The article describes two models of education policy scenario that outlined from our research on the role of knowledge in public policy. First, through the summary of our KNOWandPOL\textsuperscript{1} national results and of the Romanian social context of the knowledge-policy relation, the article contextualizes the subsequent discussion. Then, it explores the two scenarios through some criteria and comparison zones, relevant to policy feasibility. The article concludes that within the specific circumstances of the post-socialist knowledge regime, the new challenges and opportunities of national education policy-making stand in the nature of knowledge. The interaction between the policy’s explicit knowledge and the users’ tacit knowledge creates new possibilities, the interface between the two types of knowledge might be of a highly creative nature that might increase policy effectiveness.
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Introduction

In the framework of the KNOWandPOL research project, twelve national teams investigated the changing role of knowledge in the construction and regulation of health and education policies. The 5 years project was structured as follows: in the first orientation, the research teams mapped the social and cognitive field of national policy-making, the second

\textsuperscript{*} Sapientia University, Romania.

\textsuperscript{1} http://www.knowandpol.eu
orientation focused on the investigation of two public actions, while in the third orientation research was conducted on international and national knowledge-based regulatory instruments. The ideas developed in this study originated from a «project-task» within which we had to look back at what we have accomplished during the 5 years project. This reflection was made through key questions like: Is the knowledge-policy relationship going through changes? Are there new trends in this relationship? Do changes in regulation or governance relate to changes in the role and nature of knowledge? Do context, places and history matter in this relationship? Is knowledge a tool or it is inseparably from identities? Are there new forms of knowledge emerging through policy processes? What are the constellations of the relationships between the different actors from policies? In this article, it was our intention to bring a synthesis – based on the 5 years work of the Romanian team – to this last question: the constellations of the relationships between the different types of actors from policies. Based on the research findings from the project, we can conclude that, in the Romanian context in most education policies, distinction can be made between «the policy» and its «recipients». Accordingly, the relationships between the policies’ decisional executive levels and the recipient local society might have various different outcomes.

During the different research orientations of the 5 years project, it was possible to find both successfully and effectively functioning policies – the Community Action Programme (Kiss, Fejes, & Biró, 2009) was an example of this –, and hardly working (or even forced) policy initiatives – the experiments for decentralization (Biró & Kiss, 2010) or the system of quality assurance in the Romanian pre-university education (Kiss, Fejes, & Rostás, 2010) are of this kind. Based on these experiences and results, we will now scrutinize the characteristics of the relationships between the policy and its recipients in these different policy contexts, in order to highlight the determinants of policy effectiveness.

---

2 By «the policy», we understand both the official agents, including policy-makers, decisional actors, experts and school inspectors at different levels, and the contents, the aims the policy specifies. By policy «recipients», we understand the actors to whom the policy is designed, at whom the policy aims to induce paradigm shift. To precisely define the parties, in most policies one can distinguish the target groups the policy addresses, actually, the users or beneficiaries, the lower-level (street-level) actors of front line execution. In this narrow sense, the county school inspectors or education policy experts are not considered as «recipients», their role is only to intermediate, they are considered as intermediaries between the policy and street-level actors in policy execution. While speaking about policy recipients, here we think on the low-level actors that have a pivotal role in policy implementation (not members of policy drafting). They are local actors, the ultimate consumers of the policies.
Methodological considerations

Considering methodological issues, the project used mainly qualitative research methods, especially interviews, document analysis, literature review, case studies and secondary analysis. The primary sources of information and data were processed in national reports. For the analysis, we turned to secondary sources, mainly to the research reports produced within the project, and will develop this article on the basis of two analysis conducted in the field of education. Each of them is a case study of a public action (Kiss et al., 2009; Biró & Kiss, 2010). In methodological terms, the article draws on the interpretations and conclusions of the national reports of the two public actions. In order to present the education policy scenarios, the paper applies as research method the meta-analysis of interpretations, considerations and conclusions of the secondary sources on the two public actions.

