

Lived Experiences of Project Holders in the NESDA Mechanism: An Exploration of Systemic Obstacles and Improvement Avenues

Mohamed Akram Belloula^{1*}, Mourad Kharouby²

¹ Oran Graduate School of Economics (Algeria),

mohamed.belloula@esc-oran.dz 

² University of Batna 1 (Algeria),

mourad.kharouby@univ-batna.dz 

Received: 25-03-2025

Accepted: 16-12-2025

Abstract :

This study investigates the lived experiences of project holders within Algeria's NESDA entrepreneurship support mechanism, focusing on systemic obstacles and potential improvements. Based on 21 semi-structured interviews conducted across three contrasting regions, it identifies key barriers: strict eligibility requirements excluding non-graduates, administrative delays (1–2 months), impractical training schedules, financial constraints (e.g., 5% personal contribution), and supplier inefficiencies. While 85.7% of participants see NESDA as a tool to reduce inequality, 14.3% believe it widens disparities. Recommendations include assessing practical skills for eligibility, digitizing processes, easing financial criteria, and regulating suppliers to improve equity and efficiency.

Keywords:

NESDA mechanism;
Entrepreneurship support;
Systemic barriers;
Inequality reproduction.

JEL Classification Codes: L26 ; R58 ; O17.

* Corresponding author

1. INTRODUCTION

In a context marked by persistent socio-economic challenges in developing countries, public entrepreneurial support mechanisms have been perceived as strategic levers to stimulate employment and reduce inequalities. While international policies emphasize financial, training, and fiscal tools to support entrepreneurs (Beck & Demirguc-Kunt, 2006; Lerner, 2009), their adaptation to the realities of developing countries remains problematic, particularly due to bureaucratic constraints and informal economic structures (De Soto, 2000). In Algeria, this issue is evident in the adoption of several support mechanisms, starting with ANSEJ, followed by ANADE, and finally the latest initiative, NESDA.

Despite the evolution of Algerian support mechanisms, no study has qualitatively explored the lived experiences of project holders under NESDA, particularly the systemic obstacles perceived by stakeholders. Existing research has focused on quantitative indicators (job creation rates, funded amounts) related to earlier mechanisms. From this brief introduction to the research problem, we can now formulate the research question: **What systemic obstacles, as perceived by project holders, highlight the contradictions between NESDA's redistributive ambitions and institutional constraints?**

This study aims to address a dual gap by analyzing: first, the concrete challenges faced by project holders during their journey within NESDA; second, the contradictions between the stated objectives of the mechanism and its implementation; and finally, the solutions proposed by stakeholders to improve the system's effectiveness.

Our hypothesis is inspired by Bourdieu's (1986) work on the reproduction of socio-educational inequalities, which will serve as

a guiding thread for our qualitative analysis. We posit that NESDA's institutional rigidities (educational requirements, procedures, financial barriers, etc.) reproduce structural inequalities, thereby limiting its redistributive impact.

Following this introduction, the literature review section examines international models and their limitations in developing countries, contextualizing Algeria's specificities. The third section, "Methodology," details the qualitative approach adopted (21 interviews conducted across three contrasting wilayas). The fourth section, "Results," presents the systemic obstacles perceived by project holders. The fifth section, "Discussion," confronts these findings with theories on public policies and international experiences. Finally, the conclusion synthesizes implications for future reforms and research avenues.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing research on public support mechanisms for project holders highlights diverse models shaped by the economic and institutional realities of each country. While international studies emphasize the importance of financial, training, and fiscal levers (Beck & Demircug-Kunt, 2006; Lerner, 2009), their application in developing countries, particularly Algeria, remains under-documented. This is especially true for the NESDA mechanism, recently introduced to address the shortcomings of its predecessors, ANADE and ANSEJ.

2.1 Public Entrepreneurial Support Mechanisms

In developing countries, governments employ public tools based on three key levers to encourage business and job creation (Lerner, 2009).

