Proceedings of ICEIPI 2025 Symposium: Reimagining Society: AI's Role in Cultural Transformation and Learning Environments
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

Government Policies and Education Inequality: An Analysis of Policy Effectiveness in Bridging the Educational Gap

Yujie Zhang

University of Wollongong, Sydney, Australia
ZHANGYUJIE199808@outlook.com

Abstract: Educational inequality remains a global issue, particularly in low-income communities, where limited resources, insufficient funding, and a shortage of qualified teachers severely impact students' learning opportunities. Government intervention plays a crucial role in addressing this challenge, yet the effectiveness of different policies varies depending on the socioeconomic context of each country or region. For example, Finland has successfully reduced educational disparities through an equitable funding distribution system and inclusive education policies. In contrast, many other countries continue to struggle with structural inequalities that hinder access to quality education. This study evaluates the impact of government policies in three key areas: education funding allocation, affirmative action initiatives, and digital education strategies, all of which aim to mitigate educational inequality. By conducting a comparative policy analysis, this research seeks to assess the effectiveness of these interventions in promoting educational equity. Additionally, it aims to provide insights and recommendations for future education reforms to create more inclusive and accessible learning opportunities for all students, regardless of their socioeconomic background.

Keywords: Educational Inequality, Government Policy, Affirmative Action, Digital Education

1. Introduction

Educational inequality remains a significant barrier to social mobility and economic development. Across the globe, the distribution of educational resources often varies significantly, particularly in low-income areas and among disadvantaged groups. The unequal access to education further exacerbates social and economic disparities, limiting opportunities for upward mobility [1]. Education not only shapes an individual's career prospects and income level but also plays a crucial role in a country's economic growth and social stability. However, due to various economic, political, and historical factors, many countries continue to experience severe disparities in educational resource allocation, preventing certain groups from accessing quality education and thus restricting their chances for upward mobility.

To address these challenges, governments worldwide have implemented a range of intervention measures aimed at reducing educational inequality. For instance, targeted funding allocation policies are designed to provide additional financial support to underprivileged areas, improving school infrastructure, increasing the availability of qualified teachers, and enhancing teaching quality. Affirmative action policies, on the other hand, seek to promote fairness in higher education

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

admissions by granting preferential treatment or quotas for marginalized groups to counteract structural inequalities. Furthermore, with the rapid advancement of information technology, digital education has emerged as a crucial tool for improving educational accessibility. Governments and educational institutions have introduced online courses, distance learning programs, and free educational resources to expand access to education. However, the effectiveness of these policies varies significantly across different countries and regions, depending on their socioeconomic conditions, implementation strategies, and public acceptance [2]. In some cases, policies intended to promote educational equity may inadvertently create new challenges, such as inefficient resource allocation, social controversies surrounding affirmative action, or the widening of the digital divide due to disparities in technological access.

The primary objective of this study is to assess the effectiveness of government policies in reducing educational inequality. Specifically, this research focuses on three key educational interventions: education funding policies, affirmative action initiatives, and digital education policies. By conducting a comparative analysis of educational policies in different countries, this study aims to explore the impact of these measures on promoting educational equity and examine their effectiveness across various socioeconomic contexts. Ultimately, this research seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations for future educational reforms, contributing to a more equitable and sustainable global education system.

2. Literature review

2.1. Education funding policies and resource allocation

The educational funds invested by the government determine the quality of school resources. But because of the uneven distribution of funds, schools in poor areas often lack good teachers, advanced teaching equipment, and sound infrastructure. Su [3] studied the impact of government fund allocation on basic education and higher education, indicating that the allocation of education funds has a decisive role in the quality of education.

2.2. The effectiveness of affirmative action in education

Governments use grants, quota systems and dedicated support programs to improve access to education for vulnerable groups. However, the effects of these measures are controversial, with some studies suggesting that they significantly improve educational equity, while others suggest that they may create new social stratification. Pelle, Patel & Leung [4] studied affirmative action policies in the United States and India and pointed out that while these policies improved access to higher education, they also raised new social stratification issues. Although financial aid helps to reduce economic barriers, Boatman & Long [5] pointed out that the distribution pattern of financial aid may inadvertently exacerbate the imbalance of educational resources among different groups, leading to new social stratification.

