

Public Sector Management, Government Performance, and Public Service Delivery in Senegal

Ousmane Diallo

¹Universite Cheikh Anta Diop, Senegal

Abstract

This study examines the relationships among Public Sector Management, Government Performance, and Public Service Delivery in Senegal, with particular attention to the mediating role of Government Performance. A quantitative explanatory design was employed using survey data from 320 employees working in central government ministries, public agencies, and local government institutions. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale and analyzed with Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS. The measurement model demonstrated satisfactory indicator reliability, internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. The structural model showed that Public Sector Management had a strong positive effect on Government Performance, while Government Performance significantly influenced Public Service Delivery. Public Sector Management also had a significant direct effect on Public Service Delivery, although the magnitude was lower than its effect on Government Performance. Mediation analysis further revealed that Government Performance significantly mediated the relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery, indicating complementary partial mediation. These findings show that managerial practices contribute to service outcomes both directly and indirectly through improvements in institutional performance. The study highlights the importance of strategic management, accountability, resource utilization, institutional coordination, administrative effectiveness, and professional human resource management in strengthening public-sector outcomes. The results provide empirical evidence for designing administrative reforms that connect management capacity with service outcomes. For Senegal, improving managerial capacity and performance-oriented administration may support more accessible, reliable, responsive, and citizen-oriented public services while reinforcing institutional effectiveness across different levels of government.

Keywords: Public Sector Management, Government Performance, Public Service Delivery, PLS-SEM, Senegal

Received: August 7, 2026

Revised: September 3, 2026

Accepted: Oktober 5, 2026

Introduction

Public sector management occupies a central position in the capacity of governments to translate public resources, policies, and institutional mandates into tangible outcomes for citizens. Effective management involves strategic planning, competent human resources, accountable financial management, interagency coordination, and performance monitoring. These dimensions are particularly important in developing-country contexts, where governments often face simultaneous pressure to expand access to services, improve institutional efficiency, and maintain public trust under constrained fiscal and administrative conditions. Evidence from public-sector research shows that investment in human capital and managerial capacity can contribute positively to organizational performance, indicating that the way public institutions manage people and internal processes is an important determinant of institutional results (Costumato, 2021).

In Senegal, strengthening the performance of public institutions has become increasingly relevant as the state continues to pursue decentralization and improvements in local governance. Recent initiatives have emphasized performance-based financing, transparency, accountability, investment planning, fiduciary management, and citizen engagement at the local-government level. The PACASEN program strengthened decentralization systems in Senegal, doubled state transfers to all 601 local governments between 2018 and 2024, and improved the performance of participating local governments in investment planning, fiduciary management, safeguards, and citizen engagement (Ruppel & Murray, 2024). Nevertheless, stronger capacity does not automatically ensure that public organizations will consistently convert resources and reforms into effective and responsive services.

Government performance therefore represents an important intermediate dimension between administrative management and the quality of services experienced by citizens. It reflects the extent to which public institutions achieve policy objectives efficiently, effectively, transparently, and responsively. Across African public administrations, performance-oriented reforms increasingly emphasize monitoring, coordination, and implementation. Delivery units, for example, have been used in several African governments to focus attention on priority objectives, strengthen monitoring, and accelerate implementation where conventional bureaucratic arrangements may struggle to produce timely results (Mthembu & Nhamo, 2021). This perspective suggests that stronger public sector management may improve government performance by strengthening institutional coordination, clarifying objectives, reinforcing accountability, and increasing implementation capacity.

The significance of government performance becomes particularly visible in public service delivery. Citizens encounter the state through schools, health facilities, local administrations, identity-document services, infrastructure, security institutions, and other public services. Service accessibility, reliability, timeliness, responsiveness, and fairness can therefore shape citizens' assessments of government effectiveness. Recent evidence from African countries indicates that many citizens continue to experience difficulties in obtaining essential services, while disrespectful or poor treatment during interactions with public institutions can weaken trust in government and satisfaction with governance (Asunka et al., 2024; Molines et al., 2026). For Senegal, these broader regional patterns make the relationship between managerial quality, institutional performance, and citizen-facing service outcomes particularly important to examine.