First, they prioritize training programs to strengthen project

holders' managerial skills. Validated by Gatewood et al. (2002), this approach increases startups survival chances by 30% in emerging economies.

Second, governments often provide interest-free loans or state-guaranteed credit. Beck and Demirgüç-Kunt's (2006) foundational study shows that access to formal credit reduces SME failure rates by 15% in sub-Saharan Africa.

Third, fiscal incentives play a critical role. For instance, Djankov et al. (2010) found that a 10% reduction in administrative costs in bureaucratic economies boosts business creation by 5%.

However, these approaches vary by context. In France, Bpifrance exemplifies an integrated strategy, combining loans, bank guarantees, and sector-specific mentorship to support SMEs throughout their growth (Colombo et al., 2016). Similarly, Germany's public bank KfW supports innovative SMEs through interest-free loans, a model credited with revitalizing industrial dynamism (Audretsch et al., 2005).

2.2 The Algerian Context: A Contrast in Institutional Evolution (NESDA, ANSEJ, ANADE)

Algeria has successively deployed three entrepreneurship support mechanisms. The first, ANSEJ, launched in 1996, targeted youth aged 19–35, offering subsidized loans with minimal personal contributions (1–2% of the project cost). Despite its ambition, it faced criticism for bureaucratic rigidity, restrictive age criteria, and lengthy application processing (MF.gov.dz, 2023).

ANADE, introduced in 2020, expanded eligibility to those aged over 18 and adjusted financing ratios, raising the personal contribution to 5–15% based on the applicant's profile. However, persistent challenges such as procedural complexity and delays in fund disbursement were reported (BNA.dz, 2023).

Established in 2023, NESDA represents a break from its predecessors by introducing triangular financing (state, bank, and project holder) and expanding tax incentives. Unlike earlier mechanisms, it mandates 21 day training at Entrepreneurship Development Centers (CDEs) and ties eligibility to academic qualifications (nesda.dz, 2023). While theoretically aligned with Becker's (1964) human capital theory, this approach overlooks the informal economy's reliance on practical experience (Bourdieu, 1986). Additionally, NESDA's interest free loans, though reducing initial costs, risk cashflow challenges for micro enterprises a problem observed in other contexts (Kuratko, 2017).

2.3 Research Gap: The Absence of Systemic Analysis of Lived Experiences

The recent introduction of NESDA may explain the lack of qualitative studies on project holders' experiences under the mechanism. Existing research on its predecessors (ANSEJ and ANADE) focused on quantitative metrics (e.g., job creation rates, funding volumes), neglecting systemic obstacles perceived by stakeholders.

Bourdieu's (1964) work on symbolic capital suggests that overemphasizing academic credentials could exclude informal sector entrepreneurs. Furthermore, the effectiveness and role of institutional actors (CDEs, banks, suppliers) in implementing the mechanism and their contribution to its goals have never been analyzed through the lens of organizational contradictions, a critical perspective for understanding policy failures (Lipsky, 2010). These gaps suggest that NESDA's innovations, such as mandatory training or academic criteria, risk reproducing or amplifying existing issues.

In sum, this study adopts an exploratory approach to move

beyond purely quantitative evaluations and inform future reforms in Algeria and similar contexts. It addresses two critical gaps: (1) the lack of qualitative data on lived experiences under NESDA and (2) the need for a systemic analysis of obstacles, incorporating institutional legacies from ANSEJ and ANADE.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study, aims to explore the lived experiences of project holders enrolled in Algeria's NESDA mechanism. To achieve this we adopted an inductive qualitative approach.

3.1 Study Site

The survey was conducted in three socio economically contrasting provinces: Batna, Souk Ahras, Oran. Interviews were conducted via online calls to accommodate participants geographic constraints.

3.2 Sampling

In total, 21 semi structured interviews were conducted with project holders. This threshold was deemed sufficient to identify recurring patterns without new insights emerging, aligning with the principle of theoretical saturation (Morse, 2000). Notably, all interviewed project holders were still in pre-funding stages a limitation likely due to NESDA's recent implementation and restricted access to funded beneficiaries. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample.