2.3. Digital education policies and the digital divide

The government is increasingly promoting online learning platforms and digital infrastructure in an attempt to reduce educational inequalities. However, uneven access to technology (i.e., the digital divide) remains a major concern, especially in rural and low-income areas where many students lack access to stable networks and electronic devices. Lai & Widmar [6] examined government efforts to promote online learning platforms and digital infrastructure during COVID-19 and noted that while these measures are aimed at reducing educational inequalities, the digital divide remains a major challenge.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

3. Research questions

How do government education funding policies affect disparities in school resources and student outcomes?

What are the strengths and weaknesses of affirmative action policies in improving education equity?

To what extent do digital education policies help reduce education inequality, and what challenges remain?

To comprehensively address these research questions, this study examines various government policies and their influence on educational equity across different national contexts.

4. Analysis comparative

This study employs a comparative policy analysis approach to evaluate the effectiveness of government interventions in reducing educational inequality. By examining educational policy cases from Finland, the United States, Brazil, India, and China, the study explores the impact of different policies on educational equity.

4.1. Impact of education funding policies

Finland adopts an equitable funding distribution model, significantly improving student performance and narrowing the urban-rural gap. Studies indicate that Finland's higher education funding system follows a performance-based funding (PBF) model, where government allocations are based on education quality indicators such as graduation rates and academic achievements, rather than relying solely on traditional fiscal appropriations [7]. This model enhances the efficiency of fund utilization and helps reduce regional disparities in educational resources to some extent.

In the United States, public school funding heavily depends on property taxes, leading to disparities in school funding across districts due to variations in property values. Wealthier districts generate sufficient tax revenue, whereas poorer districts, even with similar tax rates, struggle with inadequate funding [8]. Texas introduced the IFA (Instructional Facilities Allotment) and EDA (Existing Debt Allotment) programs to address these disparities. However, research shows that middle-income districts neither qualify for government subsidies nor generate enough tax revenue, resulting in stagnation in educational investment [8].

China has significantly increased investment in rural education through fiscal transfer payments, implementing various special funding programs such as the Compulsory Education Program for Poor Areas and the Boarding School Construction Project to improve educational opportunities for rural students [9]. While fiscal reforms have improved school infrastructure, low teacher salaries remain a challenge, leading to a migration of teachers to urban areas, which negatively affects the quality of education in rural regions [9].

4.2. Effectiveness of affirmative action policies

Affirmative action (AA) policies in the United States have played a significant role in promoting diversity in higher education but have faced increasing legal and social challenges in recent years [10]. While most Asian Americans support AA, believing it contributes to greater educational equity, some Chinese immigrants oppose it, arguing that it negatively impacts Asian students' admission opportunities [10].

India’s quota system has effectively increased enrollment rates among disadvantaged groups. However, it has also sparked social controversy, with some high-caste students arguing that the system undermines merit-based admissions and compromises fair competition [11].

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

In Brazil, the government introduced the FIES financial aid program to help low-income students access higher education, achieving some success [12]. However, the program also has notable shortcomings. Many FIES beneficiaries enroll in low-quality private universities, which limits their competitiveness in the job market and reduces the long-term impact of the policy [12]. Additionally, most recipients must work to support themselves, which further affects their academic performance [12].

4.3. Digital education policies and the digital divide

In developed countries, online learning platforms have significantly improved access to education, with many schools and educational institutions relying on digital platforms to provide learning resources [13]. However, digital literacy remains a key issue affecting the effectiveness of online education, as some teachers and students lack the necessary skills to efficiently utilize online learning tools [13].

In developing countries, digital education faced severe challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly due to underdeveloped network infrastructure and equipment shortages, which significantly impacted the accessibility and effectiveness of online learning [14]. In rural areas and low-income households, many students struggle to access stable internet connections and personal devices, making it difficult for them to participate in online courses [14]. Additionally, a widespread lack of digital teaching training among educators further limits the effectiveness of online education implementation [14].

