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Abstract: As the German vocational education and training (VET) system, with its dual learning environment in both firms and vocational schools, is an international benchmark, many concepts and projects are aiming to transfer this approach to other countries and education systems. In such contexts, it is important to consider the specific concepts and requirements of educational transfer. This paper outlines success factors and hindrances for such endeavors. Therefore, a literature review is combined with empirical survey results from Germany. This is directed at a specific project regarding a transfer of the dual VET system from Germany to Tunisia, but it also exemplifies general factors for any such concept transfer. As important success factors, “quality assurance” and “perspectives for graduates”, for example, are identified.
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1. Introduction

The German dual vocational education and training (VET) system is internationally recognized as performing very well [1–4]. This is related to the specific setup of two learning environments, in a commercial firm and a vocational school, working in a symbiotic fashion [5–8]. For reasons such as (i) the global economic and financial crises in 2008–2009 and 2020, (ii) the increased global need for qualified workers, and (iii) high levels of youth unemployment, many countries would like to implement variations on such a VET system [9]. Germany has the lowest rate of youth unemployment in Europe, which decreased from 11.2% to 7.5% between 2009 and 2013 [10]. Furthermore, Germany has provided more official development assistance (ODA) funding for VET than the World Bank or the European Union [11]. Emerging countries, in particular, require capable VET systems to meet demands for well-trained employees [12].

There is a growing body of literature on the topic of the transferability of the German VET system to other countries [13–20]. (There is no clear definition of the terms “transfer” and “export” of education in the literature, with a few exceptions. Hummelsheim and Baur (2014) define “export” as copy or duplication, while the term “transfer” implies more variation and adaption. Therefore, in this paper, the term “transfer” is consistently used). There are VET transfer projects in Asia, e.g., Afghanistan, China, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam [12,21], as well as in Saudi Arabia [22], the United States [23,24], China [25], and Mexico [26,27]. Oxtoby reflects on the planning of VET systems in developing countries [28]. Apart from the
transfer of the German VET system, there are many related fields of research, for example regarding the measurability of the quality of VET programs [29], international challenges and outcomes [30–32], skill transferability [33,34], market-driven training systems [35], public–private partnerships in VET systems [33,36] or trends in VET in South Africa after the ending of apartheid [37]. Turbin describes lessons learned from attempts to transfer VET from an advanced to an advanced country context, as well as from an advanced to a developing country context [38]. Tripney et al., as well as Tripney and Hombrados, summarized the evidence about the effects of VET interventions for young people in low- and middle-income countries, especially in Latin America [39,40]. However, in the context of educational transfer, it is generally important to consider the specific concepts and requirements of the target country of implementation. “Each country’s social, cultural and economic conditions determine the methods and strategies to be used in this process” [20] (p. 6). The concept of VET transfer must be understood as a flexible adaption, rather than a blueprint [12]. Germany is urged to address the high expectations of countries implementing a dual VET system [41].

This paper presents a literature review combined with empirical survey results from Germany to identify success factors and hindrances to the transfer of the German VET system, specifically from Germany to Tunisia. The contribution of this paper considers success factors and hindrances regarding VET transfer from an advanced to a developing country context. The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents a literature review regarding success factors in VET transfer. Section 3 describes the educational system in Tunisia. Section 4 describes the objectives, conception, and implementation as well as the results of the empirical survey. Section 5 outlines the relevant discussion of the findings, and Section 6 presents the conclusions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. VET Transfer Motivation

Germany is by far the largest donor country for promoting VET through international cooperation [42]. This demand arises partly because the VET system is considered Germany’s “secret of success” [43]. In addition, the VET system is a model in the worldwide domain of VET cooperation and transfer [44]. This warrants further elaborations and insights regarding VET transfer, especially from Germany toward other countries, in order to improve such projects [45]. Countries apply increasing effort to using the role model of the German VET system to support the transition of young people from compulsory education to the labor market [20,46]. In particular, developing and emerging economies [47] strive to implement the German VET system [27]. The main target regions for transfer activities are Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe, but there is also an increasing transfer of educational services to Turkey, Asian countries (e.g., China), North Africa and Latin America. There are few transfer projects in Sub-Saharan Africa or in the least-developed countries [48]. Important findings related to the question of the transferability of the dual VET system have resulted from studies of VET projects in development cooperation [49]. VET as an intervention field of poverty reduction and employment promotion already has a long tradition in German development cooperation [49]. Beyond the general debate on the feasibility of the transfer of the dual VET system, academic literature has so far paid little attention to existing training practices in German organizations located in other countries with some exceptions [50–53]. The focus of interdisciplinary academic literature on knowledge transfer is on the transfer of research and development and technology-related knowledge [54,55]. In contrast, the transfer of implicit, production-related knowledge is seldom studied [26]. While the literature on international human resources management often researches topics such as world talent pipelines and highly skilled personnel [56,57] it neglects the training of intermediately skilled workers [53,58], with the exception of Pilz and Li [53], who compared the training practices of German organizations in the USA, China and India [26].
However, past discussions on the nature and competencies of German VET cooperation have already shown that the impossibility of transferring a specific model of VET must be assumed. Due to the heterogeneity of the starting situations in the individual countries, it can be assumed that the implementation of a particular universal model of VET is not possible, so that in the current development cooperation the dual VET system is seen as a reference model [42,59,60]. If in the past the assumption was to transfer the dual VET system entirely (in an adapted form), the transfer of system elements and successful features into the existing educational system is now more modestly assumed [44,49,61–63]. Similar results are found in examinations by external experts who evaluated GIZ projects, and in which a critical “transfer balance sheet” was drawn with regard to the implementation of a dual VET model based on the German dual VET system [19,64]. These evaluations demonstrated that the projects examined were only of little sustainability, with the aim of introducing dual or cooperative training structures [64,65]. Stockmann [66] and Wrana and Revilla Diez [67] reported studies revealing that projects of VET transfer often remain as stand-alone solutions within the country. This view is also shared by numerous vocational and business educators who have dealt with the topic of transfer and the question of general transferability [15,68], assignability regarding existing educational programs and degrees [44], or the specific transferability of the dual VET system [20]. This can even be criticized as policy-borrowing [69]. It is reasonable to conclude that fast and short-term VET transfers are not expected, and that a transfer can only take place with the involvement and cooperation of both countries [26]. “A national system of education is a living thing, the outcome of forgotten struggles and difficulties, and ‘of battles long ago’”. [70] (p. 49). However, there are some studies with a focus on success factors and hindrances of educational transfer, presented in the following section.

