RESEARCH ARTICLE (QUALITATIVE)

Implementation of Education Policy in Learning Practices

Ahmad Rusli[1*], Zulpan[2]

[1]English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Islam Labuhanbatu, [Labuhan Batu], Indonesia
[2]Islamic Primary Teacher Education Study Program (PGMI), STAIN Mandailing Natal, [Mandailing Natal], Indonesia

*Correspondence: [rusli.sinarhrp@gmail.com]

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: *[27/09/2025]* **Revised:** *[03/11/2025]* **Accepted:** *[27/12/2025]* **Published:** *[28/02/2026]*

Vol/No/Pages: *[Vol.1(No.1), 65-80]*

Abstract

The implementation of education policy is the process through which policy objectives are translated into concrete practices at the school and classroom levels. Because policies are not enacted mechanically, their realization is shaped by the interpretation, capacity, context, interaction, and agency of the actors involved. This study aimed to describe and analyze how education policy is translated into learning practices, the factors that influence this process, and the forms of gap that may emerge between policy as designed and policy as enacted. A qualitative approach with a descriptive-narrative design was employed. The data were drawn from a purposively selected corpus of scholarly literature on education policy implementation, policy enactment, teacher practice, school leadership, curriculum implementation, and learning innovation, and were examined through documentation study and a thematic analytic procedure. The analysis generated six interrelated themes: policy implementation as a process of translation; teachers as the principal actors of implementation; school leadership as the link between policy and practice; the interaction of structure and agency within organizational contexts; the emergence of gaps between designed and enacted policy; and the dependence of pedagogical innovation on systemic support. The findings indicate that education policy becomes meaningful only when it is understood, accepted, adapted, and enacted by educational actors in ways that fit learners' needs. Effective implementation therefore requires clear communication, continuous professional learning, contextual adaptation, collaborative leadership, adequate resources, and feedback mechanisms from schools and teachers.

Keywords: *education policy; policy implementation; learning practices; policy enactment*

1. INTRODUCTION

Education policy is fundamentally a strategic instrument used to direct the provision of education toward established goals. Through policy, governments and educational stakeholders set the direction of change concerning curriculum, learning processes, learner competencies, teacher professionalism, school leadership, assessment systems, and the various other aspects that determine the quality of

education. Nevertheless, the existence of a policy does not automatically produce change in educational practice. A policy acquires substantive meaning only when it is translated into concrete action at the school and classroom levels.

The problem of implementation is important because a distance exists between policy as formulated and practice as carried out. A policy may be designed systematically at the national level, yet when applied locally it encounters diverse school conditions, differing teacher capacities, unequal resource availability, varied learner characteristics, and the organizational cultures that develop within each educational unit. Viennet and Pont (2017) explained that education policy implementation is a complex process because it involves multiple actors, levels of government, institutional conditions, and contextual factors that interact with one another.

From an implementation perspective, policy cannot be understood merely as a set of instructions to be executed uniformly. Spillane et al. (2002) showed that policy implementation is closely related to the cognitive processes of policy actors. Teachers and other educational actors do not simply receive policy; they interpret its meaning on the basis of their knowledge, experience, professional beliefs, and work context. Implementation practice is therefore the product of an interaction between policy and the way educational actors understand and use it.

This view indicates that learning practice is one of the most important spaces in which the success, or the dynamics, of education policy implementation can be observed. Curriculum policy, for instance, may mandate learner-centered learning, competency-based learning, project-based learning, or a particular pedagogical approach. However, how such policy is actually realized in learning depends greatly on teachers' interpretation and capacity and on the support of the school organization.

Cobb and Jackson (2012) argued that the analysis of education policy needs to attend to the relationship between policy and learning design. Education policy is ultimately concerned with how learning opportunities are designed and how learners' learning experiences are shaped. Policy therefore cannot be separated from pedagogical practice. Policy change has an impact only when it can be translated into changes in the design, enactment, and experience of learning.

This phenomenon is evident in various education policies that emphasize changes in learning practice. The implementation of outcome-based education (OBE), for example, requires alignment between learning objectives, learning processes, and learning outcomes. W. et al. (2026) showed that the implementation of OBE requires a fit among policy, organization, and enactment. In this context, the success of a policy is determined not only by its design but also by the degree of fit between policy demands and the capacity and conditions of implementation.