Lived Experiences of Project Holders in the NESDA Mechanism: An Exploration of Systemic Obstacles and Improvement Avenues

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Demographic Characteristics		Measures	
Academic Level	University Graduate	National Institute Graduate	Training Center Graduate
Frequency	17	0	4
Percentage	81%	0%	19%
Professional Situation	Student	Employed	Unemployed
Frequency	4	12	5
Percentage	19%	57%	24%
Gender	Male		Female
Frequency	13		8
Percentage	62%		38

Source : Data extracted from Interviews, January 2025

Participants were recruited via Facebook groups dedicated to entrepreneurship a common method in contexts where official registries are incomplete (Bourdieu, 1986), The sample included 13 men and 8 women aged 20–43 years.

As shown in Table 1, the sample was primarily composed of university graduates (17 participants), including professionals. Four participants without university degrees (from vocational training pathways) were also included, though their applications to CDEs were rejected.

3.3 Analysis

For this exploratory study, all interviews averaging 25 minutes were fully transcribed and analyzed manually using an inductive approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method allowed deep immersion in participants' narratives. The analysis followed three steps:

- Open coding : Identification of recurring themes (e.g., “administrative delays,” “exclusion by diploma”);
- Thematic grouping : Organization of codes into cross-cutting themes, such as “institutional contradictions” or “endogenous solutions”;
- Triangulation : Cross-checking narratives with NESDA’s official documents to highlight gaps between stated promises and on-the-ground realities.

3.3 Ethics and Rigor

Prior to interviews, oral consent was obtained from all participants. Data were anonymized by replacing names with codes (P01–P21) and omitting precise geographic details.

3.4 Limitations

Key limitations include the small sample size (21 participants) and exploratory nature of the study, which restricts result generalization, as noted by Morse (2000). Additionally, the absence of funded beneficiaries limited analysis to early stage experiences, preventing coverage of all NESDA applicant profiles and necessitating cautious interpretation (Yin, 2014). Lastly, the overrepresentation of university graduates (57% of the sample) reflects structural biases in the mechanism rather than a deliberate methodological choice.

4. RESULTS

This section presents the raw data derived from the 21 interviews conducted as part of the study, with the analysis organized around three main objectives. The first seeks to identify the challenges as perceived by project leaders, shedding light on their concrete obstacles and expectations. The second objective aims to document the institutional contradictions mentioned by

the participants. Finally, the third focus lists the solutions proposed by the actors themselves to improve the system, encompassing both practical suggestions and structural recommendations.

4.1 Exclusion of Non-University Graduates

Table 2. Distribution of Participants by Education Level and Eligibility

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	CONCERNED PROFILES	EXAMPLE QUOTE
University graduates	17	P03, P04, P07...	"Only university students [...] can benefit from the mechanism."
Non-graduates	4	P01, P02, P11...	"The main obstacle is related to the level of education."

Source: Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

According to the data in Table (2), 4 participants (19%) were excluded from the NESDA mechanism due to their vocational training center diploma, despite an average professional experience of 28.3 months. The 17 university graduates were able to access the CDE training.

4.2 Administrative and Banking Delays

Table 3. Administrative and Banking Delays

TYPE OF DELAY	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE DURATION	DECLARED IMPACT
Start of training	3 (P03, P13, P18)	1.5 months	"I am still waiting for a response from the center."
Eligibility certificate	2 (P08, P19)	1 month	"These delays penalize project leaders."
Bank approval	2 (P18, P19)	2 months	"Bank approval requires a wait of about 2 months."

Source : Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

According to the data in Table (3), 7 participants (33%) reported administrative or banking delays, with average durations ranging from 1.5 to 2 months. These delays led to additional costs (e.g., rent) for project leaders awaiting funding.