2.2. Success Factors

Stockman [65], for example, reviewed a number of major evaluations of German development cooperation in the VET sector and identified the following success factors for transfer projects: careful planning, attention to framework conditions, flexible management, manageable and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation systems, the efficiency of the provider, ownership, and qualified and committed personnel. Gonon [71] found seven criteria vital for success: the readiness of companies to train, duality of learning sites (workplace and school), the formalization of the dual model, access to codified scientific knowledge, a cooperative model of governance including social partners, vocational practice as the main learning activity, and career relevance. Similarly, Bliem, Petanowitsch, and Schmid [72] define seven success factors of the Austrian dual VET model, which they consider crucial for successful implementation elsewhere, and which also applies to all German-speaking countries:

- governance and financing (social partners—especially companies—are the carriers of the vocational training),
- vocational concept (vocations are more than jobs),
- benefits for the companies (an apprenticeship is also useful for the training company),
- mechanisms of quality assurance (quality is the responsibility of all stakeholders),
- customization and innovation mechanisms (an apprenticeship adjusts to changing qualification requirements),
- demand from young people (an apprenticeship as an attractive training path for young people),
- administration and implementation (a lean administration and clear, transparent processes).

The European Commission Guidebook [73] provides an overview of the main vocational and apprenticeship programs in each member state in the period 2007–2012. With a focus on employment outcomes and overall effectiveness, the following success factors are summarized: apprenticeship and traineeship, a robust institutional and regulatory framework, active social partner involvement, strong employer involvement, a close partnership between employers and educational institutions, funding including employer
subsidies and other incentives, close alignment with the labor market needs, robust quality assurance, high-quality guidance, support and monitoring of apprentices/trainees, the appropriate matching of apprentice/trainee to host organization (company), a combination of theoretical, school-based training with practical work-related experience, the existence of an apprenticeship/traineeship agreement, certification of acquired knowledge, skills and competences, tailored and flexible approaches to the needs of vulnerable young people, the provision of adequate support, guidance and mentoring to the young participants, both at the workplace and at the sending organization, effective support and mentoring of the apprentice together with an individualized approach towards his/her learning needs and abilities, a mix of school-based training and practical work-based experience, social partner involvement, close links between education and business, and rigorous certification procedures which lead to nationally recognized qualifications.

Langthaler [74] published a briefing paper that summarizes the international debate about the nature of transfer processes in education, and analyzes the German-speaking discussion on the transfer of the dual VET system in this light. The following success factors for transfer processes are identified: (i) occupational principle, a qualification that includes subject-specific knowledge and skills and that the student is capable of independently carrying out entire work processes, not just individual processes, and is codified and socially recognized; (ii) duality of learning locations and modes, a combination of workplace and school education, practical skills and theoretical–formalized knowledge; (iii) social partnership governance, joint financing, administration, codification of standards and quality assurance by the social partners (in the literature they are often reduced to state and companies); (iv) the social relevance of teaching as a career model, the prospect of certain social security and (to varying degrees) the permeability to the general education system and thus to further career opportunities, ensuring the comparatively high social acceptance of the teaching; (v) the training readiness of companies, since the lack of this structural component often leads to the failure of transfer attempts In order to ensure this readiness, benefits for companies are a prerequisite. In order to ensure this readiness, benefits for companies are a prerequisite.

Mazzarol, Soutar, and Thein [75] examined the critical success factors in the marketing of an educational institution. They found the following factors: marketing activity, technology and people, campus and courses, market image, resources and courses, off-shore marketing, entry and advertising. The German Federal Parliament [76] published a strategy paper of the federal government on international VET cooperation. In this paper, the following success factors are summarized: (1) the demand of the partner state for cooperation with German partners on vocational training, and a corresponding will to change in the partner country, (2) appropriate political and legal frameworks, such as a national VET strategy and a political will for modernization and reform, (3) the willingness of the key relevant actors, in particular the social partners and economic organizations, to participate in the reform projects in an own-initiative and responsible manner, (4) the openness of state actors to the involvement of the social partners and economic organizations, (5) the orientation of VET to the current and future needs of the economy, (6) support from German training providers in order to convey the strengths of a cooperative and business-oriented VET system, (7) the joint commitment of companies as well as organizations to the economy and development cooperation, (8) viable quality of the general education system and the permeability of the entire education system, (9) reliable information on the labor market, from which reform and qualification needs can be derived, (10) sufficient economic potential, (11) inclusive educational cultures and educational traditions, an appropriate role of VET (social acceptance), also in comparison to academic education, (12) high-performing actors who offer and finance vocational training, and institutions and structures that secure VET standards, and (13) existing state support cultures in education, science and innovation. In the joint consideration of the mentioned research findings, quality assurance as well as the labor market relevance of VET contents were consistently identified as an important success factor for VET transfer.
2.3. Hindrances

With respect to hindrances, there are few empirical studies with this specific focus, but some authors reported major hindrances to dual VET implementation abroad [27]. Companies need to balance the benefits of increased production with well-trained employees and the cost of training. [77,78]. In emerging countries with contested labor markets, turnover is often a problem [79]. Companies in emerging countries often only adopt the core of the German dual VET system (practical training in the handling of modern technologies), to reduce the length of the training programs [63]. The Almannie [22] study introduces a critical perspective on the practicality of VET programs in Saudi Arabia and other developing countries, and reports hindrances encountered in the transfer of VET to Saudi Arabia:

- work environment factors such as lack of managers’ and supervisors’ encouragement and support for transfer,
- no incentives,
- lack of accountability of managers for providing better environments for transfer, and
- lack of authority to apply training knowledge in the workplace.

Managers and supervisors in the workplace have no active involvement with training centers or the training needs of employees, before participants attended the training program. Gilley, Eggland, and Gilley [80] reported hindrances to knowledge transfer, including delayed application, fear of change, lack of confidence, lack of management support, work environment factors, management practices, and training overload. Ratnada [81] provides an overview of the image and attractiveness of VET in Indonesia. One major problem he reports is that VET graduates are not considered to be ready for work. There are several factors contributing to this problem: among others, a lack of facilities for practice, a lack of linkages between schools and companies, a poor educational system, and a lack of teachers’ qualifications. Wieland [82] presented an article about possibilities and limitations for the transferability of the German dual VET system. For example, companies’ lack of willingness to provide training and the low social acceptance of VET are reported to be among the major hindrances to the implementation of dual VET systems or institutions. Further hindrances to the success of dual VET implementation in developing countries are: (1) TVET graduates still do not meet the needs of the economy [81,83], (2) a lack of good cooperation between school or universities with the economy [81,84], (3) a lack of company involvement and lack of fit between the content of curricula and the requirements of companies [81], and (4) low levels of formal employment [85]. In summary, work environment factors and the lack of company involvement can be considered as obstructive to the implementation of a VET institution or system. Building on this literature-based success factor and hindrances framework, the following two sections outline the project and empirical survey context for this paper in order to add to this existing state-of-the-art framework regarding VET transfer.