A similar pattern is apparent in the implementation of outcome-based education and learner-centered learning. Katawazai (2021) demonstrated that implementing such policies faces various challenges at the level of practice, particularly regarding educators' readiness, resources, understanding of the learning approach, and institutional conditions. This indicates that pedagogical policy change requires processes of adaptation and professional learning.

Kadir (2023) showed that the relationship among policy, practice, and professional learning is a mutually connected process. Policy can drive changes in practice, but such change requires space for teachers to learn, collaborate, reflect on their experience, and align their practice with policy demands. Policy implementation therefore does not end with the transmission of regulation; it must be continued through the development of professional capacity.

At the school level, principals occupy an important position in translating policy into practice. Lundqvist and Westerlund (2022) showed that principals play a role in interpreting and facilitating policy within the school environment. A principal is not merely an administrative implementer but an actor who links policy demands with the local conditions of the school. In the Indonesian context, Komariah et al. (2026) likewise showed the importance of e-leadership in managing learning disruptions and supporting the implementation of the merdeka belajar (independent learning) policy. This demonstrates that school leadership is one of the important factors connecting policy with learning practice.

Beyond leadership, organizational structure and individual agency also shape the implementation process. Rigby et al. (2016) explained that structure and agency interact in influencing education policy implementation and organizational change. Structure provides boundaries, rules, and resources, while agency enables educational actors to interpret, adapt, and enact policy according to the situations they face.

McLaughlin (2007) emphasized the importance of learning from field practice in understanding policy implementation. This perspective shows that policy does not always proceed in line with its initial design, because the conditions of implementation have differing characteristics. Field experience becomes an important source for understanding how policy is received, translated, modified, or even obstructed in practice.

Schulte (2018) reinforced this perspective through the idea of a distinction between envisioned and enacted practice. Education policy has a form as designed by policy makers, but that form may change when it is used by schools and teachers. There is thus a process of enactment, in which educational actors give concrete meaning and form to policy in practice.

These conditions show that education policy implementation is not a simple matter. The same policy can produce different practices in different schools. Asim et

al. (2024), for example, showed that management practices and implementation challenges within district education structures are influenced by organizational conditions and implementer capacity. Bukhari et al. (2025) likewise showed that the impact of education policy on the school system is closely related to the quality of its implementation.

In the context of learning, the challenge of implementation becomes more complex when policy promotes pedagogical innovation. Daly-Smith et al. (2019) showed that implementing active learning requires attention to the relationship among research, policy, and practice. Triyantara and Purwoko (2026) illustrated how the implementation of project-based learning (PBL) policy needs to be understood through a policy-implementation framework rather than solely through the lens of a teaching method.

Policy change may also give rise to a gap between policy goals and the realities of schools. Widyati et al. (2026) specifically discussed the gap between national education policy and its implementation in schools. Shan (2025), in the context of English language education policy in China, showed that the success of policy implementation is influenced by complex conditions and cannot be understood merely from the existence of a formal policy. Education policy implementation therefore needs to be understood as a dynamic process that unfolds through the interaction among policy, the school organization, teachers, leadership, resources, and learners. Building on these problems, this study aimed to describe and analyze how education policy is translated into learning practice, the factors that influence this process, and the forms of gap that may emerge between policy and practice. Accordingly, the study was guided by three research questions: (RQ1) How is education policy translated into learning practices? (RQ2) What factors influence this implementation process? (RQ3) What forms of gap may emerge between policy as designed and policy as enacted?

This study is important because the success of education policy ultimately depends on the ability of the education system to translate policy objectives into real learning experiences. Sound policy requires contextual implementation, while sound practice requires a clear policy direction and adequate systemic support.

2. METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive-narrative design. A qualitative approach was chosen because the study was oriented toward understanding and describing the process of education policy implementation in learning practice on the basis of the meanings, interpretations, relationships, and contexts found across scholarly sources. Consistent with an interpretive orientation,

the design foregrounded the cognitive and contextual dimensions of implementation rather than the normative evaluation of any single policy.