5. Discussion

5.1. Success factors

Several factors have been identified as crucial in the successful reduction of educational inequality:

Equitable Funding Distribution: Countries that allocate education funding based on need rather than relying on traditional tax-based systems have seen significant improvements in overall educational outcomes. For example, Finland's approach to education funding ensures that all schools, regardless of location or socioeconomic status, receive adequate resources. This has led to consistently high student performance and a narrowing of the achievement gap between different social groups. When governments prioritize equitable funding, students from disadvantaged backgrounds gain access to better school facilities, well-trained teachers, and enhanced learning materials, which collectively contribute to a more inclusive education system.

Targeted and Well-Managed Affirmative Action Policies: Affirmative action policies, when carefully designed and implemented, can effectively increase educational opportunities for marginalized groups. By offering preferential admission policies, scholarships, and reserved quotas, governments can address historical disadvantages and improve representation in higher education. However, for these policies to be widely accepted and effective, they must be carefully managed to minimize potential backlash. In some cases, poorly structured affirmative action measures have led to social and political resistance, as some groups perceive them as unfair. Ensuring transparency, maintaining academic standards, and providing additional support mechanisms for beneficiaries can enhance the long-term success of these policies.

Digital Education as a Tool for Reducing Educational Disparities: The rapid expansion of digital education presents an opportunity to bridge learning gaps, particularly for students in remote or underserved areas. Online learning platforms and digital resources can make high-quality education more accessible, allowing students to learn beyond the limitations of physical classrooms. Countries that have integrated digital education effectively, such as through government-funded e-learning initiatives, have demonstrated its potential in reducing regional educational disparities.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

However, the success of digital education depends on adequate infrastructure, such as internet access and technological devices, as well as sufficient digital literacy training for both teachers and students. Without these supporting measures, digital education may inadvertently widen the educational gap rather than reduce it.

5.2. Challenges and limitations

Despite the potential benefits of education funding policies, affirmative action, and digital education, various challenges and limitations hinder their full effectiveness.

Political and Social Resistance: One of the most significant obstacles to implementing affirmative action policies is political and social opposition. In certain regions, affirmative action has been met with resistance from groups who feel that it undermines merit-based selection and creates reverse discrimination. For example, in the United States, debates surrounding race-based admissions policies in universities have led to legal battles and public controversy. Similarly, in India, caste-based reservation systems have sparked protests from high-caste students who believe these policies limit their opportunities. Overcoming this resistance requires governments to strike a balance between fairness and inclusivity while ensuring that affirmative action policies are seen as a means of leveling the playing field rather than disadvantaging certain groups.

Economic Constraints in Developing Countries: Implementing effective educational policies requires significant financial investment, which poses a major challenge for developing nations. Many low-income countries struggle to allocate sufficient resources for education due to competing demands in other sectors, such as healthcare and infrastructure. As a result, policies aimed at reducing educational inequality may suffer from inadequate funding, leading to poorly maintained schools, underpaid teachers, and insufficient learning materials. Even when external funding is available, issues such as corruption and inefficient budget allocation can further hinder policy implementation. Sustainable financing strategies and international support are essential to ensuring that education policies in developing nations achieve their intended impact.

Infrastructure Gaps in Digital Education: While digital education holds promise for reducing learning disparities, its effectiveness is highly dependent on the availability of infrastructure. In many rural and underdeveloped areas, students lack access to stable internet connections, computers, and other necessary devices, preventing them from fully benefiting from online learning. Additionally, the success of digital education relies not only on access to technology but also on the ability of teachers and students to use these tools effectively. Many educators, particularly in resource-limited settings, have not received adequate training in digital teaching methods, making it difficult to integrate technology into the classroom effectively. Without addressing these infrastructural and technical barriers, digital education may fail to reach its full potential in promoting equitable learning opportunities.

6. Conclusion

This study explores the role of government policies in reducing educational inequality, focusing on three key measures: education funding allocation, affirmative action policies, and digital education. By comparing different countries, we examined how these policies affect students' access to quality education and to what extent they help reduce the impact of socioeconomic disparities.