Evidence from Senegal further demonstrates that institutional arrangements and management practices can influence service-level outcomes. Wetterberg, Frazer, and Johnson (2023), examining local health governance in Senegal, found that an integrated governance approach involving local governments, health-facility actors, and civil-society participants improved problem solving and health-service readiness, particularly through stronger citizen involvement and better access to resources. However, sector-specific studies do not fully explain whether broader public sector management practices systematically enhance public service delivery across government institutions, nor do they clarify whether such effects occur directly or through improvements in government performance.

This study addresses that gap by examining the relationships among public sector management, government performance, and public service delivery in Senegal. Previous research has examined public-sector capacity, decentralization, performance management, and service delivery, but limited attention has been given to an integrated model that positions government performance as a mechanism through which managerial practices may translate into better public services. This relationship is theoretically important because effective management may

first strengthen institutional efficiency, responsiveness, accountability, and goal achievement before these improvements become visible in service outcomes. Contemporary governance research likewise emphasizes the need for management systems that connect public resources and administrative practices with measurable results and citizen expectations (Dobrolyubova, 2021). Accordingly, this study aims to examine the effect of public sector management on government performance and public service delivery, assess the effect of government performance on public service delivery, and determine whether government performance mediates the relationship between public sector management and public service delivery in Senegal. The findings are expected to support performance-oriented public administration and more citizen-centered service delivery.

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design to examine the relationships among public sector management, government performance, and public service delivery in Senegal. The quantitative approach was selected because the study aimed to measure the strength and direction of relationships among the proposed constructs and statistically test the hypothesized effects. The explanatory design enabled the study to assess both direct and indirect relationships within the research model. Specifically, public sector management was treated as the independent variable, government performance as the mediating variable, and public service delivery as the dependent variable. The study used a cross-sectional design, with data collected from respondents at a single point in time.

Population and Sample

The target population consisted of employees working in public-sector institutions in Senegal, including central government ministries, government agencies, and local government institutions. Public-sector employees were considered appropriate respondents because they are directly involved in administrative processes, institutional management, policy implementation, and public service provision. Respondents were required to have sufficient work experience and knowledge of their institution's management practices and service-delivery processes. A purposive sampling technique was used to select respondents who met these criteria. The final sample was designed to provide an adequate number of observations for Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), allowing simultaneous assessment of the measurement and structural models.

Research Variables and Measurement

The study examined three latent constructs: public sector management, government performance, and public service delivery. Public sector management was measured through indicators related to strategic management, human resource management, resource allocation, accountability, institutional coordination, and administrative effectiveness. Government performance was assessed through indicators reflecting efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, achievement of organizational objectives, transparency, and institutional capacity. Public service delivery was measured using indicators related to accessibility, reliability, timeliness, responsiveness, service quality, and citizen-oriented service provision. These indicators were operationalized through multiple questionnaire items to capture respondents' perceptions of organizational practices and performance within their respective institutions.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured self-administered questionnaire. All constructs were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Questionnaire items were developed based on the conceptual definitions of the study variables and adapted to the public-sector context in Senegal. Before the main data collection, the questionnaire was reviewed to ensure clarity, relevance, and consistency with the research objectives. A preliminary assessment was also conducted to identify ambiguous statements and ensure that the instrument adequately represented each construct. The final questionnaire consisted of sections covering respondent characteristics, public sector management, government performance, and public service delivery.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted among eligible employees from selected public-sector institutions in Senegal. Prior to questionnaire distribution, respondents were informed about the objectives of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. Questionnaires were distributed either directly or electronically depending on institutional accessibility. Respondents were instructed to answer all items based on their experience and perceptions of management practices and service performance in their institutions. Completed questionnaires were screened before analysis to identify incomplete responses, missing data, and response patterns that could affect data quality. Only questionnaires meeting the predetermined completeness criteria were included in the final analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling with SmartPLS. Descriptive analysis was first conducted to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and provide an overview of the distribution of responses for each research construct. PLS-SEM analysis was subsequently performed in two stages. The first stage involved assessment of the measurement model by examining indicator loadings, internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, convergent validity through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity. The second stage evaluated the structural model by examining collinearity, path coefficients, coefficient of determination (R^2), effect sizes, and predictive relevance. Bootstrapping procedures were used to determine the statistical significance of the hypothesized relationships.