Participants and Data Sources

Because the study analyzed the phenomenon through scholarly discourse rather than fieldwork, the data were secondary data drawn from scholarly literature; the study therefore involved documentary data sources rather than human informants. The sources were selected purposively. The inclusion criteria were that a source (a) addressed education policy implementation, policy enactment, teacher practice, school leadership, organizational change in education, outcome-based or learner-centered learning, or learning innovation; (b) was a peer-reviewed article or scholarly document; and (c) was relevant to the relationship between policy and learning practice. Applying these criteria yielded a corpus of 20 scholarly sources that served as the reference base for the analysis.

Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through documentation study of the scholarly articles and documents that constituted the study's sources. Each source was read critically to identify its main ideas concerning policy implementation, implementing actors, organizational context, learning practice, barriers to implementation, and the relationship between policy and practice. Because the study relied on documentary sources, interview and observation protocols were not used.

Procedure

The analytic procedure proceeded in four stages. First, the main concepts of each source were identified. Second, information sharing common themes was grouped into analytic categories. Third, the relationships among categories were interpreted. Fourth, the results of the analysis were arranged narratively to obtain an integrated account of education policy implementation in learning practice. The analytic framework was directed at seven principal aspects: (1) the translation of policy into practice; (2) the interpretation of educational actors; (3) teacher capacity and professional learning; (4) school leadership; (5) organizational structure and resources; (6) the adaptation of policy to the local context; and (7) the gap between policy as designed and policy as enacted.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed qualitatively using a thematic analytic procedure. Coding proceeded from the identification of core concepts (initial coding), through the grouping of conceptually related codes into categories, to the interpretation of relationships across categories and their consolidation into overarching themes. The analysis was inductive and interpretive and was informed by Spillane et al.'s (2002) emphasis on the cognitive processes of actors and by McLaughlin's (2007) attention

to situated practice, so that the analysis sought to understand how policy takes form in practice rather than to appraise policy normatively.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was addressed with reference to the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was supported by source triangulation, that is, by corroborating analytic claims across multiple independent scholarly sources rather than relying on a single source. Transferability was supported by describing the corpus and the analytic categories so that readers can judge the applicability of the findings to other contexts. Dependability and confirmability were supported by maintaining a systematic and traceable analytic procedure that linked each theme to its supporting sources. Because the study did not involve human participants, member checking was not applicable.

Ethical Considerations

Because the study analyzed publicly available scholarly literature and did not involve human participants or personal data, the ethical requirements centred on academic integrity, the accurate representation of sources, and proper attribution.

3. RESULTS

The thematic analysis produced six interrelated themes that together address the three research questions, as summarized in Table 1. The themes were derived from the reviewed sources and are presented below with their supporting evidence.

Table 1

Themes, Core Codes, and Supporting Sources Derived from the Analysis

Theme	Core codes / analytic focus	RQ	Key supporting sources
Policy implementation as translation	Interpretation; sense-making; translation of goals into pedagogy; non-mechanical enactment	RQ1	Spillane et al. (2002); Cobb & Jackson (2012); W. et al. (2026)
Teachers as principal actors	Teacher interpretation; pedagogical integration; professional learning; role shift to facilitator	RQ1, RQ2	Kadir (2023); Katawazai (2021)
School leadership as link	Principal enactment; facilitation; e-leadership; enabling conditions	RQ2	Lundqvist & Westerlund (2022); Komariah et al. (2026)
Structure, agency, and organizational context	Structure-agency interaction; rules and resources; local context; adaptation	RQ2	Rigby et al. (2016); Asim et al. (2024)

Theme	Core codes / analytic focus	RQ	Key supporting sources
Gap between designed and enacted policy	Envisioned vs. enacted; policy–practice gap; feedback from the field	RQ3	Schulte (2018); Widyati et al. (2026); McLaughlin (2007)
Innovation requires systemic support	Research–policy–practice link; readiness; policy–practice fit	RQ2	Daly–Smith et al. (2019); Triyantara & Purwoko (2026)

Note. RQ = research question. The themes and codes were derived inductively from the reviewed scholarly sources.

3.1 Policy Implementation as a Process of Translation

The analysis showed that the implementation of education policy in learning practice was a process of translating policy from the conceptual and regulatory level to the level of pedagogical action. Policy that was initially formulated as objectives, standards, guidelines, or regulations had to be translated by schools and teachers into the planning, enactment, and evaluation of learning.

This translation did not proceed mechanically. Teachers needed to understand the substance of a policy, relate it to the curriculum and to learners' needs, and then decide how the policy would be realized through learning strategies. Implementation thus became an interpretive process.