3. VET Transfer Project and Educational System, Tunisia

Within a research project funded by the Federal Government of Germany, a concept for transferring the German VET system towards a specific VET training site in Tunisia was developed from 2017 to 2019. This was accompanied by an external scientific evaluation of the development and transfer process. In order to frame this project development, the next sections outline briefly the background of the general Tunisian education system (see Figure 1).
The education system in Tunisia is very similar to the French education system [86]. The reasons for this are connected to the French colonial rule from 1881 to 1956. The Tunisian education system was set up during the French Protectorate, but after its independence from France, Tunisia did not carry out any fundamental reforms [87]. In Tunisia,
school education is compulsory from 6 to 16 years of age [86,88]. During basic education, children are taught within one school. The official language of instruction is Arabic [86]. French is taught from the third grade onwards. With the successful completion of the ninth grade, the students receive the “Diplôme de Fin d’Étude de l’Enseignement de Base” [89], qualifying them for secondary school. The object of secondary education is either to prepare students for the labor market or to qualify them for university studies [90]. The secondary school consists of four years of school, divided into two two-year stages [91]. Students are taught together in the 10th and 11th grades (“Tronc Commun”). A specialization in one out of five disciplines (foreign languages, technical sciences, natural sciences, economics and business administration) takes place in the last two years. The completion of secondary education and the higher education qualification forms the “Examen National du Baccalauréat”, [91]. Adolescents can enter into a two-year initial vocational training after the end of the nine-year basic education (“Enseignement de Base”), which is completed with the “Certificat d’Aptitude Professionnelle” (CAP) [89]. At the end of the second year of secondary education, students also have the opportunity to start a two-year VET program, ending with the “Brevet de Technicien Professionnel” (BTP). Holders of the “Certificat d’Aptitude Professionnelle” (CAP) are also eligible for this training. A two-year higher specialized education with the degree “Brevet de Technicien Spécialisé” (BTS) is open to holders of the “Baccalauréat” as well as to holders of the “Brevet de Technicien Professionnel” [89]. The Ministry of Vocational Training and Employment is responsible for the development of “dual education” in companies and schools, and coordinates several agencies, offices and institutions responsible for 196 vocational training centers [92,93]. The most-acquired professional qualifications in Tunisia are the following [93]: (i) “Certificat d’Aptitude Professionnelle” (CAP), duration: 18 months; (ii) “Brevet de Technicien Professionnel” (BTP): further education, duration: 2 years; (iii) “Brevet de Technicien Supérieur” (BTS): masters training, duration: 3 years. After the 2011 revolution, the VET system was reformed according to the National VET Reform Plan 2014–2018. Those seeking training who do not meet the initial vocational qualification requirements (“Certificat d’Aptitude Professionnelle”) may undertake preparatory training, lasting at least six months, and obtain the “Certificat de Compétence” (CC). People under the age of 15 can participate in preparatory courses. In 2008, the “Baccalauréat Professionnel” was introduced, preceded by two years of training. The training is open to second-year students of initial vocational training [89]. Table 1 shows degree numbers in the Tunisian VET system.

| New Enrolments | In the Ongoing Training | Degrees |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Total          | 63,225                  | 97,545  | 27,683  |
| Public         | 48,226                  | 76,329  | 23,823  |
| Tunisian agency for vocational training | 45,791 | 72,999 | 22,298 |
| Agency for the promotion of agricultural training | 529   | 784    | 229    |
| Ministry of national defence | 1182  | 1407   | 818    |
| National office for Tunisian tourism | 724   | 1139   | 478    |
| Ministry for public health | n. d. a. | n. d. a. | n. d. a. |
| Private        | 14,999                  | 21,216  | 3860   |
| Of which state-recognised training | 7285  | 11,681 | 3860   |

4. Empirical Survey

One overall objective of this paper is the identification of success factors for the development of a generalized success factor model for the transfer of the German dual VET system to other countries. In addition, hindrances to success are identified. For this purpose, a guideline for expert interviews regarding the specific task was developed.
4.1. Exploratory Talks

To prepare for the conception stage of the expert interviews, exploratory talks were held with two Tunisian experts. They reported critical factors for success as follows:

- recruitment immediately after training,
- adequacy training for the needs of the economic sectors,
- practical training in new technologies,
- internships abroad,
- coaching young people to start their own businesses,
- exclusive training content and the integration of specializations,
- quality of the coaches,
- mastery of the dual VET system,
- contact with manufacturers to identify their needs,
- quality of the labels the center works with,
- good administration of the center, and
- cooperation with the public sector (Ministry, ATFP, CNFCPP, ANETI, CENAFFIF).

Furthermore, they recommended that cooperation between Tunisian and foreign education actors (e.g., universities, educational consulting or research institutions, and economic associations such as chambers of commerce) should not be limited to one or two institutions. In a second step, links could be established with other educational institutions (e.g., in France, Japan and the USA). The experts emphasized the need for trained young people to be able to integrate into companies immediately. To ensure high quality in a long-term vision and strategy implementation, the scientific council of the center must be involved in the development of the program from the start. There are 230,000 unemployed executives in Tunisia. A role-model training center is one that creates jobs through innovative ideas, for example, the creation of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the use of a pool of high scientific skills in Tunisia, attracting foreign companies to settle in Tunisia, the establishment of an emergency service that meets the needs of businesses at all times, training skills according to a vision of international exchange, and training within an international professional qualifications framework that meets the future needs of Industry 4.0. International exchange is relevant and important in a globalized economic environment for teachers and students alike, indicating cultural competencies as well as first-hand, personal experience in global business settings [95,96].

4.2. Guideline Expert Interviews

A pre-test was carried out with five persons to check for misunderstandings regarding the formulations of individual items. After conducting the pre-test, eight changes in question wordings were applied to the interview guide. The complete version of the interview guide can be found in Appendix A.

4.2.1. Concept

On the one hand, the design of the expert interviews was planned on the basis of a project-internal expert assessment of two Tunisian educational experts. They estimated success factors and obstacles for education export from Germany to Tunisia, based on their long-term professional experience in this field.

