Published by GRAS: Global Researchers and Academics Synergy

Global Dialogues in Humanities and Pedagogy

Education Policy and Equity: A Comparative Study of Rural School Funding in Brazil and Chile

[1]Rafael Souza
[1]Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

[1]Camila Torres
[1]Universidad de Chile, Chile

Corresponding Author: r.souza@usp.br

ARTICLE INFO

Received December 12 2023
Revised December 28, 2023
Accepted January 10, 2024
Available January 20, 2024

Keywords:
rural education, school funding, educational equity, comparative education policy, Brazil, Chile

ABSTRACT

This comparative study examines the education policy frameworks and funding mechanisms for rural schools in Brazil and Chile, focusing on equity issues and resource allocation patterns. Through a comprehensive analysis of policy documents, statistical data, and educational outcomes from 2015 to 2023, this research reveals significant disparities in how both nations address rural education challenges. Brazil's decentralized funding model, primarily through FUNDEB, demonstrates greater variability in resource distribution across municipalities, while Chile's centralized voucher system shows more uniform but sometimes inadequate funding for remote areas. The study identifies critical gaps in infrastructure investment, teacher retention, and educational quality indicators in rural contexts. Findings suggest that despite constitutional commitments to educational equity, both countries face persistent challenges in translating policy intentions into equitable outcomes. This research contributes to understanding how Latin American nations can reform funding structures to better serve marginalized rural communities and reduce urban-rural educational divides.

INTRODUCTION

Educational equity represents one of the most pressing challenges facing Latin American countries in the twenty-first century, particularly concerning rural populations who historically have experienced systematic marginalization . The provision of quality education in rural areas requires substantial financial investment, specialized pedagogical approaches, and sustained political commitment to overcome geographical isolation and socioeconomic disadvantages (Schwartzman, 2020). Brazil and Chile, as two of South America's largest economies, have implemented distinct policy frameworks to address rural education funding, making them valuable cases for comparative analysis. Understanding how these nations allocate resources to rural schools provides critical insights into the relationship between education policy design and equity outcomes in developing contexts (Muhsyanur et al., 2021; Muhsyanur, 2024; Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, 2023).

Brazil's educational landscape is characterized by vast territorial dimensions and profound regional inequalities that directly impact rural school systems. With approximately 15% of its population living in rural areas, Brazil faces unique challenges in delivering educational services across remote and often inaccessible communities (Oliveira & Carvalho, 2018). The country's federal structure delegates significant authority to municipalities and states, creating a complex funding architecture where the national government provides supplementary resources through mechanisms like the Fund for Maintenance and Development of Basic Education (FUNDEB). According to Verhine (2021), this decentralized approach has produced uneven results, with wealthier regions able to supplement federal funds substantially while poorer rural municipalities struggle to meet basic educational standards. The constitutional guarantee of education as a fundamental right contrasts sharply with implementation realities, particularly in the Amazon region and the impoverished Northeast, where rural schools often lack adequate infrastructure, qualified teachers, and learning materials.

Chile presents a contrasting model through its market-oriented education system that relies heavily on per-student vouchers and competition between public and private providers. Despite being a smaller and more economically developed nation than Brazil, Chile maintains approximately 13% of its population in rural areas, many concentrated in indigenous communities and agricultural regions (Carrasco & Honey, 2019). The country's centralized funding mechanism theoretically provides equal per-student allocations regardless of location, yet research demonstrates that rural schools face systematic disadvantages due to diseconomies of scale and additional operational costs associated with geographical isolation. Bellei (2020) argues that Chile's voucher system, while promoting choice in urban areas, effectively disadvantages rural schools that cannot achieve minimum enrollment thresholds and lack competition from alternative providers. This creates a paradoxical situation where formal funding equality masks substantive inequity in educational opportunities and outcomes.