The findings show that fair and reasonable funding allocation is crucial for narrowing educational gaps, but many countries still struggle with efficiently utilizing resources. Affirmative action policies have helped disadvantaged groups gain access to higher education but have also sparked social controversy. At the same time, digital education offers new opportunities for expanding learning access, yet disparities in technology infrastructure and digital skills prevent many students from fully

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO23913

benefiting. While these policies have made progress in reducing educational inequality, they need continuous improvement and adaptation, along with broader socioeconomic reforms, to achieve long-term success.

To enhance the effectiveness of these policies, governments should focus on data-driven and context-specific approaches. Education funding should be distributed based on actual needs rather than relying on property taxes to ensure that all schools receive sufficient resources. Affirmative action policies should be more transparent and include additional support measures to reduce public opposition. The development of digital education also requires stronger investments in infrastructure and digital skills training to truly benefit students in underprivileged areas.

This study provides valuable insights into achieving educational equity. By comparing experiences and challenges across different countries, we aim to offer useful references for policymakers, educators, and researchers to develop fairer and more sustainable education policies. Ultimately, reducing educational inequality requires a multifaceted effort—improving funding distribution, optimizing policy implementation, and leveraging technology—to ensure that all students, regardless of their background, have equal access to quality education.

References

[1] *Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2008). The role of cognitive skills in economic development. Journal of Economic Literature, 46(3), 607-668. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.46.3.607*

[2] *Al-Mahadin, S. (2023). General education requirements, the liberal arts and government intervention in higher education: A case from Jordan. On the Horizon: The International Journal of Learning Futures, 31(1), 71-78. https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-07-2022-0038*

[3] *Su, X. (2004). The allocation of public funds in a hierarchical educational system. Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control, 28(12), 2485-2510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2004.01.003*

[4] *Pelle, M., Patel, S., & Leung, B. (2016). Affirmative action and subgroup inequality in higher education: Adapting Indian policy solutions to the American context. Review of Black Political Economy, 43(3), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12114-015-9227-0*

[5] *Boatman, A., & Long, B. T. (2016). Does financial aid impact college student engagement? Evidence from the Gates Millennium Scholars Program. Research in Higher Education, 57(6), 653-681. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-015-9402-y*

[6] *Lai, J., & Widmar, N. O. (2021). Revisiting the digital divide in the COVID-19 era. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 43(1), 458–464. https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13104*

[7] *Adam, E. (2020). 'Governments base performance-based funding on global rankings indicators': A global trend in higher education finance or a global rankings literature fiction? A comparative analysis of four performance-based funding programs. International Journal of Educational Development, 76, 102197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102197*

[8] *Plummer, E. (2006). The effects of state funding on property tax rates and school construction. Economics of Education Review, 25(5), 532–542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2005.04.002*

[9] *Wang, R. (2008). Reform of the rural compulsory education assured funding mechanism: Policy design perspective. Chinese Education & Society, 41(1), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.2753/CED1061-1932410101*

[10] *Johnston-Guerrero, M. P., & Zhao, K. (2022). Is Affirmative Action interfering with the Chinese dream in America? Exploring WeChat users' views on Affirmative Action in US college admissions. Race Ethnicity and Education, 25(7), 939-957. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1753678*

[11] *Sabharwal, N. S. (2024). Understanding students' attitudes towards affirmative action policy in higher education in India. Social Inclusion, 12, Article 7601. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.7601*

[12] *Kussuda, C. (2016). The struggles of financial aid for higher education in Brazil. Educational Leadership and Societal Change, Special Issue 2016. Retrieved from http://nau.edu/COE/eJournal/*

[13] *Singh, U., Venkatesh, J. D., Muraleedharan, A., Saluja, K. S., J H, A., & Biswas, P. (2024). Accessibility analysis of educational websites using WCAG 2.0. Digital Government: Research and Practice, 5(3), Article 32. https://doi.org/10.1145/3696318*

[14] *Hussain, I. A., & Suma, J. T. (Eds.). (2023). Coronavirus Pandemic & Online Education: Impact on Developing Countries. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6853-2*