On the other hand, the construction of the empirical survey was based on a literature search of studies addressing VET systems and the success factors for educational transfer—the selected studies have a common objective and were used to identify the research items for the present study. Additionally, a search on VET systems and barriers to educational transfer was conducted, and items for assessing barriers for educational transfer were selected. As there are very few studies focusing on barriers for educational transfer, it was accepted that factors were combined from studies in different areas. If no suitable success factors could be selected from the literature, on the basis of the expert assessment, corresponding items were developed specifically for the research.
The interview begins with a piece of introductory text. Subsequently, the participants are advised that the call will be recorded with their consent, in order to ensure an objective transcription of the data. The first section of the interview guide—questions 1 to 4—refers to success factors, while the focus of the second section—questions 5 to 8—is on hindrances. In the first, open question, participants are asked to identify beneficial factors for the success of private VET institutions in Tunisia. The closed second question consists of a list of items that are graded on a five-grade scale. The items were taken in part from studies on the subject of “education transfer”, and partly developed for the “expert interviews” themselves. Section A2 refers to success factors for the delivery of VET provision, while Section B2 deals with the identification of success factors for the development of VET provision. In the closed third question, the participants are asked to form a sequence of meaning from the items evaluated as very important in question 2. In the fourth, open question, participants are asked to identify beneficial factors for VET transfer in general. The second section of the interview guide is structured analogously to the first section. The fifth, open question seeks to identify hindrances to the success of private VET institutions in Tunisia. In the sixth, closed question, participants are asked to rate the listed items on a five-level scale. In the seventh, closed question, the participants are asked to sort the items classified as very obstructive in question 6 into a sequence of meaning. The final, eighth open question seeks to capture hindrances to VET transfer from Germany to other countries in general.

4.2.2. Procedure
The expert interviews were conducted in August and September 2018 by telephone. After welcoming each participant and briefly presenting the background of the interview guide, the participant was given the opportunity to ask questions. Subsequently, the participant was asked for their permission to record the interview. After receiving the relevant consent, the call was started in the “TapeACall Pro” application. After that, the interview started with the first question described above. Following the expert interview, the recording in the application was terminated. The participant was again given the opportunity to ask questions.

4.2.3. Sample
Based on a literature review of studies with the background success factors for education transfer, a total of 63 experts were identified. The minimum criterion for selection as an expert was the participation in studies in the field of transfer of educational services from Germany to other countries. The selected experts were contacted by e-mail. The e-mail included a short cover letter, a brief description of the background of the interview, and the interview guide as a .pdf file. Of the 63 experts contacted, 26 could not be reached, or there was no feedback after three contact attempts. A total of 18 people refused to participate. The sample size, therefore, totaled \( n = 19 \) experts who participated in the interview. The interview duration varied between 10:01 and 65:33 min, with a mean of 29:16 min.

4.2.4. Evaluation of Expert Interviews
For the evaluation of the expert interviews, the “qualitative content analysis” method according to Mayring [97] was applied. In German-speaking countries, this method is often used [98–100]. The content analysis serves as the systematic processing of communication material [97]. There are different variants of qualitative content analysis, and there is no consistent definition of what constitutes content analysis [100]. For example, Ritsert [101] (p. 9) defines qualitative content analysis as “a research tool for analyzing the ‘social’, and ultimately, the ‘ideological content’ of texts,” while Lisch and Kriz [102] (p. 11, p. 44) understand “content analysis as an attempted reconstruction of a (comprehensive) social process, as the central model for understanding (or constituting) social science reality”. A recent definition of Krippendorff [103] (p. 18) describes content analysis as “a research
technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use.”

For the present evaluation, structuring qualitative content analysis was used. In this procedure, the text is structured in two steps. In the first step, the text passages in the material that address a category are referred to. This process is known as the coding process [104]. In the present paper, the term “coding” is understood to mean the assignment of a specific text section (code) to the corresponding category of the category system [104]. In a second step, the filtering-out, summarizing and processing of the marked material takes place, depending on the structuring type (formal, content-related, typing, scaling, and, in the present case, structuring of the content) [105].

An encoding guide was created for the evaluation. At first, categories are defined. Subsequently, anchor examples with a prototype function are defined and coding rules formulated, to ensure a clear category assignment. The term “category” is often used “synonymously with variable, feature or feature expression” [104] (p. 58). There are several basic techniques for performing this content analysis. These include topic analysis, contingency analysis, rating analysis, frequency analysis and other specialized methods (for an overview of the different techniques of classical content analysis, see [97,100,106]). Some of the above techniques are rarely used in research, while topic analysis and frequency analysis are more commonly used [104]. The present study uses frequency analysis, which counts how often certain words or phrases appear in a text [104]. The frequencies are used to weigh the categories by their importance. The development as well as the application of the category system are interpretative and allow the incorporation of the latent utterance content of the material [100]. Categories can be developed inductively or deductively. In the inductive approach, the categories are derived from the data, while the deductive classification is based on the corresponding theoretical foundations [105].

Deductive categorization is advisable when there is already much established knowledge of the subject matter of the analysis, while the inductive approach to categorization is appropriate if prior knowledge or detailed knowledge of the subject of analysis is insufficient, and the analysis is intended to serve exploratory purposes [104]. Since the analysis of the expert interviews served to explore the data material and to generate new knowledge, the categories were formed inductively. Qualitative content analysis is conducted on a regular, systematic basis and is based on the quality criteria of reliability and validity. “Reliability” refers to an inter-subjectively consensual understanding of the text. To determine reliability, the interrater coefficient can be calculated, but this is not a mandatory step [99,107]. The quality criterion of validity requires the creation of a category system that is able to capture relevant aspects of the meaning of the material. For this, an inductive development—at least in some categories—is required for the material [100].

4.2.5. Transcription of the Collected Data

The audio files created with the “TapeACall Pro” application were first transcribed in the MAXQDA evaluation software [108]. In empirical social research, the term “transcription” is understood to mean the verbalization of verbal or non-verbal communication, based on an audio or video file [109].

The recording of interviews is common, but there are no exact guidelines or transcription standards for the subsequent transcription procedure; different transcription rules exist side by side [109]. Verbal transcription was used for text preparation, with three techniques: (i) use of the international phonetic alphabet; (ii) literary transcription with an indication of dialect coloring in the usual alphabet; (iii) transmission in normal written German [105]. Since the evaluation of the expert interviews mainly served a content-structural analysis, literal transcription indicated a translation into written German. (The following transcription rules are applied. (i) Text is literally transcribed, not phonetically or as a summary. Dialects are not transcribed. (ii) Speech and punctuation are easily smoothed and approximated to written German. (iii) Any information that allows conclusions to be drawn to those interviewed will be anonymized. (iv) Consent or confirming vocal-
izations of the interviewer will not be transcribed if they do not interrupt the flow of the interviewee. (v) Paragraphs spoken by the interviewer are clearly identified by an 'I'; the paragraphs of the interviewed persons by 'B'. (vi) Each speaker change is made clear by the table column inserted between the speakers to increase readability).