Spillane et al. (2002) placed interpretation and cognition at the centre of policy implementation. The same policy could be understood differently by different implementers because each actor holds distinct experiences, knowledge, and frames of thinking.

This finding was also evident in the implementation of OBE. W. et al. (2026) showed the importance of a fit between policy and practice in OBE implementation. An orientation toward learning outcomes could not be realized merely by revising curriculum documents; it had to be translated into learning objectives, learning activities, assessment, and learner attainment.

3.2 Teachers as the Principal Actors of Implementation

Teachers were the actors who directly translated policy into learners' learning experiences. The success of policy implementation was therefore closely tied to teachers' ability to understand policy and to integrate it with pedagogical practice.

Kadir (2023) showed the connection among policy, practice, and professional learning. Implementation that demanded changes in practice required support for teachers' professional learning. Teachers needed opportunities to understand the rationale for change, try new approaches, obtain feedback, and reflect on their practice.

Katawazai (2021) showed that the implementation of outcome-oriented and learner-centered learning encountered various challenges in practice. The shift from teacher-centered toward more learner-centered learning required not only a change of method but also a change in the understanding of the roles of teacher and learner. In this context, the teacher no longer functioned merely as a transmitter of material but was required to become a designer of learning experiences, a facilitator, a mentor, and a manager of the learning process. Such change required pedagogical competence together with organizational support.

3.3 School Leadership as the Link between Policy and Practice

The analysis showed that school leadership performed an important function in translating policy into the local context. The principal was one of the actors linking policy demands with the capacity and needs of the school.

Lundqvist and Westerlund (2022) showed that principals played a role in interpreting and facilitating policy within the school environment. A principal thus not only carried out administrative functions but also helped to shape the conditions that made policy enactment possible.

Komariah et al. (2026) showed that digital leadership was relevant to managing learning disruptions and to implementing the independent learning policy. This indicated that the changing educational environment demanded a form of leadership capable of managing technology, communication, collaboration, and organizational change.

School leadership that supported implementation created space for teachers to discuss, develop competence, innovate, and adapt policy to learning needs. Conversely, when policy was understood merely as an administrative obligation, implementation risked stopping at the fulfilment of documents.

3.4 Structure, Agency, and Organizational Context

Policy implementation was also influenced by the relationship between organizational structure and the agency of implementers. Rigby et al. (2016) explained that structure and agency were related within the process of policy implementation and organizational change.

The school structure provided rules, procedures, division of tasks, resources, and decision-making mechanisms. However, structure did not fully determine action. Teachers and principals retained space to interpret and adapt policy according to the conditions they faced.

Asim et al. (2024) showed that implementation challenges could arise from management practices and organizational conditions. This indicated that the same policy could yield different implementation experiences when applied in organizations with different capacities and environments.

The local context mattered because schools differed in learner characteristics, organizational culture, resources, facilities, and teacher capacity. General policy therefore required a process of adaptation in order to be enacted meaningfully.

3.5 The Emergence of Gaps between Policy and Practice

A principal result of the analysis was the possibility of a gap between policy as designed and policy as realized in practice. Such a gap could arise from differences in interpretation, limited resources, implementer capacity, organizational characteristics, or the need for local adaptation.

Schulte (2018) distinguished between envisioned and enacted practice. Policy underwent processes of use and interpretation as it entered the life of the school. The form of a policy in practice could therefore differ from its form in documents.

Widyati et al. (2026) explicitly showed a gap between national education policy and its implementation in schools. This indicated that policy formulation and policy enactment were two related but non-identical processes.

McLaughlin (2007) affirmed the importance of attending to field experience in understanding implementation. Field practice provided information about the real conditions faced by policy implementers. Feedback from schools and teachers therefore became an important part of improving implementation.

3.6 The Implementation of Learning Innovation Requires Systemic Support

Education policy that promoted learning innovation required adequate systemic support. Active learning, OBE, project-based learning, and learner-centered approaches required changes across various aspects of learning.

Daly-Smith et al. (2019) showed that implementing learning innovation required a strong relationship among research, policy, and practice. This indicated that innovation policy could not merely stipulate the approach to be used; it also had to provide support so that teachers were able to implement it.