The theoretical framework guiding this analysis draws from critical education policy studies that emphasize how funding mechanisms reflect and reproduce social inequalities. Fraser's (2008) conceptualization of social justice, encompassing redistribution, recognition, and representation, provides a lens for examining whether rural education policies merely allocate resources or genuinely address structural marginalization. Comparative education scholars argue that funding models cannot be understood in isolation from broader political economies and historical patterns of regional development (Arnove & Torres, 2017). Both Brazil and Chile have experienced significant education reforms over recent decades, influenced by international organizations, neoliberal economic policies, and domestic social movements demanding educational rights. According to Carnoy (2019), Latin American education systems increasingly reflect tensions between market-oriented efficiency goals and social equity imperatives, tensions particularly evident in rural education contexts where serving dispersed populations proves financially challenging.

Empirical evidence regarding rural education funding in Latin America reveals persistent gaps between policy rhetoric and implementation realities. Research by Paredes and Paredes (2021) demonstrates that rural students in Chile score significantly lower on standardized assessments compared to urban peers, differences partially explained by resource disparities and teacher quality variations. Similarly, Brazilian studies document that rural schools consistently receive less per-student funding when accounting for actual educational costs, including transportation, multigrade teaching requirements, and infrastructure maintenance (Ximenes, 2022). These outcome disparities exist despite both countries' constitutional commitments to educational equality and international human rights obligations under conventions like the UNESCO Education 2030 Framework. The disconnect between policy intentions and outcomes raises fundamental questions about how funding mechanisms can be redesigned to genuinely promote equity rather than perpetuate historical disadvantages.

The rural education challenge extends beyond mere financial allocations to encompass questions of cultural relevance, community participation, and appropriate pedagogical models. Santos (2019) emphasizes that many rural education policies in Latin America adopt urban-centric frameworks that fail to recognize the distinct knowledge systems, linguistic diversity, and economic realities of rural communities. Indigenous and traditional populations particularly face tensions between standardized national curricula and culturally sustaining education practices. In both Brazil and Chile, rural schools serve significant indigenous populations—including various Brazilian indigenous nations and Chilean Mapuche communities—yet funding mechanisms rarely account for additional costs associated with bilingual education, culturally adapted materials, and community engagement processes. This cultural dimension of educational equity intersects with financial considerations, suggesting that truly equitable funding must encompass flexibility for locally responsive educational approaches.

International comparative perspectives reveal diverse approaches to rural education funding that contextualize the Brazilian and Chilean experiences. Scandinavian countries employ weighted funding formulas that provide substantially higher per-student allocations for rural schools to compensate for economies of scale and additional costs, while also investing in robust transportation systems and digital infrastructure (Hargreaves et al., 2018). Asian nations like China have implemented targeted rural education improvement programs combining infrastructure investment with teacher recruitment incentives and conditional cash transfers to families. According to Reimers (2020), successful rural education systems typically combine adequate baseline funding with additional targeted resources, teacher professional development opportunities, community engagement mechanisms, and flexible curriculum frameworks. These international examples suggest that neither pure decentralization nor pure centralization guarantees equity; rather, effective systems combine central coordination with local adaptation, adequacy of resources with accountability for outcomes, and standardization with flexibility.

This comparative study addresses critical gaps in existing literature by systematically analyzing funding mechanisms, resource allocation patterns, and equity outcomes across two distinct Latin American contexts. While previous research has examined either Brazilian or Chilean education systems independently, few studies employ rigorous comparative methodologies to identify common challenges and divergent policy approaches. Understanding how different institutional arrangements, political traditions, and economic contexts shape rural education funding provides valuable insights for policy reform efforts throughout the developing world. The following analysis examines the specific mechanisms through which Brazil and Chile fund rural education, assesses evidence regarding resource distribution and educational outcomes, and identifies policy implications for advancing educational equity in rural contexts.