4.2.6. Data Evaluation

For the evaluation of the 19 expert interviews, the computer-aided program MAXQDA version 18.1.1 was used, which is recommended by Kuckartz [104] (for more detailed information see https://www.maxqda.com/products, accessed on 10 December 2018). MAXQDA is a “Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software” (CAQDAS, often recently referred to as qualitative data analysis software, QDAS) [110]. The term “qualitative data” encompasses all unstructured, non-numerical data. There is a large amount of qualitative data that can arise from interviews, as in this study, but also from focus groups, photographs, documents, and films, to audio and video recordings [110]. On the one hand, MAXQDA allows for synchronous playback of audio or video files and the corresponding transcripts. In addition, it can be used to analyze all data that are usually collected in the context of qualitative research [110]. For this purpose, it is possible to work with codes (categories) that are assigned to selected parts of the data (e.g., words, passages of a text, sections of a picture or scenes in a video [110]).

In this study, structuring content analysis was used for data analysis [97]. For inductive category formation, frequency analysis was chosen, in which it is counted how often certain words or word groups appear in a text. The frequencies are used to weigh the categories in terms of importance. The development as well as the application of the category system happen interpretatively and allow the inclusion of the latent utterance content of the material.

In phase 1, individual passages from open questions 1, 4, 5 and 8 were coded, based on the semantic similarities of the experts’ specifications. In phase 2, categories comprising codes with similar content meaning were derived inductively from the assigned codes. For example, the category “political framework conditions” contains the statements “political support” and “cooperation with politics”. The ranking of the categories was based on the number of codes (mentions) within the documents. For example, the category “good preparation for the country” contains 30 codes, while the category “local anchoring” contains 17 codes. For questions 2, 3, 6 and 7, with a closed answer format, a descriptive evaluation was conducted. The frequencies of the item level scores, as well as mean ($\bar{x}$) variance ($s^2$) and standard deviation ($s$) for the individual items, were calculated.

5. Results

Based on the assigned codes in the interviews, inductively derived categories were developed. Table 2 shows a comparison of the categories for specific success factors for Tunisia (question 1) and for general success factors for educational transfer (question 4) in a ranking. The given rank weighed the success factors. The ranking was based on the number of codes assigned per category. Table 2 shows that good preparation for each destination country is considered very important, regardless of the specific country to which educational services are to be transferred.

Likewise, the factor “Prospects for graduates” is considered to be important. In Tunisia, “Local anchorage” is considered to be particularly important, while “Quality assurance” is seen as a general success factor, which also occurs among the success factor categories for Tunisia, albeit at a lower rank. Table 3 shows the contrasting juxtaposition of categories for hindrances specifically for Tunisia (question 5) and for general hindrances to transferring the German VET model (question 8) in a ranking.

Regarding hindrances, it turns out that the rating is more mixed than that regarding success factors. With regard to Tunisia, general political conditions (e.g., instability), lack of appreciation of VET, and cultural differences are considered to be particularly obstructive, while lack of flexibility and readiness to adapt, regional frameworks and partners (e.g., wrongly selected partners, lack of cooperation, lack of unity) are generally
considered as very obstructive. In an overall view, without separating success factor hindrances into general and specific factors for Tunisia, the ranking of the categories shifts. Table 4 shows an overview of success factors and hindrances to educational transfer from Germany to other countries.

Table 2. Categories of success factors for Tunisia and of success factors in general.

| Rank | Categories Success Factors Tunisia | Rank | Categories Success Factors General |
|------|-----------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|
| 1    | Good preparation for the country   | 1    | Good preparation for the country   |
| 2    | Local anchorage                   | 2    | Quality assurance                 |
| 3    | Perspectives for graduates         | 3    | Perspectives for graduates         |
| 4    | Political framework                | 4    | Local anchorage                   |
| 5    | Quality assurance                  | 5    | Increase social recognition of VET |
| 6    | Financing                          | 5    | Political framework                |
| 7    | Partner                            | 6    | Partner                           |
|      |                                   | 7    | Financing                         |
|      |                                   | 8    | Regional framework                 |
|      |                                   | 9    | Good image of German VET           |
|      |                                   | 10   | Suffer pressure                    |

Table 3. Categories of hindrances in general and Tunisia.

| Rank | Categories Hindrances Tunisia | Rank | Categories Hindrances General |
|------|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| 1    | Political framework            | 1    | Lack of flexibility and readiness to adapt |
| 2    | Low appreciation of VET        | 2    | Regional framework              |
| 3    | Cultural differences           | 3    | Partner                         |
| 4    | Partner                        | 4    | Financing                       |
| 5    | Quality                        | 5    | Political framework              |
| 6    | Financing                      | 6    | Lack of preparation for the country |
| 7    | Lack of information about the target market | 7 | Cultural differences |
| 8    | Implementation risk            | 8    | Structural framework             |

Table 4. Categories of success factors and hindrances—total.

| Rank | Categories Success Factors—Total | Rank | Categories Hindrances—Total |
|------|----------------------------------|------|------------------------------|
| 1    | Good preparation for the country | 1    | Political framework          |
| 2    | Local anchorage                  | 2    | Low appreciation of VET      |
| 3    | Perspectives for graduates       | 2    | Partner                      |
| 4    | Quality assurance                | 3    | Cultural differences         |
| 5    | Political framework              | 4    | Financing                    |
| 6    | Financing                        | 5    | Lack of flexibility and readiness to adapt |
| 7    | Increase social recognition of VET | 6 | Regional framework |
| 8    | Good image of German VET         | 7    | Lack of information about the target market |
| 9    | Regional framework               | 7    | Lack of preparation for the country |
| 10   | Suffer pressure                  | 8    | Structural framework          |
|      |                                   | 9    | Implementation risk           |

Question 2 is divided into two sections. Section A2 refers to success factors for the delivery of VET provision, while Section B2 deals with success factors for the development of VET provision. For question 2, a frequency analysis of the item level ratings was made. In addition, mean (\(\bar{x}\)), variance (\(s^2\)) and standard deviation (\(s\)) were calculated for individual items. The answer category “no indication” (n.i.) was retrospectively introduced in the course of conducting the expert interviews. Tables 5 and 6, as well as Figures 2 and 3, provide an overview of the item metrics in Sections A2 and B2.
### Table 5. Overview of the answers in question A2.