The knowledge and policy relationship in the light of our research findings

According to the project’s structure and to research plans, the first orientation mapped the national social-political context of education policy-making, including the identification of the most important actors of the field – decisional, knowledge-producers, executive actors, and so on –, and specified the relationships and networks between them. Set up in a framework, the project considered «knowledge types and their association with different forms of regulation along a continuum from «bureaucratic» to «post-bureaucratic» knowledge types. We classified types of knowledge associated with the contrasting bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic forms of regulation» (Kósa et al., 2008: 23). Accordingly, the bureaucratic knowledge was described as professional, administrative, disciplinary academic, fragmented, with professional monopoly, command and control, while the post-bureaucratic knowledge was presented as processual, future-oriented, managerial, comparative, integrated, international or trans-national, evidence-based, quantitative, with focus on performance, users’ experiences and evaluation (Kósa et al., 2008: 23). In our view, post-bureaucratic knowledge was an integrated knowledge conception. According to the framework of interpretation, the Romanian report specifies a «mixed institutional model», stressing the uncertainty national knowledge productive institutions have to face (Kósa, 2008). Furthermore, it concludes that education policy-making in Romania tends to move from a contemplative policy culture to an evaluative policy culture, however, there is limited interaction in the knowledge-policy relationship since education policy-making works by occasional solutions instead of regularities and strategies of knowledge-mobilization. As the author claims: the lack of legitimacy in education policy
issues, the fragmented and mosaic-like character and the ephemeral components of policies run against legitimacy” (Kósa, 2008: 3).

Moving from this knowledge and policy tradition, the analysis was focused on two public actions, interpreted as multi-actor and multi-level processes (Commaille, 2004), equivalent with paradigm change. The Community Action Programme⁵, promoting the social integration of disadvantaged and handicapped children, is considered to be a successful and effective policy initiative from the point of view of knowledge mobilization. As the authors of the national report emphasize, there can be observed a quantitative evolution in the public action, however, it does not necessarily entail significant qualitative development (Kiss et al., 2009). The networks built upon common understanding and tacit knowledge were facilitated and supported by a very strong social approval, but even so the public action could not fully apply and mobilize its knowledge potentials, mostly because of the asymmetric relationship between the policy and the recipient society. Asymmetry facilitated the transfer and acceptance of knowledge, but it was less favourable for the creation and emergence of new types of knowledge(s). The interaction of the explicit and codified knowledge of the public action with the tacit knowledge of the recipient society offered many opportunities for knowledge production (since the actors had a common understanding of the goals and what should be done) and for new forms of knowledge (a more comprehensive understanding of what volunteering means, for example), but, as the report states, the public action could not completely fulfill this role. The authors finally note that this does not prejudice the other successes (and the general positive evaluation) of the public action, but it explains why – despite its successes – it remained an experiment in the unfolding of the knowledge-policy relation (Kiss et al., 2009).

The decentralization of the education system⁴ – that similarly aimed a cognitive shift – was finally considered a less successful and effective policy initiative, since for that the necessary conditions for knowledge mobilization have been created neither by the overall public action, nor by its part-projects. As the authors conclude, actors did not identify themselves with the idea, although the issue was important for them, their attitude and opinion was greatly

---

⁵ In the case study of the Community Action Programme – as a primary research method –, interviews were conducted, document, event and website analysis was processed, media materials and statistics were used to provide a full understanding of knowledge circulation within the public action. These materials were processed by the research report by Kiss et al. (2009).

⁴ The case study of the decentralization process identified the institutional and non-institutional actors that played an important role in the public action (PA) process, with whom where realized interview discussions. Furthermore, media materials were analysed, and participant observation was carried out on the PA’s official public events, and even within the informal speech events between end-users. Report of the decentralization process by Biró & Kiss (2010).
influenced by the fact whether they had to express their opinion in “official” or “informal” situations (Biró & Kiss, 2010: 8). The different interests present in this public action could not be summarized in a common reference framework. As the report states, within the fifteen years long preparatory experimental process, «a small amount of knowledge was produced and applied. It is very probable that after the new launch of the public action there will appear in the process of decentralization the need for knowledge not yet produced». Compared to the last fifteen years’ practice, the difference will be that – according to some experts’ interpretations – «everyday tasks and problems will force processes of knowledge production and knowledge circulation» (Biró & Kiss, 2010: 48).