4.3 Constraints Related to CDE Training

Table 4. Impact of CDE Training on Participants' Activities

PROBLEM	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	DECLARED CONSEQUENCES	PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
Interruption of activity	4 (P05, P06...)	"Disruption of my professional commitments"	Evening/weekend sessions
Conflict with studies	3	"Temporary suspension of studies"	Sessions outside university hours
Duration of training	2	"21 days too long for an employee"	Flexible schedules

Source : Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

Lived Experiences of Project Holders in the NESDA Mechanism: An Exploration of Systemic Obstacles and Improvement Avenues

According to the data in Table (4), 9 participants (42.8%) highlighted conflicts between the CDE training and their personal or professional commitments. Students (3 cases) and employees/business owners (2 cases) were the most affected.

4.4 Financial Barriers

Table 5. Criticisms Related to Financing

FINANCIAL OBSTACLE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	IMPACT
Personal contribution (5%)	3 (P04, P14, P17)	"As a student, I have no capital."
Ceiling of 10 million DZD	2	"Insufficient for expensive equipment."
Exclusion of rolling stock	2	"Penalizes sectors like logistics."

Source: Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

According to the data in Table (5), 3 participants (14%) deemed the 5% personal contribution unattainable, while 2 others (9.5%) criticized the financing limits (ceiling and exclusion of rolling stock).

4.5 Dysfunctions with Suppliers

Table 6. Discriminatory Practices by Suppliers

PROBLEM	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	EXAMPLE
Overcharging for NESDA beneficiaries	3	"Suppliers increase their prices upon learning of NESDA financing."
Refusal to collaborate	2	"Some suppliers refuse to work with us."

Source : Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

According to the data in Table (6), 5 participants (23.8%) reported discriminatory practices by suppliers.

4.6 Perceptions of Social Impact

Table 7. Perceptions of the Social Objective of NESDA

OPINION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	EXAMPLE
Reduction of inequalities	18	"The objective is to reduce inequalities."
Reinforcement of inequalities	3 (P01, P06, P12)	"The criteria exclude non-graduates."

Source : Data extracted from interviews, January 2025.

According to the data in Table (7), 18 participants (85.7%) stated that NESDA aims to reduce inequalities, but 3 of them (14.3%) believed that the current criteria (e.g., education level) risk reinforcing them.

5. DISCUSSION

The results of this study reveal a discrepancy between the stated objectives of the NESDA and the experiences of some project leaders. When compared with scientific literature and institutional reports, the findings highlight certain contradictions and potential avenues for reform.

5.1 The University Degree: A Filter Excluding Practical Skills

The results indicate that four participants, representing 19% of the sample, were excluded from the NESDA program due to the lack of a university degree, despite having significant professional experience (up to 40 months). This reveals a

contradiction between the stated objective of the NESDA and its eligibility criterion, which excludes graduates from vocational training centers. This observation aligns with Bourdieu's (1986) work on the reproduction of socio-educational inequalities, where public programs often perpetuate existing hierarchies. Sen (1999) has also formulated critiques against policies that neglect informal skills, limiting access to entrepreneurship support programs for already marginalized groups.

To address this issue, the participants recommended a revision of the eligibility criteria, including an assessment of practical skills, which could align the program with its egalitarian ambitions.

5.2 Administrative and Banking Delays: Hidden Costs

The findings show that seven participants, or 33% of the sample, reported administrative or banking delays, with average delays ranging from one to two months. This illustrates a structural inefficiency within institutions, a phenomenon analyzed by Evans (1996) in states with low administrative capacity.

The problem worsens when we consider that these delays are coupled with costs that the project leader must bear (e.g., rent). This situation recalls De Soto's (2000) conclusions on the "costs of formality," where bureaucratic delays discourage entrepreneurship.

To remedy this problem, the participants advocated for the digitalization of procedures and the creation of one-stop shops, which could reduce these issues, in line with the World Bank's (2020) recommendations for developing economies.

5.3 CDE Training: Between Empowerment and Socio-Professional Constraints

The results demonstrate that all participants unanimously judged the CDE training to be very “enriching.” However, the students and professionals who participated in this study reported that its 21-day duration and schedule disrupt their personal and professional activities.

