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Dual Vocational Training

✓ a success story with many positive effects:

- low youth unemployment
- producing high expertise
- needs oriented
- reducing state spending on education
- socially accepted alternative
- flexible and adaptable
✓ an Export-hit in development cooperation

But: no direct transferability because of...

✓ its socio-historical roots
✓ particular division of responsibilities
✓ integrated vocational structures
Objective of the lecture

Examine to what extent this kind of cooperation was successful, and if it was successful, then under which conditions?
(1) An evaluation of the sustainability of vocational training projects carried out mainly in the 1970s and 1980s. These include projects to introduce dual system structures in Honduras, Guatemala and Ecuador.  
   (cf. Stockmann 1996)

(2) An impact study on the introduction of the dual system in the People's Republic of China.  
   (cf. Stockmann et.al. 2000)

(3) A meta-evaluation of vocational training, in which measures for the introduction of dual system elements were evaluated – in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Burkina Faso, Macedonia, and the Philippines.  
   (cf. Stockmann and Silvestrini)
### Success and failures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Impact 1)</th>
<th>Sustainability 2)</th>
<th>Diffusion 3) in the vocational training system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Scale from 1 (very good) to 6 (useless).
2) Scale from 1 (very good) to 4 (inadequate).
3) Scale from 1 (very broad) to 6 (no) diffusion.

n.s. = not specified
Success-factors
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- careful planning
  - ex-ante evaluation
  - stakeholder analysis
  - baseline-study
- flexible steering
  - M&E-System
- framework conditions
  - cultural
  - social
  - political
- efficiency of partner organization
  - ownership
  - organizational structure
  - technical equipment
  - financial resources
  - qualified + motivated personal

success
Balanced scorecard for program success

- Ownership
- System compatibility
- Qualified + motivated personal
- Flexible steering

Vision + Strategie
Nothing new under the sun?

If yes, why are these factors still not sufficiently taken into consideration?

Is it because they are not explicitly understood and therefore disappear into the background?

Or is it because the conditions under which development programs are carried out do not permit these factors to be sufficiently considered?
Thank you for your attention!