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BACKGROUND

Countries the world over are facing ugly challenges such as unemployment, migrations, poverty, marginalisation, and starvation. These challenges cut across the developed and developing world. To contain these problems, governments, private entrepreneurs, faith-based organisations, and the international community are increasingly focusing on efforts to improve the welfare of young people. The relative proportion of youth in the world’s population is increasing, yet school access and attendance is not universal and youth unemployment is high. Increasing numbers of working-age individuals who are undereducated and lack productive skills pose grave development concerns geared towards livelihoods and empowerment which governments cannot handle singlehandedly. These challenges have paved the way for joint private and public technical and vocational education and training (TVET) initiatives designed to develop youth skills and enhance entrepreneurship. Ideally, TVET programs are designed to develop the skills that are most demanded by the market as well as contribute to the socioeconomic and cultural welfare of people. They should be tailored to meet the needs of the available employment opportunities, increase productivity, and eventually lead to an improvement in living standards (UNESCO-UNEVOC, 2008; Bennell, 1999). These programs could in different settings be the master key to unlocking poverty (Nyerere, 2009), promoting sustainable development fundamentals such as self-reliance in otherwise unskilled youths by helping them to adapt in a fast-changing and globally competitive knowledge-based community.

Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) is a component of the educational process seeking to build participants’ practical skills for application to employment. Broadly defined, TVET is concerned with the acquisition of knowledge and skills for the world of work (Tripney et al., 2013). TVET encompasses “those aspects of the educational process involving, in addition to general education, the study of technologies and related sciences, and the acquisition of practical skills, attitudes, understanding and knowledge related to occupations in various sectors of economic and social life” (UNESCO and ILO, 2002). Technical and vocational education and training is important for employment in a variety of occupational sectors (Atchoarena & Delluc, 2001) and can be delivered either in a school-based setting or in a work-based environment as on-the-job training (NICHE 2010). TVET instruction can be delivered by trained TVET instructors or by individuals who have substantial knowledge of their craft, but who may not have an academic background (Elkins et al., 2011). Furthermore, TVET services can target both physically unchallenged people as well as people with disabilities or special needs.
In response to the demands of the changing global economy, TVET as a field is continually evolving (Maclean & Wilson, 2009). As technology is advancing, new skills are increasingly in demand. Faced with this, both public and private sector TVET interventions are being tailored to meet these new needs. These new TVET interventions do not just focus on the needed skills but also on the approaches taken in developing and delivering the skills (Bunning, Gleissner, Kai, & Yang, 2011).

Though governments and private sector providers are carrying out similar operations to enhance TVET, there are fundamental differences between TVET programs provided through these different structures, especially in the way they are run and funded. Public TVET institutions are typically run using taxpayers’ money, with consequently a lower tuition and other related fees or a complete lack of fees for the students. On the other hand, private TVET institutions, which may be either confessional (faith-based) or lay private-for-profit, tend to have higher tuition and other related fees. In addition, the staff in the different sectors have varied motivating factors. While public sector employees seem to be motivated by work content, experience, and a better balance between work and family life, private sector employees tend to be more motivated by financial rewards, career development opportunities, and a supportive environment (Rashid & Rashid, 2012).

Incidentally, staff in the faith-based institutions, which are typically private, seem to be highly motivated by leadership style and organisational culture. Such dedication is not propelled by monitory incentives (Bassous, 2014). The private sector is a well-recognized partner and critical stakeholder in socio-economic development (IFC, 2011) yet private sector TVET programs must be viewed against a backdrop of the quest for profits. With these differences in mind, it is unclear whether TVET activities run by public institutions have comparable impacts to those run by the private sector.