Moving further to knowledge-based regulation tools, the national report presents other features of the knowledge-policy relationship. The quality assurance system developed for the monitoring, evaluation and accountability in public education as a regulation operates with a very strong central and higher level organization and control, the «instrument represents the “hard” way of regulation» (Kiss et al., 2010: 42). It carries the potentials of self-regulation, while so far it manifested as a rather normative regulation. «Since this knowledge-based regulatory instrument works within a stabile hierarchical system where actions are taken quite routinely, tasks and roles are clearly divided and there is external and direct control of activities, this instrument works in a bureaucratic environment. The tool itself in its construction and accountability mechanisms «seems to be a bureaucratic form of regulation» that «gives less chance for displacement towards post-bureaucratic forms». However, as it also contains «the possibility of a bottom-up perspective (especially when it comes to the practice of internal quality assurance and quality management at the level of the schools)», its success basically «depends on to what extent this tool» (especially the ideas and aims it represents) «can become part of the social common sense». As the authors say, the capacity of this instrument to «play an important role depends strongly on the knowledge base and the kind of expertise it claims to possess» (Kiss et al., 2010: 42).

Finally, through the investigation of the national reception of PISA, we could find out that the PISA’s relationship with the national knowledge-policy context remained only a formality, the arrangements for public and professional discourses to discuss the national results are in general limited (Rostás et al., 2009). The national PISA studies have become neither a public nor a professional concern. They have not called forth significant national knowledge; even its public thematization has been highly neglected. As the authors of the national report claim, «there is no detectable relationship between PISA results» and the renewing reform processes, «either in the meaning of content or in the meaning of the reference» (Rostás et al, 2009: 26).

The above results confirm national policy-making being a result of bricolage (Ball, 1998; Freeman, 2007). In this logic, different ideas get alongside each other, decisional actors
borrow and copy policy items, choose, complete and use locally tested approaches, or even arbitrary fashions, pounce on anything that seems to work. And because of the more intensified and growing international embeddedness of national education policies, even signs of public policy borrowing (Steiner-Khamsi, 2004) appear in domestic policy-making. However, it is not the accurate circumstance in Romania, since merging the various foreign policy items is rarely effective and successful. Adopting these items to domestic policy environments, harmonizing with the existing national practices and refining them to each other from the point of view of policy feasibility leaves much to be desired. Especially if we think in terms of Freeman's (2007) concept of translation and learning through policies – in an active, productive and creative way. Here, public policy decision-making is necessarily a translation made through bricolage, in fact a learning process, which might lead to results only if the various knowledges in public policy making could match not only between actors and interests, but also between different ways of thinking (Freeman, as cited in Berényi, 2010). Although within domestic conditions these actions (matching, harmonizing) have less impact (remain rather formal), we have seen examples of «godsend» policy functioning, where the different ways of thinking could meet. This type of policy operation (mechanisms) leads us to describe successful and less successful education policy models (by searching for aspects that facilitate or restrain policy’s operation). The theoretical frame discusses rather post-bureaucratic modes and logics of policy-making and implementation, which is perhaps difficult to apply in a bureaucratically functioning centralized system as the Romanian is, which gives less space for elements of governance and post-bureaucracy. Still, we are looking for items, factors or aspects that along this «trap» can be crossed.

A brief word on national context

In case of Romania there is a complex set of contextual elements that matters in the processes of policy-decisions and implementations. The contextual elements in education policy-making⁵ are: the post-socialist social system, the slow process of transition where most policies are extremely delayed, the vertical-hierarchical relationship structures in most areas of social life and the pressures on modernization (EU and other international and national constraints). By the context of policy recipients, we mean the cultural pattern called the techniques of passing or crossing between the formal and informal sphere of a policy (Bodó, 1998),

⁵ For a more detailed description, please consult the Romanian national reports available at http://www.knowandpol.eu/-Education,279-.html.
meaning the behaviour of street level actors showing interest and formal identification with policy ideas in official contexts, but rejecting them while being in informal environment. Disclaiming, but not confronting – a behaviour towards the central, top-down praxis. Furthermore, the survival-established way of life constitutes an obstacle in most policies, the social overload and indifference against the changes policies aim to induce, the reluctance and aversion against strategical planning and external effects that explicitly aim paradigm shift – are all among the features of the policy reception process and of policy recipients.