This tension reconciling learning with practical responsibilities reflects a classic dilemma in adult education (Knowles, 1984).

The participants recommended scheduling sessions in the evening or on weekends, suggesting a need for pedagogical adaptation consistent with the flexible models advocated by UNESCO (2021) for inclusive education.

5.4 Financial Barriers

The results of this study reveal structural limitations in the program’s economic model. The 5% personal contribution and the ceiling of 10 million DZD constitute financial barriers for participants, reproducing class inequalities a finding corroborated by Acs (2006) on financial obstacles to entrepreneurship.

Another obstacle observed in this study is the exclusion of rolling stock, which penalizes sectors like logistics. This illustrates a lack of understanding of sectoral needs, seen as contrary to the principles of market-oriented entrepreneurship (Baumol, 1990).

The ANADE already required a personal contribution (5 to 15%), but the NESDA tightens conditions by limiting financing to non-rolling equipment, a rigidity absent in its predecessors.

The participants suggested the removal of these constraints.

5.5 Dysfunctions with Suppliers

According to the results of this study, participants faced practices from suppliers that threaten the realization of projects and discourage project leaders. Indeed, some suppliers increase their prices as soon as they learn about the NESDA financing, while others categorically refuse to collaborate with beneficiaries. These practices are exacerbated by the obligation to buy locally for equipment available in Algeria, which limits competition and affects the quality of investments.

To address these dysfunctions, the participants advocated for the application of strict regulation and the opening to international suppliers, under state control, to ensure greater fairness in transactions.

5.6 Ambiguous Social Impact: Between Promises and Realities

The results of this study show that 85.7% of participants perceive the NESDA as a tool for reducing inequalities, while 14.3% highlight internal contradictions due to restrictive criteria and administrative delays. These divergences suggest a possible gap between institutional discourses and lived realities, a theme explored by Mosse (2005) in the analysis of development policies. An evaluation of the program, integrating indicators of procedural justice (Tyler, 2006), would be essential to measure its real impact.

5.7 Methodological Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study presents several methodological limitations that guide future research perspectives:

Morse (2000) emphasizes that qualitative studies aim to generate hypotheses rather than establish universal truths. Our study, based on an exploratory qualitative approach, allows for an in-depth analysis of lived experiences. However, the limited sample size (21 interviews) restricts the generalizability of the results, thus requiring caution in extrapolating the conclusions.

Another limitation lies in the fact that none of the participants reached the financing stage, which restricted the analysis to the initial phases of the NESDA program. It would be necessary, in future research, to include project leaders who have completed their journey (training, financing, launching the activity) in order to assess the sustainability of the projects and the real impact of the program.

Another limitation, this time inherent to the NESDA program, lies in the exclusion of non-university graduates. This restriction influences the composition of the sample, characterized by an overrepresentation of university graduates (81% of participants). This overrepresentation limits the scope of the conclusions regarding marginalized populations, thus justifying the need for future work focused on these groups.

A final limitation concerns the geographical scope of this study, which focused on three wilayas (Batna, Souk Ahras, Oran). For future studies, we recommend extending the analysis to other regions, particularly rural ones, in order to enrich the conclusions.

6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study is to explore the lived experiences of 21 project leaders within the framework of the NESDA program in Algeria. To achieve this, we adopted an inductive qualitative approach. The results of this study revealed structural tensions and paradoxes between the stated objectives of the program and its concrete implementation. In summary, these results highlight obstacles that could impact the equity and effectiveness of the program.

Our first observation concerns the eligibility criteria, which create a form of rigidity by excluding candidates from vocational training backgrounds, despite significant practical experience. This observation aligns with Bourdieu's (1986) theories on the reproduction of inequalities, contradicting the stated objective of reducing socio-economic disparities.

We also found that project leaders bear expenses even before obtaining funding, particularly to meet certain administrative requirements related to the application file (e.g., rent). These charges, coupled with administrative and banking delays (1 to 2 months), transform a support mechanism into an economic burden, a phenomenon analyzed by De Soto (2000).