(A) Success Factors for The Development of The Training Program

| Frequencies of Ratings | Persons | Institutes | Organisations | Label | Language courses | Exchange with Germany | Culturally adapted offer | Price | Quality of contents | Duration of training program | Connection capability to university | Internship | Quality and reliability of partners | Application of modern quality assurance systems | Ensuring the German input for teaching | Qualification programs for the local teachers | Accreditation in the destination country | Foreign language and intercultural competence | Image of Germany (high recognition of German quality in general) | Recognition of German organisations/products | Modularisation of the educational offer | Practical demonstration of the training content |
|------------------------|---------|------------|---------------|-------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1                      | 0       | 0          | 0             | 1     | 0                | 0                     | 1                        | 0     | 0                 | 0                             | 1                                | 0          | 0                                   | 1                               | 0                              | 0                           | 0                              | 0                              | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                             |
| 2                      | 0       | 0          | 0             | 0     | 0                | 0                     | 2                        | 0     | 0                 | 0                             | 0                                | 0          | 0                                   | 2                               | 0                              | 0                           | 0                              | 0                              | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                             |
| 3                      | 1       | 2          | 3             | 4     | 3                | 1                     | 8                        | 4     | 3                 | 4                             | 1                                | 3          | 1                                   | 2                               | 1                              | 1                           | 0                              | 1                              | 4                             | 1                            | 5                             | 1                            | 1                             | 5                             |
| 4                      | 0       | 0          | 0             | 5     | 0                | 1                     | 11                       | 4     | 1                | 1                             | 1                                | 0          | 2                                   | 5                               | 8                              | 5                           | 0                              | 1                              | 0                             | 2                             | 4                             | 2                            | 4                             | 2                             |
| 5                      | 0       | 0          | 0             | 13    | 1                | 5                     | 4                        | 3     | 0                | 0                             | 0                                | 1          | 2                                   | 4                               | 8                              | 3                           | 0                              | 1                              | 5                             | 5                             | 0                            | 5                             | 10                           | 4                             |
| n. i.                  | 0       | 0          | 0             | 13    | 1                | 5                     | 4                        | 3     | 0                | 0                             | 0                                | 1          | 2                                   | 4                               | 8                              | 3                           | 0                              | 1                              | 5                             | 5                             | 0                            | 5                             | 10                           | 4                             |
| x                      | 4.63    | 1.38       | 4.47          | 3.26  | 3.77             | 4.00                   | 4.31                      | 4.17  | 0.67             | 4.00                          | 4.13                            | 3.67       | 4.68                                | 4.33                          | 3.74                           | 4.74                        | 4.33                          | 3.84                          | 4.05                          | 4.89                        | 4.37                          | 4.12                         | 4.58                          | 4.84                         | 4.42                          |
| s                      | 0.36    | 0.38       | 0.62          | 1.21  | 0.58             | 0.67                   | 1.23                      | 1.21  | 0.76             | 0.44                          | 1.13                            | 0.50       | 0.56                                | 1.18                          | 0.61                           | 1.10                        | 1.18                          | 0.58                          | 0.83                          | 1.09                        | 1.13                          | 0.78                          | 0.84                          | 0.48                          |
| s²                     | 0.60    | 0.62       | 0.78          | 1.10  | 0.76             | 0.82                   | 1.11                      | 1.10  | 0.76             | 0.67                          | 1.13                            | 0.70       | 0.75                                | 1.08                          | 0.56                           | 0.91                        | 1.05                          | 0.76                          | 0.91                          | 1.05                        | 1.07                          | 0.89                          | 0.92                          | 0.75                          |

1 = very unimportant/2 = unimportant/3 = neutral/4 = important/5 = very important/n. i. stands for no indication, Item cannot be rated.

x stands for mean, s² stands for variance, s stands for standard deviation.

### Table 6. Overview of the answers in question B2.

(B) Success Factors for The Development of The Training Centre

| Frequencies of Ratings | Market survey [111] | Form a consortium | Clear definition of project objectives [111] | Make binding agreements [111] | Professional project coordination [111] | Realistic cost planning [111] | Ensure sustainable financing [111] | External evaluation [111] | Political support in both countries [111] | Cooperation with the economy [111] | Commitment of the management level [111] | Labour market relevance | Well-founded information about the target market [111] | Good contacts in the target market [111] | Cooperation with local partners [111] | Own internalisation strategy [111] | Presence of the organisation in the target market [111] | Political marketing at a higher level [112] | Coupling of educational and technological exports [25] | Integration of (German) large organisations |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1                      | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 1                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 0                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 1                                 | 0                                           | 0                                             | 1                              |
| 2                      | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 1                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                                           | 1                                             | 0                              |
| 3                      | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 0                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                                           | 0                                             | 1                              |
| 4                      | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 0                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                                           | 0                                             | 1                              |
| 5                      | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 0                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                                           | 0                                             | 1                              |
| n. i.                  | 0                   | 0                 | 0                                           | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                        | 1                                           | 0                                   | 0                                             | 0                    | 0                                            | 0                                             | 0                              | 0                                 | 0                                           | 0                                             | 1                              |
| x                      | 4.00                | 1.11              | 4.74                                        | 4.89                          | 4.63                                  | 4.47                          | 4.63                             | 3.58                     | 4.21                                        | 4.84                                | 4.58                            | 4.58    | 4.22                                     | 4.63                             | 4.58                          | 3.89                             | 4.12                                        | 4.00                                | 3.58                            |
| s²                     | 1.11                | 1.08              | 0.45                                        | 0.32                          | 0.50                                  | 0.57                          | 0.25                             | 0.60                     | 1.06                                        | 0.37                                | 0.51                            | 0.51    | 0.59                                     | 0.36                             | 0.51                          | 0.84                             | 0.74                                        | 1.00                                | 0.92                            |
| s                      | 1.05                | 1.08              | 0.45                                        | 0.32                          | 0.50                                  | 0.57                          | 0.25                             | 0.60                     | 1.06                                        | 0.37                                | 0.51                            | 0.51    | 0.59                                     | 0.36                             | 0.51                          | 0.84                             | 0.74                                        | 1.00                                | 0.92                            |

1 = very unimportant/2 = unimportant/3 = neutral/4 = important/5 = very important/n. i. stands for no indication, Item cannot be rated.

x stands for mean, s² stands for variance, s stands for standard deviation.
From Table 6 it can be seen that in Section A2, the item “Qualification programs for local teachers” was given the highest rating, followed by “Content quality” and “Quality

and reliability of partners”. The lowest ratings show the items “Label”, “Language course”, and “Application of modern quality management systems”. In Section B2, the items “Binding Agreements” and “Professional Project Coordination” received the highest rating, while the items “External Evaluation” and “Coupling of Education and Technology Exports” received the least importance.

The open answer category “examples” in question 2 was also evaluated by means of content-structuring content analysis, according to Mayring [97]. This category was only addressed by a few participants in the expert interviews. Most of the examples were named for the item “Label” (certificates as a label, the image of Germany, cooperation with Germany, and quality approach). In second place was the item “Cooperation with the economy”, for which the example “Testing needs of the economy” was cited. Further examples were given for the item “Persons”, which were considered to be exemplary for sustainability, and for the item “Institutes”, which was cited as a relevant example for meeting Tunisian minimum standards for training programs. For question 3, it was analyzed how often the items considered “very important” in question A2 were given an order of meaning from one to three.

It can be seen from Table 7 above, that of the items considered very important, “Qualification programs for the local teachers” is considered to be most important. In second place is, “Culturally adapted offer”, and in third place is “Persons”.