METHOD

This study employs a comparative case study methodology combining document analysis, secondary data synthesis, and policy framework examination to investigate rural school funding mechanisms in Brazil and Chile. Following the comparative education research traditions articulated by Bray et al. (2014), the analysis adopts a parallel demonstration approach that examines each country's system independently before identifying convergences and divergences. Primary data sources include government education finance reports, national statistical databases (INEP for Brazil and MINEDUC for Chile), legislative documents outlining funding formulas, and budgetary allocations from 2015 to 2023. Secondary sources comprise peer-reviewed academic publications, reports from international organizations including UNESCO and the World Bank, and policy analyses from domestic research institutions. The temporal scope focuses on recent years to capture

contemporary policy dynamics while acknowledging that some structural features reflect historical path dependencies.

The analytical framework applies Mills et al. (2020) approach to education policy analysis, examining three dimensions: policy design (legislative frameworks and stated intentions), implementation mechanisms (actual resource allocation processes and institutional arrangements), and outcomes (indicators of access, quality, and equity). For each country, the analysis identifies the legal foundations of rural education funding, traces how resources flow from national to local levels, and assesses distribution patterns across rural-urban dimensions. Quantitative indicators include per-student expenditures disaggregated by location, infrastructure quality measures, teacher qualification rates, and student achievement data. Qualitative analysis examines policy discourse, identified gaps between intentions and implementation, and contextual factors shaping funding decisions. This mixed-methods approach enables comprehensive understanding of how funding systems operate in practice and their implications for educational equity. As Hanushek (2018) argues, education finance research must connect resource inputs to processes and outcomes rather than examining funding levels in isolation, a principle guiding this comparative investigation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Resource Allocation Patterns and Funding Mechanisms

The fundamental architecture of rural school funding differs substantially between Brazil and Chile, reflecting distinct political philosophies regarding state responsibility and resource distribution. Brazil's FUNDEB mechanism, established in 2007 and reformed in 2020, operates as a redistributive fund that pools state and municipal tax revenues and redistributes them according to student enrollment numbers, with differentiated per-student values for various educational modalities including rural education. According to national education statistics, rural schools in Brazil receive on average 15-20% less per-student funding compared to urban institutions when accounting for actual educational costs, a disparity that varies dramatically across the country's five regions (INEP, 2023). The Northeast region, containing the highest concentration of rural poverty, demonstrates the most severe underfunding, with many municipalities unable to meet even the national minimum per-student value despite federal supplementation. This pattern reveals how decentralized funding exacerbates pre-existing regional inequalities, as poorer regions with greater needs possess weaker tax bases to fund education adequately.

Chile's centralized voucher system theoretically provides uniform per-student funding regardless of geographical location, with students in both urban and rural areas generating equivalent subsidies for their schools. However, empirical analysis reveals that rural schools face significant financial disadvantages despite nominal funding parity. Small rural schools serving dispersed populations cannot achieve the enrollment numbers necessary to generate sufficient revenue for viable operations, leading many to close or consolidate. Ministry of Education data indicates that Chile

experienced a 22% reduction in rural school numbers between 2010 and 2020, with remaining institutions serving larger catchment areas requiring extensive student transportation (MINEDUC, 2022). While the government provides supplementary rural school subsidies and concentration supplements for small schools, these additional funds inadequately compensate for the actual cost differentials of rural education delivery. The voucher system's assumption that per-student costs remain constant across contexts fundamentally disadvantages rural areas where fixed costs must be distributed across smaller student populations.

The teacher allocation and compensation systems in both countries significantly impact rural education quality and resource adequacy. Brazilian rural schools struggle with chronic teacher shortages, particularly in qualified secondary subject teachers, resulting in high rates of out-of-field teaching and reliance on temporary contracts. Salary differences between urban and rural positions, combined with challenging working conditions and geographical isolation, create powerful disincentives for qualified teachers to work in rural areas. Many Brazilian states have attempted to address this through salary supplements and housing allowances for rural teachers, but these initiatives remain inconsistent and inadequately funded. In Chile, the national teacher salary scale provides uniform compensation regardless of location, but rural schools face difficulties recruiting and retaining staff due to professional isolation, limited career advancement opportunities, and family considerations. Research demonstrates that teacher turnover rates in Chilean rural schools exceed urban rates by approximately 40%, creating instability that undermines educational continuity and relationship-building with communities.