Other constraints were revealed by the participants, including dysfunctions with suppliers (overcosts, refusal to collaborate) as well as financial constraints. Among these are the obligation to make a personal contribution, the financing ceiling (ten million dinars), and sectoral restrictions (exclusion of rolling stock). These findings corroborate Acs's (2006) work on financial barriers to entrepreneurship.

The majority of participants (85.7%) perceive NESDA as a tool for social justice. However, the constraints we have just mentioned risk compromising its redistributive ambitions. These results call for a reform of the program, including notably:

- An assessment of practical skills to replace the diploma filter;
- The digitalization of procedures and the creation of one-stop shops to reduce delays;
- The relaxation of financial criteria, for example, the elimination of the personal contribution and the revision of the financing ceiling;
- Strict regulation of suppliers to ensure price fairness.

Finally, this study opens the way for future research, particularly longitudinal studies integrating quantitative and qualitative data to assess the long-term impact of the program. Furthermore, an extension to other regions would enrich these conclusions.

7. Bibliography List :

- Acs, Z. J., Desai, S., & Hessels, J. (2008). *Entrepreneurship, economic development and institutions*. *Small Business Economics*, 31(3), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9135-9>
- Audretsch, D. B., Lehmann, E. E., & Warning, S. (2005). *University spillovers and new firm location*. *Research Policy*, 34(7), 1113–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.05.009>
- Baumol, W. J. (1990). *Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive*. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5, Part 1), 893–921. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261712>
- Beck, T., & Demircuc-Kunt, A. (2006). *Small and medium-size enterprises: Access to finance as a growth constraint*. *Journal of Banking &*

Lived Experiences of Project Holders in the NESDA Mechanism: An Exploration of Systemic Obstacles and Improvement Avenues

- Finance*, 30(11), 2931–2943.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2006.05.009>
- Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education, First Edition*. University of Chicago Press.
- BNA.dz. (2023). *Financement ANADE*. <https://www.bna.dz/fr/financement-anad/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The forms of capital*. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Colombo, M. G., D'Adda, D., & Pirelli, L. H. (2016). *The participation of new technology-based firms in EU-funded R&D partnerships: The role of venture capital. Research Policy*, 45(2), 361–375.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2015.10.011>
- De Soto, H. (2000). *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. Basic Books.
- Djankov, S., Ganser, T., McLiesh, C., Ramalho, R., & Shleifer, A. (2010). *The Effect of Corporate Taxes on Investment and Entrepreneurship. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2(3), 31–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.2.3.31>
- Evans, P. (1996). *Government action, social capital and development: Reviewing the evidence on synergy. World Development*, 24(6), 1119–1132. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(96\)00021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(96)00021-6)
- Gatewood, E. J., Shaver, K. G., & Gartner, W. B. (1995). *A longitudinal study of cognitive factors influencing start-up behaviors and success at venture creation. Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(5), 371–391.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(95\)00035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(95)00035-7)

- Knowles. (1984). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*. Gulf Publishing.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2017). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, process, practice* (tenth edition). South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Lerner, J. (2009). *Boulevard of broken dreams: Why public efforts to boost entrepreneurship and venture capital have failed and what to do about it*. Princeton university press.
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary expanded ed). Russell Sage Foundation.
- MF.gov.dz. (2023). *DISPOSITIF ANSEJ*. <https://www.mf.gov.dz/index.php/fr/grands-dossiers/115-dispositif-ansej>
- Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining Sample Size. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973200129118183>
- Mosse, D. (2015). *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. Pluto Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt18fs4st>
- nesda.dz. (2023). <https://www.nesda.dz/ar/ar-home/>
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton University Press.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2021/2: Non-state actors in education: Who chooses? Who loses?* UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/XJFS2343>
- World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report 2020: Trading for Development in the Age of Global Value Chains*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1457-0>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5. edition). SAGE.