Table 7. Order of meaning of success factors (only the factors from question A2 with the classification “very important”).

| Success Factor | No. of Entries No. 1 | No. of Entries No. 2 | No. of Entries No. 3 | No. of Entries—Total |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Persons        | 5                     | 3                     | 2                     | 8                     |
| Institutes     | 1                     | 0                     | 1                     | 2                     |
| Organisations  | 3                     | 1                     | 0                     | 3                     |
| Label          | 1                     | 0                     | 0                     | 1                     |
| Language courses | 1                     | 0                     | 0                     | 1                     |
| Exchange with Germany | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Culturally adapted offer | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| Price          | 2                     | 2                     | 0                     | 4                     |
| Quality of contents | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Duration of training program | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Connection capability to university | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Internship     | 2                     | 0                     | 1                     | 3                     |
| Quality and reliability of the partners | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Application of modern quality management systems | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Ensuring the German input for teaching | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Qualification programs for the local teachers | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 |
| Accreditation in the destination country | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| Foreign language and intercultural competence | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Image of Germany (high recognition of German quality in general) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Recognition of German organisations/products | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Modularisation of the educational offer | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Practical demonstration of the training content | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

For question 6, the frequencies of item-level assessments were analyzed. In addition, mean (\(\bar{x}\)), variance (\(s^2\)) and standard deviation (\(s\)) were calculated for the individual items. Table 8 provides an overview of the item key figures.

Table 8 shows that “Lack of contacts in the target market” receives the highest rating, followed by “Low appreciation of VET in the target market”. The item with the lowest rating is “Competition from other providers”. For question 7, an analysis was made of how often the items classified as “very obstructive” in question A2 were named in order of importance from one to three. Table 9 shows the classification of the meaning order for each item.
Table 8. Overview of the answers in question 6 of the interview guide.

| Hindrances                                                                 | Frequencies of Ratings |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | n. i. | \( \bar{x} \) | \( s^2 \) | \( s \) |
| Long start-up times [113]                                                 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0     | 3.00       | 1.30    | 1.10 |
| Lack of contacts in the target market [113]                              | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13| 0     | 4.60       | 0.30    | 0.60 |
| Obstacles in your own organisation such as limited capacities or competencies [113]| 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 0     | 4.20       | 0.60    | 0.80 |
| Visa or customs regulations [113]                                        | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2     | 3.10       | 1.60    | 1.20 |
| Limited revenue opportunities in the target market [111]                 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3     | 3.88       | 1.05    | 1.02 |
| Competition from other providers [113]                                   | 2 | 2 | 10| 0 | 2 | 3     | 2.88       | 1.18    | 1.09 |
| Lack of information about the target market [113]                        | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 0     | 4.12       | 1.06    | 1.03 |
| Low appreciation of VET in the target market [113]                      | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13| 13| 1     | 4.56       | 0.73    | 0.86 |
| Heterogeneous educational qualifications, curricula and school forms [114]| 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0     | 3.68       | 1.12    | 1.06 |
| Lack of coupling education and technology export [114]                   | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1     | 2.94       | 1.23    | 1.11 |

1 = very unimportant / 2 = unimportant / 3 = neutral / 4 = important / 5 = very important / n. i. stands for no indication, Item cannot be rated. \( \bar{x} \) stands for mean, \( s^2 \) stands for variance, \( s \) stands for standard deviation.

Table 9. Order of meaning, obstructive factors (only factors from question 6 with the classification “very obstructive”).

| Hindrance Factor                                                                 | No. of Entries No. 1 | No. ofEntries No. 2 | No. Of Entries No. 3 | No. Of Entries—Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Long start-up times                                                             | 0                    | 0                   | 0                    | 0                    |
| Lack of contacts in the target market                                           | 4                    | 5                   | 1                    | 10                   |
| Obstacles in your own organisation such as limited capacities or competencies   | 2                    | 2                   | 3                    | 7                    |
| Visa or customs regulations                                                     | 0                    | 0                   | 1                    | 1                    |
| Limited revenue opportunities in the target market                              | 0                    | 2                   | 2                    | 4                    |
| Competition from other providers                                                | 1                    | 1                   | 0                    | 2                    |
| Lack of information about the target market                                     | 3                    | 3                   | 2                    | 8                    |
| Low appreciation of VET in the target market                                    | 7                    | 1                   | 3                    | 11                   |
| Heterogeneous educational qualifications, curricula and school forms            | 1                    | 1                   | 1                    | 3                    |
| Lack of coupling education and technology export                                | 0                    | 0                   | 0                    | 0                    |

As shown in Table 9, among the highly obstructive items, “Low appreciation of VET in the target market” was considered to be the most obstructive, followed by “Lack of contacts in the target market” and “Lack of information on the target market”.

6. Discussion

Regarding success factors and comparing the results of the qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the expert interviews, it can be seen that “Assurance of a high quality” was both considered and rated as very important by the experts. This relates explicitly to the point already raised in the literature review, citing quality assurance and quality management mechanisms as central to the success of VET transfer projects. In this regard, the presented study is supporting the existing literature. In addition to the existing literature statements regarding VET transfer, this study also identified the perspective of graduates as an important success factor. Furthermore, modularization was identified as a success factor. This might be connected to the question of interoperability of the VET transfer offers with existing educational programs and degrees before and after the VET phase (i.e., school and study programs).

With regard to hindrances, the experts both considered and rated “Low appreciation of VET” as very obstructive. Therefore, research and communication of the VET system comparisons and advantages in an international setting are still and repeatedly important for supporting international transfer projects—a very practical implementation and transfer effect of vocational research in itself. This supports the existing state-of-the-art knowledge
from the literature regarding VET and managers’ motivation and accountability in transfer projects. Another similarity is in relation to “Lack of preparation for the destination country”, which the experts both identified and rated as very hindering to VET transfer endeavors. Education research and management are jointly supposed to work towards mitigating this challenge by identifying relevant knowledge. Again, this connects to the literature presentation of hindrances, like the lack of incentives and authority, specifically in the country addressed. In addition to that, the presented study finds two more relevant hindrances, not yet listed in the existing research. Firstly, cultural differences are named in the expert interview survey. Secondly, regional and political frameworks and (missing) support are listed as hindrances by the experts. This contributes to the state-of-the-art in VET transfer research.

The limitations of this study include (i) the specific focus on the two countries of Germany and Tunisia, (ii) the empirical approach of a qualitative expert study in German-speaking countries, as well as (iii) the focus on the VET sector. Similarities would be worthwhile to discover in different countries, cultural and educational segments and contexts, warranting research in an international comparison.

Lessons learned and contributions to the international discourse regarding education VET transfer point are the major items of professional preparation for transfer projects, especially concerning the communication of advantages (e.g., dual learning places within the German VET model), as well as for quality assurance systems. This might support future transfer projects. Further research would need to establish how these generalized factors could be adapted and focused on specific transfer countries and directions. This could enhance further comparative VET understanding.