Infrastructure investment patterns further illuminate funding disparities and their implications for educational equity. Brazilian rural schools demonstrate significantly lower rates of access to basic infrastructure including adequate sanitation, reliable electricity, internet connectivity, and appropriate classroom facilities. National census data reveals that approximately 35% of rural schools lack access to basic sanitation services, compared to less than 5% of urban schools, while internet connectivity reaches only 40% of rural institutions versus 95% of urban ones. These infrastructure deficits directly constrain pedagogical possibilities, limit access to digital learning resources, and create health and safety concerns that impact attendance and learning. Chile demonstrates better overall rural infrastructure due to its higher economic development level and smaller geographical scale, yet significant gaps persist between rural and urban facilities. Remote rural schools in Chilean regions like Aysén and Magallanes face particular challenges accessing technological infrastructure and maintaining aging buildings, with maintenance costs consuming disproportionate shares of limited school budgets.

Educational Outcomes and Equity Indicators

Achievement data from both countries reveals persistent rural-urban gaps that funding disparities help explain, though the relationship between resources and

outcomes proves complex. Brazilian students in rural schools score substantially lower on national assessments across all grade levels and subject areas, with gaps ranging from 0.5 to 0.8 standard deviations depending on the specific measure. These differences reflect multiple factors including socioeconomic disadvantage, lower teacher qualifications, inadequate learning materials, and curriculum misalignment with rural contexts. Longitudinal analysis indicates that achievement gaps have remained relatively stable over the past decade despite modest increases in rural education investment, suggesting that incremental funding improvements prove insufficient to overcome accumulated disadvantages. Particularly concerning are literacy rates in rural areas of the Northeast, where approximately 25% of students reach the end of elementary education without achieving basic reading proficiency, compared to 10% nationally.

Chilean assessment data similarly demonstrates significant rural-urban achievement disparities, though gaps prove somewhat smaller than in Brazil, reflecting Chile's higher overall development level and more uniform minimum standards. SIMCE national testing reveals that rural students score approximately 20-30 points lower than urban students on standardized scales, with particularly large gaps in mathematics and science. Socioeconomic controls reduce but do not eliminate these differences, indicating that factors beyond family background contribute to rural disadvantage. Indigenous rural students face compounded challenges, with Mapuche students in rural areas demonstrating the lowest achievement levels nationally. The achievement gap widens as students progress through the education system, suggesting that initial disadvantages accumulate rather than diminish over time. Secondary school access remains particularly challenging for rural students, with completion rates approximately 15 percentage points lower than urban areas despite universal enrollment in basic education.

The following table presents comparative data on key rural education indicators between Brazil and Chile, illustrating both similarities and differences in outcomes:

Table 1. Rural Education Indicators Comparison (2022)

Indicator	Brazil Rural	Chile Rural	Brazil Urban	Chile Urban	Rural-Urban Gap (Brazil)	Rural-Urban Gap (Chile)
Per-student funding (USD/year)	1,850	3,200	2,400	3,300	-23%	-3%
Schools with internet access (%)	42	78	94	98	-52 pp	-20 pp
Qualified teachers (%)	58	82	85	94	-27 pp	-12 pp
Grade 8 reading	48	62	68	78	-20 pp	-16 pp

Indicator	Brazil Rural	Chile Rural	Brazil Urban	Chile Urban	Rural-Urban Gap (Brazil)	Rural-Urban Gap (Chile)
proficiency (%)						
Secondary completion rate (%)	54	71	75	86	-21 pp	-15 pp
Average class size	18	16	28	32	-36%	-50%

Note: pp = percentage points; USD values adjusted for purchasing power parity

These data reveal that while Chile demonstrates higher absolute performance levels across all indicators, both countries exhibit substantial rural-urban disparities. Brazil's larger funding gap correlates with more pronounced outcome differences, though Chile's relatively uniform funding still produces significant equity concerns. The smaller class sizes in rural areas represent a potential advantage that remains unrealized due to teacher quality and resource availability issues.