In this context, we can say that our research consisted of exploring «belated» education policies that are trying to catch-up, and by doing so they still build on mechanic-administrative policy implementation methods, generated by the centralized and hierarchically structured education system. Although even within these conditions we have found factors signalling the possibility for a shift towards post-bureaucratic mode of operation (for example most policies offer consultation, ask for self-evaluations, are future oriented, try to apply an integrated view of the social, and so on), in social conditions these factors have not been exploited or operated. These will be functional in the knowledge-policy relationship maybe in the future, on medium- or long-term. Thus, today these are interpreted as the precursors of a paradigmatic change (Kiss et al., 2009). In the relationship between the policy and recipients the practices and discourses present different attitudes: the practice does not question the need (example: for decentralization), however, it does not really do more than what is prescribed or expected, obligatory. Discourses (related to decentralization, quality assurance, and so on) are rather permissive with the initiatives coming from central level. And in most cases there is a hidden discourse, a vernacular, everyday discourse – as well – between policy recipient local actors and end-users. Beside discourse, at users’ level there are significant independent initiatives and actions, though in education – for example – some of these cannot or do not want to enter upper levels. Here, another way of action is successful, that of the personal trust relations. Due to these personal trust relations, there are independent, self-organized, well-functioning educational practices, that succeed in good resource structures, and require no superior instruction or influences.

Models for education policy scenario

According to our research findings, embedded in the given social context, with respect to the relationship between knowledge and policy – set into a more general model –, two kinds of education policy scenarios can be outlined. We will present them through the following criteria: by describing the structure, we will discuss the policy launch, timeline, organization
and display. By discussing the channels between the policy and its recipients, we consider
the modes of knowledge transfer, the reactions and reflexivity that manifest from the part of
policy recipients and the use of knowledge in the actual model. And, finally, by the impact,
we discuss the potentials of knowledge mobilization, emergence of new knowledge and
social embeddedness or integration of the given policy. Through these aspects, we can
confirm the following two scenarios.

The scenario of the hardly working model

Here the policy is assumed to be defined as a result of EU integration commitments and of
an internal (or national) need for transformation. The policy is defined first as part-task within
national strategic governmental papers, however, shortly becomes an individual and separate
strategic program. In the execution, international actors play an important role: there are
contracts set up with international institutions, external experts are involved in the manage-
ment of the policy, external resources are allocated for the policy, it works as a widely popula-
ized project. The model for policy offered by the international actors contains ready-made
knowledge and best-practices for subprojects. By telling what to do, they do not relate specific
tasks to implementing the policy. The reasons are: on the one hand, the lack of necessary legal
frameworks for specific measures and methodologies adopted to Romanian local conditions,
on the other hand, implementation depends on national actors, policy recipients (local actors).

Considering the structure, the policy is longly delaying in time, is often redefined and re-
launched, it exists only as an expectation, need or frame. Regarding its objectives, this policy
aims structural change and, in order to achieve it, claims for project deadlines, expected
results and designates the actors of the project. As a process, changes constantly, stops, starts
again, deviates from the original design and schedule. In this emergent process, significant
internal changes are allowed. This policy model always manages less than what is included
into policy plans and goals. The knowledge production process of the policy is of confused
and ephemeral nature, the actors personal opinion as knowledge often gets more importance
than the official or experts’ knowledge distributed by the policy structure. Personal and local
knowledges get appreciated in this model, as well as the partial approaches do instead of
holistic views. The intentions to change produce strong and personal reactions loaded by
affective elements. These are in most cases negative (have negative connotations), while the
same actors emphasize the policy’s importance as well in their principle. Consequently, in this
model, there are permanently two levels considering the actors’ reflections: one accepting and
supporting the policy, and a ‘rebel’ represented by the open or covert resistances against
concrete explicit changes (that often manifests only in informal environments). These reactions are constantly working in this model, as permanent reflections of the recipients, so that an important structural feature of the policy processes. Due to the partial knowledge-mobilization aspect of the policy, in this model, after more renewals, the effects of a cognitive shift get more space. Often such external effects as the economic crisis or institutional rationalization constraints might determine the outcome of the policy (in a positive way), in that sense that constraint situations foreground or even enforce the structural changes.

Considering knowledge transfer and target groups, defining the contents and designing implementation largely depends on leaders in this model. This mentality and practice leads to a praxis where administrative decisions are taken within short time by the different level leaders and these are in general taken into consideration by recipients. The mechanism contributes – as well – to the strengthening of the recipients’ attitude discussed above. In knowledge production, middle and street level actors have minimal role. New knowledge had a significant role only initially by the construction of oppositions (good-bad policy circumstances, efficiency-inefficiency) in order to launch and legitimate the policy, knowledge circulation was limited to top-down dissemination. According to research findings, in this model actors are not engaged in producing (new) knowledge, the policy lacks the knowledges reflecting to each other. This is often hindered by the bureaucratic structure of the education system, where accountability and control are strictly managed. Recipients, street level actors, have minimal freedom in policy-related decisions.