Triyantara and Purwoko (2026) showed that the implementation of project-based learning policy could be analyzed through a policy-implementation framework. Project-based learning was thus not only a teacher's methodological choice but could also form part of a policy agenda requiring school readiness.

A similar condition was found in OBE implementation. W. et al. (2026) showed that implementation success required a fit between policy and the conditions of implementation, underscoring the importance of the relationship between policy design and implementer capacity.

4. DISCUSSION

Education policy fundamentally takes two forms. The first is formal policy set out in regulations, guidelines, standards, or curriculum documents. The second is policy

as realized in practice. Between these two forms lies a process of translation involving educational actors. Cobb and Jackson (2012) showed the importance of viewing policy through the lens of learning design. Education policy ultimately has consequences for what learners learn, how learning is designed, and how learning opportunities are provided. Education policy and learning practice therefore cannot be separated. The implementation process can be depicted as a sequence that begins with policy, proceeds through interpretation, is then translated into lesson planning, is realized in classroom interaction, and is finally reflected in learners' learning experiences. Within this process, the teacher is a key actor because the teacher engages directly with the reality of learning. A policy that mandates learner-centered learning, for example, needs to be translated into activities that allow learners to question, discuss, collaborate, solve problems, and reflect on the learning process. Policy implementation therefore cannot be measured only by whether teachers know the content of a policy; what matters more is how that knowledge is transformed into pedagogical practice.

Policy implementation is often understood as compliance with policy. However, the literature shows that implementation is more complex than mere compliance. Implementers must give meaning to a policy before enacting it. Spillane et al. (2002) explained that the cognitive processes of implementers play a role in implementation. Teachers interpret policy on the basis of professional experience, pedagogical knowledge, understanding of learners, and school conditions. This interpretive process can produce variation in practice. Variation does not necessarily indicate that teachers reject a policy; on the contrary, it can indicate a process of adaptation to make the policy fit the conditions of learning. Shan (2025), through a study of English language education policy implementation, showed that implementation success is influenced by various interrelated conditions. This strengthens the view that policy implementation cannot be separated from the context in which policy is applied. Policy makers therefore need to consider that policy will undergo a process of interpretation once it reaches the school and classroom levels.

Policy change almost always demands changes in competence. When a policy introduces a new approach, teachers need opportunities to learn that approach. Kadir (2023) positioned professional learning as the link between policy and practice. Teachers require professional support in order to understand policy goals, develop implementation strategies, and reflect on the results of enactment. In implementing outcome-oriented learning, for example, teachers do not merely need to understand the concept of learning outcomes theoretically; they need to be able to connect outcomes with the design of activities, learning methods, and assessment. If this connection is not understood, implementation may stop at administrative change without substantial change in learning. Katawazai (2021) showed that the adoption of OBE and learner-centered learning encountered challenges in practice. One

implication is the need to strengthen teacher capacity continuously. Professional learning should not be a one-off training event; sustained policy implementation requires learning communities, collaboration among teachers, academic supervision, reflection, and the sharing of practice.

Principals play an important role in building the conditions that make policy enactment possible. Lundqvist and Westerlund (2022) showed that principals play a role in translating and facilitating policy at the local level. In practice, school leadership can influence implementation through the organization of resources, the division of tasks, the communication of policy, support for teachers, the development of a collaborative culture, and the monitoring of the learning process. Komariah et al. (2026) showed that developments in the educational environment also demand leadership capable of managing learning in disrupted and changing situations. School leadership therefore needs to be adaptive and able to connect policy demands with school needs. Principals also need to ensure that policy is not understood merely as an additional administrative burden; policy needs to be translated into goals for school development and for the improvement of learning quality.

Every school has different conditions, including human resources, facilities, learner characteristics, the social environment, school culture, and organizational experience. Viennet and Pont (2017) showed that context is an important part of understanding education policy implementation. Policy that is effective in one context therefore does not necessarily produce the same implementation process in another. Asim et al. (2024) showed that organizational conditions and management practices can be factors influencing implementation, and Bukhari et al. (2025) showed the importance of implementation in determining the impact of policy on the education system. In this respect, an overly uniform approach to implementation risks disregarding the diversity of schools. Conversely, guided flexibility allows schools to adapt policy without losing its main purpose. Adaptation does not mean disregarding policy; it is the process of translating policy goals into the concrete conditions of the school.