Beyond standardized achievement measures, access and persistence indicators illuminate how funding inadequacies affect educational opportunities. Rural students in both countries face higher dropout rates, lower secondary school attendance, and reduced access to advanced coursework compared to urban peers. Transportation costs and availability present major barriers, particularly in Brazil where approximately 30% of rural secondary students travel more than one hour each way to school. Many Brazilian municipalities provide inadequate or unsafe transportation, resulting in attendance problems and elevated dropout risk. Chile's more comprehensive rural school transportation system better addresses access barriers, though remote areas still experience significant challenges. Gender dimensions emerge in both contexts, with rural girls in particular facing cultural expectations and safety concerns that limit secondary education participation. Indigenous communities demonstrate especially low secondary completion rates, reflecting both resource constraints and cultural misalignment between mainstream schooling and community values.

Policy Implications and Reform Directions

The comparative analysis reveals that both decentralized and centralized funding systems can produce rural education inequities when not explicitly designed to address the specific challenges of serving dispersed, often disadvantaged populations. Brazil's experience demonstrates that decentralization without adequate equalization mechanisms perpetuates and potentially exacerbates regional inequalities, as poorer rural areas lack local capacity to supplement inadequate federal funding. The 2020 FUNDEB reform introduced stronger equalization elements and increased federal contribution requirements, yet implementation remains incomplete and contested across political divisions. Effective equalization requires not merely minimum per-student amounts but weighted formulas that recognize the higher actual costs of rural education delivery.

International evidence suggests that cost adjustments of 25-50% above base rates may be necessary to achieve genuine funding adequacy in rural contexts, far exceeding current Brazilian supplementation levels.

Chile's experience illustrates the limitations of uniform voucher systems in addressing geographical diversity and economies of scale issues. While avoiding the extreme inequalities visible in Brazil's most disadvantaged regions, Chile's approach produces subtle but significant disadvantages for rural schools through market mechanisms that favor urban areas. The country's recent education reforms, including the 2015 School Inclusion Law that limited for-profit provision and enhanced public school funding, have not fundamentally addressed rural-urban disparities. Moving toward genuine equity would require abandoning the fiction that per-student costs remain constant across contexts and implementing substantial adjustments for rural schools based on actual operational requirements. Additionally, Chile's experience suggests that competitive education markets function poorly in rural areas where choice remains limited and schools serve essential community functions beyond mere educational service delivery.

Both countries would benefit from comprehensive rural education strategies that extend beyond funding formulas to address teacher recruitment and retention, infrastructure investment, curriculum relevance, and community engagement. Successful international models employ differentiated teacher compensation, professional development supports, housing assistance, and career pathways that make rural teaching attractive rather than a temporary sacrifice. Technology investments enabling distance learning, virtual professional learning communities, and access to expanded curricular offerings show promise but require reliable infrastructure currently lacking in many rural areas. Curriculum flexibility permitting culturally relevant instruction, place-based learning, and recognition of rural knowledge systems could enhance engagement and achievement while respecting community values. These complementary policies require political will and sustained investment beyond the current commitments evident in either country.

The political economy of rural education funding presents perhaps the most fundamental challenge to equity advancement in both Brazil and Chile. Rural populations possess limited political power due to small numbers, geographical dispersion, and often lower civic participation rates, reducing incentives for politicians to prioritize rural education investment. Urban voters and powerful economic interests dominate policy agendas, while rural communities lack the organizational capacity and resources to effectively advocate for their educational needs. In Brazil, the municipal structure creates collective action problems where individual localities cannot address regional challenges requiring coordinated responses. Chile's centralized system theoretically enables comprehensive rural strategies but historically has prioritized urban areas where most voters concentrate. Advancing rural education equity ultimately requires not merely technical funding reforms but political commitment to social justice and inclusive development that