Finally, it cannot actually embed into the surrounding social knowledge. Street level actors are mechanically activating their knowledge that is very much developed and deeply rooted in routines, so the administrative-executive, often encompassing knowledge, gets working here. These scenarios keep protests silent, while they are executing tasks mechanically. The users’ knowledge manifests and «returns» to the decisional levels only in minimal respect. This aspect is not considered important or necessary by any of the actors from the different levels. The short-term effect of the policy in these contexts is generally minimal. There is a chance only on long-term for the policy aims to go beyond the difficulties of the administrative-executive practice and to become translated and integrated into the patterns of thinking and acting of the broader social structures. Undoubtedly, this is the most common knowledge-policy scenario in Romanian education policy context. This is the scenario that most often

---

6 There are three KNOWandPOL national reports that confirm this scenario model: the report discussing the decentralization process of the pre-university education system (Biró & Kiss, 2010), the one discussing the functioning of the quality assurance system (Kiss et al., 2010) and the report on the national reception of PISA (Rostás et al., 2009).
manifests and works not only in education policy-making, but as well in most endeavours for modernization. And although there are chances or even actions of post-bureaucratic processes in more and more segments of social life and social reality, they cannot really enter the most significant social policies that aim to induce social changes.

**The scenario of a more effective education policy model**

The policy’s launch in this case can be attributed to foreign international initiative. It is not only a directly imported policy, but even the human capital necessary to the launch, coordination, and lobbying for the policy (founder person, political supporters) is coming from abroad (from the international arena). Started almost a decade ago – in the period of EU pre-accession –, it tends to peak its activity within 4-6 years of functioning. In these first active years, the policy is energetically functioning, characterized by explosive growth, but then becomes more moderate, less spectacular or visible, decreasing its activities and forms into a descending arc. The success of the policy is promoted here by the way it was put into practice. First, it is perfectly integrating into the mechanisms and routine-practices of the national education system – it chooses the same top-down mode of implementation and builds its organizational structure upon the same bureaucratic institutional system as most other policies do. On the other hand, maybe due to the assistance and knowledge-transfer of the international actors coordinating the implementation, the policy can move beyond the pitfalls of hierarchy and bureaucracy that came from the structure of the system. In general, it can only motivate those who are actively working in the system, whereas most of the recipients situated in the periphery of the system have limited or minimalized opportunities for participation in decision-making. Compared with other national education policies, in this model there is much more space and freedom given to recipients in implementation and filling up the content. Accountability is much more flexible in this model, while even the space for the use of informal contacts in the policy is wider here than in general.

The policy display in this model used to take the advantage of this «dual» mode of implementation: the policy related websites, programs, events and publications meet the official formal and content requirements (including government decision, regulations, methodologies, reports and data), and, besides, put emphasis on presenting all local policy related activities, demonstrating their experience-based activities and learning. In this model, this last point gets more emphasis with the progress of the policy. Knowledge transfer at the beginning of implementation is almost one-way (from abroad to Romania, and top-down), considering both the design and content. Routines of the system in this model do not count on the street level reci-
pients’ knowledge mobilization potentials. The initial knowledge from abroad does not count with autonomous local actors, so the encoded knowledge is somehow detailed and explanatory. If the policy remains within the bureaucratic structure, the social use of imported knowledge is likely to fail. But the lack of strict central control, the flexible frameworks and the more freedom recipients have in this model usually unfold the creativity of local actors. The policy’s success actually lies in that the experiential engagement and the flexibility of implementation makes possible the translation and application of the imported knowledge into the language of the Romanian society. The knowledge content disseminated by the policy can meet not only with the local knowledge and practice, but it can also fit into it.

There is a third element that contributes to this success: if the policy relates to an area that local society or the social classes are quite sensitive. Social commitment and collective support has significant tradition and thus accumulated tacit knowledge capital as well. The common knowledgebase generated this way is able to produce such type of knowledge that can induce spectacular and massive activities, furthermore, it can reverse the direction of knowledge to be bottom-up, from national to international. Target groups and actors’ reactions are also two-faceted in this model. Because initially the policy is spreading and involves middle and street level actors through bureaucratic structure-channels, their behaviour and reflections are also conforming to the situation – according to the requirements of the system, mainly performing the official tasks without implication, by constraint. However, as the policy evolves into a movement and moves beyond the task-solving manner – as it happened in the case of Community Action Programme –, it gives broader frames for self/autonomous initiatives, resulting in positive experiences and adopting attitude. The longstanding institutional behaviours however do not entirely disappear: during fieldwork in the Community Action Programme we could see practices where the same recipient used to report in a usual way towards upper level (using the bureaucratic forms), writing what is expected, while in practice there were successful and well-functioning activities carried-out about which they were not reporting.