Rigby et al. (2016) offered the perspective that educational change occurs through the relationship between structure and agency. Structure provides the framework, while educational actors use their agency to enact and adapt policy. In learning practice, teachers work within the structure of the curriculum, timetable, assessment standards, school rules, and education policy. At the same time, teachers have space to determine learning strategies, select learning resources, manage classroom interaction, and adapt learning to learner characteristics. This relationship explains why policy implementation does not always produce uniform practice: policy provides direction, but practice is formed through the interaction between structure and professional judgment. Lisewski (2020) showed that top-down education policy can shape learning regimes and institutional practices. In higher-education settings, top-

down policy can influence how learning is organized, yet implementation remains shaped by practices that have developed at the institutional level. This shows that policy change interacts with existing habits, cultures, and practices.

The gap between policy and practice cannot be resolved simply by increasing oversight. Mechanisms are needed that allow policy makers to learn from the experience of implementation. McLaughlin (2007) emphasized the importance of attending to field experience. Schools and teachers are important sources of information for knowing whether a policy can be enacted, which parts encounter obstacles, and what support is required. Schulte (2018) showed that policy undergoes a process of enactment when it is used in practice. The difference between formal policy and practice therefore need not always be viewed as deviation; it needs to be analyzed in order to understand how policy works in real contexts. Widyati et al. (2026) showed that the gap between national education policy and its implementation in schools is an issue that warrants attention. The gap can be reduced through clear policy communication, resource support, the development of teacher capacity, strong leadership, and feedback mechanisms.

The synthesis indicates that policy implementation should not be understood as an activity that ends once a policy is issued. Implementation is a continuous process requiring monitoring, learning, evaluation, and adjustment. W. et al. (2026) showed that OBE implementation requires a fit between policy and practice. Daly-Smith et al. (2019) showed that implementing learning innovation also requires a continuous relationship among research, policy, and practice. Triyantara and Purwoko (2026) showed that enacting project-based learning policy requires an implementation framework that considers various aspects, while Lundqvist and Westerlund (2022) showed that leadership actors play a role in facilitating policy at the local level. Education policy therefore needs to be viewed as a continually developing process. After a policy is enacted, the experience of schools needs to be gathered to see how the policy works in practice, and this information can then be used to improve implementation and, where necessary, to refine the policy.

Implications. Theoretically, the findings reinforce an interpretive and enactment-oriented view of education policy in which implementation is a process of sense-making and translation rather than mechanical compliance. Practically, they suggest that improving implementation depends less on adding regulation or tightening administrative control than on strengthening teachers' professional learning, developing adaptive and collaborative school leadership, ensuring adequate resources, allowing space for contextual adaptation, and establishing feedback mechanisms from schools and teachers.

Limitations and Suggestions. This study was based on a qualitative synthesis of a purposively selected corpus of scholarly literature rather than on primary fieldwork;

its findings therefore reflect the analyzed sources and are not derived from direct observation of schools or classrooms. The corpus, although thematically relevant, was limited in size and scope. Future research could examine policy implementation empirically through case studies, phenomenological studies, or ethnographic studies in specific school settings, drawing on interviews, classroom observation, and documentation to capture how teachers and principals enact policy in situ, and could compare implementation across diverse organizational and cultural contexts.

5. CONCLUSION

The implementation of education policy in learning practice is a complex and dynamic process. Policy does not automatically become practice simply because it has been set out in regulations or guidelines; it must pass through processes of interpretation, translation, adaptation, and enactment by educational actors, especially teachers and principals. Learning practice is the principal space in which education policy takes concrete form, so that policies concerning curriculum, outcome-based education, learner-centered learning, active learning, and project-based learning are ultimately realized through teachers' pedagogical decisions and the support of the school organization.

Teachers occupy a central position because they engage directly with learners, and successful implementation therefore requires the strengthening of teachers' professional capacity. School leadership is likewise important, since principals link policy with the local conditions of the school. The gap between policy and practice is a phenomenon that may arise from differences in context, capacity, resources, interpretation, organizational structure, and local needs, and it should be understood as part of the implementation process to be analyzed rather than simply as non-compliance. Effective implementation requires connection among policy design, implementer capacity, school leadership, organizational support, professional learning, and the real conditions of learners. Policy also needs to leave room for contextual adaptation without losing its main purpose. Improving the quality of implementation thus calls for a more collaborative and sustained approach through clear policy communication, the strengthening of teacher capacity, supportive school leadership, adequate resources, room for adaptation, and feedback mechanisms from field practice.

