen, Ed.). The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/19401>
- Johnson, A. D., Padilla, C. M., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2017). Predictors of public early care and education use among children of low-income immigrants. *Children and Youth Services Review, 73*, 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.11.024>
- Justino, P., Leone, M., Rolla, P., Abimpaye, M., Dusabe, C., Uwamahoro, M. D., & Germond, R. (2023). Improving parenting practices for early child development: Experimental evidence from Rwanda. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 21*(4), 1510–1550. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvac070>
- Krafft, C., Raikes, A., Towfighian, S. N., & Mojgani, R. S. (2024). Quality and inequality in pre-primary and home environment inputs to early childhood development in Egypt. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 68*, 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2024.03.001>
- Lanigan, J. D. (2011). Family child care providers' perspectives regarding effective professional development and their role in the child care system: A qualitative study. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 38*(6), 399–409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-010-0420-2>
- LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Akar, H., Gutierrez, C., Jenkins-Gunn, E., & Rosebrock, K. (2005). *Classroom Management*.
- Lu, C., Cuartas, J., Fink, G., McCoy, D., Liu, K., Li, Z., Daelmans, B., & Richter, L. (2020). Inequalities in early childhood care and development in low/middle-

- income countries: 2010–2018. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(2), e002314.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002314>
- Magnuson, K., & Waldfogel, J. (2016). Trends in Income-Related Gaps in Enrollment in Early Childhood Education: 1968 to 2013. *AERA Open*, 2(2), 2332858416648933. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416648933>
- McCoy, D. C., Salhi, C., Yoshikawa, H., Black, M., Britto, P., & Fink, G. (2018). Home- and center-based learning opportunities for preschoolers in low- and middle-income countries. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 88, 44–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.02.021>
- Ministry of Education. (2018). *Education sector strategic plan 2018/19 to 2023/24*.
https://www.mineduc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/Mineduc/Publications/ESSP/1_Education_Sector_Strategic_Plan_2018_2024.pdf
- Ministry of Gender & Family Promotion. (2016). *Early Childhood Development Policy*. MIGEPROF Rwanda.
<https://www.ncda.gov.rw/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=54552&token=53ad145c1915cf6c1f9fb47d0555c52dc988e1bc>
- Moore, T., Ryan, R. M., Fauth, R. C., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2019). Low-income and young children. In *Handbook of Research on the Education of Young Children* (pp. 209–233). Routledge.
- National Child Development Agency. (2022). *Operational plan 2022–2025*. NCDA Rwanda.
<https://www.ncda.gov.rw/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=70621&token=1dc5c84f5723c9d2fae2fab0e8bc07b25631b50b>

- Neuman, M. J., & Powers, S. (2021). Political prioritization of early childhood education in low- and middle-income countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 86, 102458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102458>
- OECD. (2017). *Starting Strong V: Transitions from Early Childhood Education and Care to Primary Education*. OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264276253-en>
- Padilla, C. M., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). School readiness among children of Hispanic immigrants and their peers: The role of parental cognitive stimulation and early care and education. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 52, 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.04.008>
- Patrinos, H. A., & Psacharopoulos, G. (2020). Chapter 4—Returns to education in developing countries. In S. Bradley & C. Green (Eds.), *The Economics of Education (Second Edition)* (pp. 53–64). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815391-8.00004-5>
- Peisner-Feinberg, E. S., Burchinal, M. R., Clifford, R. M., Culkin, M. L., Howes, C., Kagan, S. L., & Yazejian, N. (2001). The relation of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development*, 72(5), 1534–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00364>
- Phillips, D., Mekos, D., Scarr, S., McCartney, K., & Abbott-Shim, M. (2000). Within and beyond the classroom door: Assessing quality in child care centers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(4), 475–496. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(01\)00077-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(01)00077-1)