In this model, the initial, routinous mode of action is replaced by a system of praxis showing a high degree of autonomy in action, which goes beyond the frames of the strict institutional structure, consequently the policy successfully embeds into the practices of social classes. Although we consider this model to be successful and efficient (due to its embeddedness and the knowledge mobilizing potentials), after the first arcs of functioning, we might experience downturn. However, this turn concerns mainly the policy’s central and official structure, in this phase the large number of actors mobilized within the policy are still continuing the activities in many areas.
Conclusion

In our analysis we compared two Romanian education policies from the point of view of their effectiveness, both launched through external (international) initiatives. Both scenario models demonstrate that the relationship between policy and policy recipients does not work properly, or does not work at all. The partly conscious or often unconscious techniques of protection that manifest in recipients’ reactions dampen or restrain the course of the policy.

As results show, a more successful scenario evolves when the policy takes into account the nature and specificities of policy recipients, whether consciously or by chance. In this scenario we can expect results only if the policy aims and tries to involve street level actors into some kind of praxis. A good chance for this involvement is when the policy addresses such or similar social praxis that actors feel attracted by or that is obvious and consider to be their own responsibility to get involved. In this model, recipients feel that they are really necessary in the functioning of the policy; consequently they should be active and, furthermore, often have freedom concerning decisions at local level. Thus the policy stands closer to their own world, objectives and values. In this scenario there is much more chance for policymaking to stand up in a more effective bricolage (Freeman, 2007).

It is less successful when the policy aims direct and fast structural transformation, the recipients’ participation is formal and occasional (ad hoc), if actors feel that they have actually no individual leeway within the policy, just get the roles of task execution. In such cases, different techniques of protection become activated decreasing the policy’s effectiveness. Thus, regarding the relationship between the policy and its recipients in policy-effectiveness, we consider the second scenario to be successful, although in the Romanian education policy there is still less practice of this kind.

The actually possible post-bureaucratic aspects or manifestations of knowledge – referred earlier in this paper – (that manifests in the effectively functioning education policy model as the recipients’ freedom in decision and action, the practicality and realism of a policy – for example) that gain ground or get the chance to become active in social policies are often interpreted by upper level actors as objections or protests, displeasure or resistance. Decisional actors likely do not measure effectively the potentials of local knowledge when importing and translating policies. According to the less effective scenario, bureaucracy does not allow from its mechanisms, decision-makers and policy designers over-bureaucratize the policy issues. Consequently they over-secure the policy with sanctions and threats. This causes an anarchical situation, since the spaces and channels for public debates, arguments and counter-arguments, or enforcing interests in most policies are quite limited. However, street level actors are responsible in this situation as well, since they unintentionally turn
towards bureaucratic structures (claim or wait for help and support) while they are called to self-representation or need to protect their interests. Thus, they basically contribute to maintain the anarchical situation, which is unfavourable for post-bureaucratic changes – changes that are theoretically present in most policies as offer or supply (consultation, inviting more actors, evaluation, competition, performance, etc.), but which are not becoming part of implementation or practice (remain formality). Therefore, transformative social policies do not meet with users, street level actors’ ideas. The potential is clearly present, but the situation is of “either-or”: either the central initiatives or the users’ actions succeed in a given policy. But not so as to exclude each other, rather functioning parallely and independently. However, impossible to have one policy merging the two models yet. We think the chance stands in the nature of knowledge Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) defined. The interaction of the explicit and tacit knowledge creates the chance to establish new knowledge. The interface between the two consists of an interactive surface that claims learning and the use of intelligence. The national education policy context is however – from the point of view of the different types of intelligences (as analytic or evidence-based, empirical or interpersonal, etc.) – still incomplete and limited. Thus, we think that there is a need to help this process, and contribute to the confrontation between the local actors’ tacit and the policies’ explicit knowledge to make this interface between the two interactive in order to establish a more effective and successful education policy practice.
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