7. Conclusions

This paper has highlighted and considered the following points. The objectives, conception, and conduct, as well as the results of the ‘expert interviews’ with actors from Germany, Austria and Switzerland, were presented. General success factors are “Good preparation for the respective target country”, “Quality assurance” and “Prospects for graduates”. As a specific success factor for Tunisia, “Local anchorage” was identified. General hindrances are “Lack of flexibility and adaptability” and “Regional framework conditions”. Hindrances specific to Tunisia are “Policy framework”, as well as “Low appreciation of VET”. (2) A comparison of the results of the qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the “expert interviews” was presented. The success factor “Quality assurance” was named most often and rated highest. Among the hindrances, “Low appreciation of VET” and “Lack of preparation for the target country” were named most often by experts and rated highest. This survey of success factors and hindrances to education transfer serves the objective of providing ideas, suggestions and basic concepts for further projects and work in similar countries. The statements presented in this paper provide a basis for deriving a general success factor model on the question of the transfer of the German dual VET system to other countries. This will be an important avenue for further research, considering recent research by dedicated research institutions in this field, like the German BIBB [115–117]. Especially for a world and specific countries recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, education and VET systems will be crucial to jumpstarting economic growth and innovation, as for most industries, qualified workers on all levels are the competitive starting point for the future.
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Appendix A

Project OpporTUNIty Survey Guideline for Expert Interviews

Background of the Project, OpporTUNIty

The overall object of the project is the exemplary implementation of a vocational training concept for technical apprenticeships in Tunisia. For this the development and implementation of a practicable cooperation model with local Tunisian corporate networks of the producing sector on the basis of the German vocational training model is sought. This should ensure the involvement of local companies in the training process, guarantee a practical training and enable a sustainable business model through training fees. Adapted training programs for the Tunisian apprenticeships “Maintenace Industrielle” (similar to “industrial mechanic/mechatronics”) and “Informatique et Automatisme Industrielle” (similar to industrial computer) are being developed. The close cooperation between German and Tunisian partners from the public and private sector ensures that as well German quality standards as Tunisian training standards and ultimately the employability of graduates in Tunisia can be achieved.

In the course of the project, through the targeted pilot actions an economically viable vocational training centre will be built, operated, evaluated and developed. The pilot actions described here, their evaluation under the responsibility of the University of Duisburg-Essen (PIM) and the aggregation of findings within the project aim to derive success factors and procedures that can be transferred to comparable target markets of interested educational partners.

With your permission, your answers will be recorded during the interview in order to ensure objective transcription of the data.

Interview

Success Factors

(1) Please describe from your point of view what factors are conducive to private VET provision in Tunisia.

(2) What contribution do you think the following elements can make to the success of a private VET provision in Tunisia?

(A) Success Factors for the Development of the Training Programs

| Persons | Institutes | Organizations | Label | Language Courses | Exchange with Germany | Culturally adapted offer | Price |
|---------|------------|---------------|-------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
|         |            |               |       |                  |                        |                         |       |

Examples
(A) Success Factors for the Development of the Training Programs

- Quality of contents
- Duration of training program
- Connection capability to university
- Internship
- Quality and reliability of the partners [111]
- Application of modern quality management systems [111]
- Ensuring the German input for teaching [111]
- Qualification programs for the local teachers [111]
- Accreditation in the destination country [111]
- Foreign language and intercultural competence [112]
- Image of Germany (high recognition of German quality in general) [25]
- Recognition of German organizations/products [25]
- Modularization of the educational offer [25]
- Practical demonstration of the training content

(B) Success factors for the development of the training centre

- Market survey [111]
- Form a consortium [111]
- Clear definition of project objectives [111]
- Make binding agreements [111]
- Professional project coordination [111]
- Realistic cost planning [111]
- Ensure sustainable financing [111]
- External evaluation [111]
- Political support in both countries [111]
- Cooperation with the economy [111]
- Labour market relevance [111]
- Commitment of the managing level [113]
- Well-founded information about the target market [113]
- Good contacts in the target market [113]
- Cooperation with local partners [113]
- Own internationalization strategy [113]
- Presence of the organization in the target market [113]
- Political marketing at a higher level [113]
- Coupling of educational and technology exports [114]
- Integration of (German) large organizations [25]

1 = very unimportant / 2 = unimportant / 3 = neutral / 4 = important / 5 = very important.

Items that are not explicitly provided with source information were specially developed for the expert interviews.

(3) Please only put the beneficial factors classified as ‘very important’ in Question 2A into a meaning order.

| Factor                    | Meaning Order |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Persons                   |               |
| Institutes                |               |
| Organizations             |               |
| Label                     |               |
| Language courses          |               |
| Exchange with Germany     |               |
| Culturally adapted offer  |               |
| Price                     |               |
| Factor                                                                 | Meaning Order |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Quality of contents                                                  |               |
| Duration of training program                                         |               |
| Connection capability to university                                  |               |
| Internship                                                           |               |
| Quality and reliability of partners                                  |               |
| Application of modern quality management systems                     |               |
| Ensuring the German input for teaching                               |               |
| Qualification programs for the local teachers                        |               |
| Accreditation in the destination country                             |               |
| Foreign language and intercultural competence                        |               |
| Image of Germany (high recognition of German quality in general)     |               |
| Recognition of German organizations products                         |               |
| Modularization of the educational offer                              |               |
| Practical demonstration of the training content                      |               |

(4) Please describe from your point of view, which supporting factors play a role in the transfer of educational models from Germany to other countries in general.

Only the factors from question A2 with the classification ‘very important’

Hindrances

(5) Please describe from your point of view which hindrances to private VET provision in Tunisia are relevant.
(6) What is the significance of the following hindrances to the success of private VET provision in Tunisia?

| Faktor                                                                 | Order of Meaning |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Long start-up times                                                   | 1                |
| Lack of contacts in the target market                                 | 2                |
| Obstacles in your own organization such as limited capacities or competencies | 3                |
| Visa or customs regulations                                           | 4                |
| Limited revenue opportunities in the target market                     | 5                |
| Competition from other providers                                      |                  |
| Lack of information about the target market                           |                  |
| Low appreciation of VET in the target market                          |                  |
| Heterogeneous educational qualifications, curricula and school forms  |                  |
| Lack of coupling education and technology export                      |                  |

1 = not obstructive/2 = little hindrance/3 = neutral/4 = more obstructive/5 = very obstructive.

(7) Please bring the following hindrances, in question 6 classified as ‘very obstructive’, into an order of meaning.

(8) Please describe from your point of view the hindrances to the transfer of educational models from Germany to other countries that generally play a role.
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