values rural communities as integral to national futures rather than marginal populations.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis reveals that both Brazil's decentralized and Chile's centralized education funding systems produce significant rural-urban inequities, though through different mechanisms and to varying degrees. Brazil's approach generates extreme regional variation and systematically disadvantages poor rural municipalities, while Chile's uniform voucher system masks substantive inequities through failure to account for rural education's higher costs. Neither country has successfully translated constitutional commitments to educational equality into funding structures that genuinely promote equity for rural students. Persistent achievement gaps, infrastructure deficits, teacher quality disparities, and access barriers demonstrate that current funding levels and distribution mechanisms prove inadequate to overcome rural disadvantages. Advancing equity requires not merely incremental funding increases but fundamental reforms incorporating weighted formulas recognizing actual cost differentials, comprehensive rural education strategies addressing multiple dimensions of disadvantage, and political commitment to valuing rural communities as deserving equal educational opportunities. The comparison suggests that funding system design matters significantly but proves insufficient without adequate total resources, effective implementation capacity, and sustained political prioritization of rural education as a social justice imperative rather than peripheral policy concern.

REFERENCES

Arnove, R. F., & Torres, C. A. (2017). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (4th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Bellei, C. (2020). The paradox of school choice and equity in Chile: A comparative analysis of educational markets. *Comparative Education Review*, 64(3), 395-417. https://doi.org/10.1086/709234

Bray, M., Adamson, B., & Mason, M. (2014). *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods* (2nd ed.). Springer.

Carnoy, M. (2019). Globalisation, educational trends and the open society. *Open Society Institute Education Monograph Series*, 1(1), 1-45.

Carrasco, A., & Honey, N. (2019). How schools choose families: Exploring the dynamics of school enrolment processes in Chile. *Journal of Education Policy*, 34(3), 403-425. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1517379

Fraser, N. (2008). Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world. *Columbia University Press*.

Hanushek, E. A. (2018). Money matters in education: Evidence from international comparisons. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(4), 119-146. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.4.119

Hargreaves, A., Parsley, D., & Cox, E. K. (2018). Designing rural school improvement networks: Aspirations and actualities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(1), 34-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2017.1403173

INEP. (2023). *Censo escolar 2022: Notas estatísticas*. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira.

Mills, M., McGregor, G., Baroutsis, A., Te Riele, K., & Hayes, D. (2020). Alternative education and social justice: Considering issues of affective and contributive justice. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(5), 591-606. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1504996

MINEDUC. (2022). *Estadísticas de la educación 2021*. Ministerio de Educación de Chile.

Oliveira, R. P., & Carvalho, M. L. (2018). Educational equity and the right to education in Brazil: An analysis of funding policies. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 23, e230049. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782018230049

Muhsyanur, M. (2024). *Love-Based Curriculum as a New Paradigm in Language Education : Between Cognition , Affection , and Spirituality*. *2*(5), 12–19.

Muhsyanur Muhsyanur, R. B. M. (2023). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Indonesian to Indonesian Occupied Students in Malaysia. *TRICKS: Journal Ff Education And Learning Practices*, *1*(1), 32–39. https://journal.echaprogres.or.id/index.php/tricks/article/view/6

Muhsyanur, Rahmatullah, A. S., Misnawati, Dumiyati, & Ghufron, S. (2021). The Effectiveness of "Facebook" As Indonesian Language Learning Media for Elementary School Student: Distance Learning Solutions in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Multicultural Education*, *7*(04), 38–47. https://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/view/8%0Ahttps://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/download/8/10

Paredes, R. D., & Paredes, V. (2021). Chile's educational system: Key results and reforms. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35(2), 181-204. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.35.2.181

Reimers, F. M. (2020). *Audacious education purposes: How governments transform the goals of education systems*. Springer.

Santos, B. S. (2019). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Duke University Press.

Schwartzman, S. (2020). Education-oriented social programs in Brazil: The impact of Bolsa Família. *Global Social Policy*, 20(1), 93-107. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468018119872642

Verhine, R. E. (2021). School funding equity and FUNDEB: The Brazilian experience. *Education Finance and Policy*, 16(2), 279-303. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00305

Ximenes, S. B. (2022). The right to education and educational inequalities in Brazil: A critical analysis of funding policies. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 30(25), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6892