- Pianta, R. C., Barnett, W. S., Burchinal, M., & Thornburg, K. R. (2009). The Effects of Preschool Education: What We Know, How Public Policy Is or Is Not Aligned With the Evidence Base, and What We Need to Know. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 10(2), 49–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100610381908>
- Porter, T., Paulsell, D., Del Grosso, P., Avellar, S., Hass, R., & Vuong, L. (2010). *A review of the literature on home-based child care: Implications for future directions*. Mathematica Policy Research. <https://www.mathematica.org/our-publications-and-findings/publications/a-review-of-the-literature-on-home-based-child-care-implications-for-future-directions>
- Porter, T., Paulsell, D., Nichols, T., Begnoche, C., & Grosso, P. D. (2010). *Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: A Compendium of 23 Initiatives*. Mathematica Policy Research. https://www.mathematica.org/-/media/publications/pdfs/earlychildhood/hbcc_compendium_23.pdf
- Raikes, A., Rao, N., Yoshikawa, H., Cahrssen, C., Behrman, J., Cappa, C., Devercelli, A., Lopez Boo, F., McCoy, D., Richter, L., & the UKRI GCRF. (2023). Global tracking of access and quality in early childhood care and education. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 17(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40723-023-00116-5>
- Raikes, H., Raikes, H. A., & Wilcox, B. L. (2005). Regulation, subsidy receipt and provider characteristics: What predicts quality in child care homes? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 20(2), 164–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2005.04.006>

- Rao, N., Cahrssen, C., Sun, J., Su, Y., & Perlman, M. (2021). Chapter Eight - Early child development in low- and middle-income countries: Is it what mothers have or what they do that makes a difference to child outcomes? In J. J. Lockman (Ed.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (Vol. 61, pp. 255–277). JAI.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2021.04.002>
- Rege, M., Solli, I. F., Størksen, I., & Votruba, M. (2018). Variation in center quality in a universal publicly subsidized and regulated childcare system. *Labour Economics*, 55, 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2018.10.003>
- Rusby, J. C., Jones, L. B., Crowley, R., & Smolkowski, K. (2016). An Efficacy Trial of Carescapes: Home-Based Child-Care Practices and Children’s Social Outcomes. *Child Development*, 87(4), 1291–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12541>
- Sachs, J. D., Lafortune, G., & Fuller, G. (2024). *The SDGs and the UN summit of the future*. Network, Dublin: Dublin University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.25546/108572>
- Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Taggart, B. (2010). *Early childhood matters: Evidence from the effective pre-school and primary education project* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203862063>
- Tang, J., Hallam, R., & Francis, J. (2024). Exploring parents’ child care search and decision-making processes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 157, 107437.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2024.107437>
- Ulferts, H., Wolf, K. M., & Anders, Y. (2019). Impact of Process Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care on Academic Outcomes: Longitudinal Meta-

- Analysis. *Child Development*, 90(5), Article 5.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13296>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2020/inclusion>
- UNICEF. (2024). *Education in Rwanda: A situation analysis*. United Nations Children's Fund. <https://www.unicef.org/rwanda/media/5346/file/UNICEF%20Rwanda.pdf>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development (A/RES/70/1)*. New York, NY: UN General Assembly.
<https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- World Bank. (2018). *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1096-1>
- Yoshikawa, H., Weiland, C., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2016). When Does Preschool Matter? *The Future of Children*, 26(2), 21–35. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43940579>
- Yoshikawa, H., Weiland, C., Brooks-Gunn, J., Burchinal, M. R., Espinosa, L. M., Gormley, W. T., Ludwig, J., Magnuson, K. A., Phillips, D., & Zaslow, M. J. (2013). Investing in our future: The evidence base on preschool education. *Society for Research in Child Development*.
- Yoshikawa, H., Wuermli, A. J., Raikes, A., Kim, S., & Kabay, S. B. (2018). Toward High-Quality Early Childhood Development Programs and Policies at National Scale: Directions for Research in Global Contexts. *Social Policy Report*, 31(1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2379-3988.2018.tb00091.x>

Appendix

Figure A.1

Distribution (%) of Centre-based (Green) and Home-based (Red) Pre-Primary Settings across Administrative Sectors




Figure A.2

UpSet Plots of Funding Source Combinations by Setting Type