Declarations

Acknowledgements.

The authors would like to acknowledge the academic and institutional support that contributed indirectly to the completion of this study. No additional acknowledgements are required.

Author Contributions.

Ahmad Rusli contributed to the conceptualization of the study, research design, methodology, identification and collection of scholarly literature, data analysis, interpretation of findings, and writing of the original manuscript. Zulpan contributed to the literature review, interpretation of the findings, critical analysis of the manuscript, and writing—review and editing. Both authors participated in revising the manuscript, approved the final version, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding.

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest related to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Data Availability.

This study used publicly available scholarly literature as its data sources and did not generate new empirical datasets. The scholarly sources analyzed in this study are identified and listed in the References section of the article.

6. REFERENCES

Asim, M., Bell, S., Boakye-Yiadom, M., Nudzor, H., & Mundy, K. (2024). Management practices and implementation challenges in district education directorates in Ghana. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 60*, 275-309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x241230527

Bukhari, S. T., Rafiq-Uz-Zaman, M., & Bano, S. (2025). Analysing the impact of education policies and their implementation on the school education system in Punjab, Pakistan. *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.63544/ijss.v4i1.136

Cobb, P., & Jackson, K. (2012). Analyzing educational policies: A learning design perspective. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21*, 487-521. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2011.630849

Daly-Smith, A., Quarmby, T., Archbold, V. S. J., Routen, A., Morris, J., Gammon, C., Bartholomew, J., Resaland, G. K., Llewellyn, B., Allman, R., & Dorling, H. (2019). Implementing physically active learning: Future directions for research, policy, and practice. *Journal of Sport and Health Science, 9*, 41-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2019.05.007

Kadir, M. A. A. (2023). Connecting policy, practice and professional learning: A case study. *Educational Research, 65*, 496-514. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2023.2264317

Katawazai, R. (2021). Implementing outcome-based education and student-centered learning in Afghan public universities: The current practices and challenges. *Heliyon, 7.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07076

Komariah, A., Asy'ari, H., Kardoyo, K., Dikdik, A., Kurniady, D., Abdullah, Z., Sunaengsih, C., Salsabil, S. H., Nurlatifah, S., Gunawan, M., & Nurochim, N. (2026). E-leadership in managing learning disruptions for independent learning policy implementation in Indonesian schools. *Education Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16030398

Lisewski, B. (2020). Teaching and learning regimes: An educational developer's perspective within a university's top-down education policy and its practice architectures. *International Journal for Academic Development, 26*, 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144x.2020.1831505

Lundqvist, C., & Westerlund, S. (2022). Principals' enactment of policy on research-based education: Interpreting and facilitating policy in local school settings in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 68*, 320–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2022.2148270

McLaughlin, M. (2007). Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and situated practice (pp. 70–84). https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4451-8_4

Rigby, J. G., Woulfin, S. L., & März, V. (2016). Understanding how structure and agency influence education policy implementation and organizational change. *American Journal of Education, 122*, 295–302. https://doi.org/10.1086/685849

Schulte, B. (2018). Envisioned and enacted practices: Educational policies and the 'politics of use' in schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 50*, 624–637. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1502812

Shan, Z. (2025). Is successful implementation possible? Unraveling the implementation of English language education policy in China. *SAGE Open, 15.* https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251359014

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research, 72*, 387–431. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003387

Triyantara, D. R., & Purwoko, B. (2026). Implementing project based learning policy through Grindle's framework. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education.* https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v5i1.3029

Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). *Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework.* https://doi.org/10.1787/fc467a64-en

W., Novita, E., & Haryono, B. (2026). Bridging policy and practice: An analysis of outcome-based education (OBE) curriculum implementation using David C. Korten's fit model. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran.* https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v12i1.19879

Widyati, E., Pratiwi, I. H., Budiman, H., & Rasyani, D. (2026). Analisis kesenjangan antara kebijakan pendidikan nasional dan implementasinya di sekolah [Analysis of the gap between national education policy and its implementation in schools]. *Didaktik: Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang.* https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v12i01.11363

© Mecca-Edu: Journal of Sinar Education, Language, and Evaluation (JSELE) — Sinar Asia Institute. This article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.