Some governments heavily subsidise public institutions and provide little or no subsidies to private sector institutions, especially in developing countries. While some governments have adopted a participatory approach to subsidizing private TVET institutions (PNA, 2010), others have opted for regional networks and TVET qualification frameworks in which TVET institutions, the industry, and the government are involved in improving programming quality (SADC, 2005). This has led to attempts made at different levels to encourage industry to subsidise TVET training, as the industry is the ultimate user of the graduates. A good example of this is the Chongqing project (an Australia-China Vocation Education and Training Project), which established five industry co-ordination committees at municipality level to enable the industry invest in TVET training programmes (Comyn & Barnaart, 2010). In developed countries such as Britain, skill development programmes are organised through Sector Skill Councils that are government licensed (Munbar, 2010). However, it is an open question as to whether these resources could be more effective if used to subsidise private sector TVET institutions (IFC, 2011). All these recommendations are not based on a review of evidence. It is important that global evidence is generated concerning the effectiveness of TVET intervention approaches by both public and private sectors in delivering the target goals. The aim of this review is to inform policy makers on best options.
(public and private) on which to invest taxpayers’ money. Though one review presently exists (Tripney et al., 2013), it focuses on the effectiveness of TVET interventions in low- and middle-income countries and does not compare public and private sector TVET programmes. This review will be global. A systematic review of available evidence will help identify effective interventions and can be used to inform policy makers globally on which sector to invest taxpayers’ money.

OBJECTIVES

Primary objectives

Are private sector TVET programmes effective for improving adolescent and young adult performance on aptitude tests?

Are public sector TVET programmes effective for improving adolescent and young adult performance on aptitude tests?

Are private sector TVET programmes more effective than public sector TVET programmes for improving adolescent and young adult performance on aptitude tests?

Secondary objectives

How does the public sector compare with the private sector in inclusion of gender, disability and socio-economic class in its programs?

How do public sector graduates compare with private sector graduates in gaining employment after training?

How does public sector training compare with private sector in tailoring training to local job needs?

How does the public sector curriculum compare with the private sector curriculum? Does this address issues related to student creativity and motivation to gain employment after training (e.g., to find work, to secure promotion at work), Job search skills, productivity, Job satisfaction?

How are private sector financing mechanisms, programme tuition and cost compared to the public sector.
HOW ARE PRIVATE SECTOR FINANCING COMPARE TO THE PUBLIC SECTOR FINANCING? EXISTING REVIEWS

While Tripney et al’s (2013) existing review is based on low and medium income countries the present review is global and will include evidence on the performance of TVET programmes run by public compared with private institutions.

INTERVENTION

To be eligible for this review, studies must fall into one of the following categories:

- Private sector TVET interventions compared to no intervention
- Public sector TVET interventions compared to no intervention
- Public sector TVET interventions compared to private sector TVET interventions

Public sector interventions will include TVET programmes offered by the government in government run schools while private sector interventions would include TVET programmes offered by accredited individual, civil society organisations and faith based institutions.

Joint interventions by both government and private actors will be considered multifaceted and will not be included.

Should sufficient literature be available, we will investigate any differences in effectiveness between confessional (faith based) and lay private institutions (not faith based). We will also carry out sub group studies for international development agencies that come in to provide intervention either using existing curriculum or bringing in their own curriculum.

POPULATION

Population: Adolescent (11-18 years old) and young adults (18-25 years old) involved or willing to get involved in TVET in accredited centres in developed and developing countries.

OUTCOMES

Primary outcomes

Aptitude test performance during competitive examinations: these exams are taken under the supervision of an authority (School authority, government, and accredited institution). These exams could be oral written and/or practical)
Secondary outcomes

Inclusion of socioeconomic class
Inclusion of people with disability
Inclusion of gender in the training programme
Ability to get a job after training
Inclusion of creativity and motivation factors in the curriculum (e.g., to find work, to secure promotion at work), job search skills, productivity, job satisfaction)
Financing mechanisms, programme tuition, or cost of programme.

STUDY DESIGNS

Design: Randomised control interventions, quasi-randomised, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental designs will be included. Case studies are to be reviewed separately as they are inappropriate to answer the review question posed.

METHOD

Studies will be coded for methodological factors such as method of selection or assignment, attrition, blinding, method of statistical analysis (e.g., ITT), among others. A form will be developed for coding items such as participant, intervention, treatment, design, and effect size characteristics. During coding, we will record information about the curricula used in each program as well as the level of tailoring of the programmes to local conditions. This information will be used to investigate our secondary objectives relating to differences in public and private sector programmes in terms of tailoring and curriculum.

All studies will be coded by two reviewers. Any differences in coding will be reported in terms of interrater agreement and subsequently reviewed, discussed and resolved or continuing differences will be resolved by a third party.
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