Hypothesis and Mediation Testing

The structural analysis tested the direct effect of public sector management on government performance, the direct effect of public sector management on public service delivery, and the effect of government performance on public service delivery. In addition, mediation analysis was performed to determine whether government performance transmitted the effect of public sector management to public service delivery. The indirect effect was evaluated using the bootstrapping procedure in SmartPLS. Statistical significance was determined based on the estimated path coefficients, t-statistics, p-values, and confidence intervals. This procedure enabled the study to determine whether government performance acted as a significant mediating mechanism between managerial practices and service-delivery outcomes.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles were applied throughout the research process. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were provided with information regarding the purpose and procedures of the

study before completing the questionnaire. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and respondents were allowed to withdraw from participation without any consequences. No personally identifiable information was included in the analysis, and all responses were treated confidentially and used solely for academic purposes. Data were reported in aggregate form to protect the anonymity of individual respondents and participating institutions.

Results and Discussion

Respondent Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

A total of 320 valid responses were included in the analysis, representing employees from different public-sector institutions in Senegal. Of the respondents, 187 (58.4%) were male and 133 (41.6%) were female. In terms of age, 54 respondents (16.9%) were below 30 years old, 112 (35.0%) were between 30 and 39 years old, 96 (30.0%) were between 40 and 49 years old, and 58 (18.1%) were aged 50 years or above. Employees between 30 and 49 years old therefore constituted the largest proportion of the sample. The inclusion of respondents from different demographic groups provided representation of employees involved in various levels of public administration and service provision. Public-sector performance is closely associated with managerial capacity, employee characteristics, leadership, and institutional arrangements within government organizations (Leisink & Boxall, 2021).

The educational profile showed that 71 respondents (22.2%) held a diploma or equivalent qualification, 153 (47.8%) held a bachelor's degree, 82 (25.6%) possessed a master's degree, and 14 (4.4%) held a doctoral or equivalent qualification. Accordingly, 77.8% of respondents had at least a bachelor's degree. In terms of institutional affiliation, 118 respondents (36.9%) worked in central government ministries, 83 (25.9%) were employed in government agencies or other public institutions, and 119 (37.2%) worked in local government institutions. This distribution provided observations from different administrative settings and levels of government within Senegal.

Regarding professional experience, 63 respondents (19.7%) had worked in the public sector for fewer than five years, 102 (31.9%) had between five and ten years of experience, 91 (28.4%) had between 11 and 15 years, and 64 (20.0%) had more than 15 years of experience. Thus, 257 respondents (80.3%) had at least five years of public-sector experience. Furthermore, 69 respondents (21.6%) occupied managerial or supervisory positions, whereas 251 (78.4%) worked in professional, administrative, technical, or operational positions. The representation of employees from different organizational levels was relevant because performance information and organizational practices can be interpreted differently across managerial and operational positions within public institutions (Hansen & Nielsen, 2022).

Descriptive analysis of the main research constructs showed that Public Sector Management recorded a mean score of 3.72 (SD = 0.61) on the five-point Likert scale. This construct represented respondents' assessments of strategic management, human resource management, resource utilization, accountability, institutional coordination, and administrative effectiveness. The mean value above the midpoint of the scale reflected relatively favorable perceptions of management practices, while the standard deviation indicated variation in responses across institutions and individual respondents.

Government Performance recorded a mean score of 3.65 (SD = 0.64). The construct covered institutional efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, transparency, organizational goal achievement, and institutional capacity. The slightly higher standard deviation compared with Public Sector Management indicated greater dispersion in respondents' perceptions of

government performance. Public Service Delivery recorded a mean score of 3.69 (SD = 0.63), covering service accessibility, reliability, timeliness, responsiveness, service quality, and citizen-oriented service provision. The descriptive scores for these dimensions reflected variation in respondents' experiences with public service implementation across different organizational contexts. Public-management research similarly identifies organizational capabilities, managerial practices, and innovation as important elements associated with the quality of services delivered by government organizations (Alkaabi et al., 2024).

Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model was assessed before evaluating the structural relationships among Public Sector Management, Government Performance, and Public Service Delivery. Because all three constructs were specified as reflective constructs, the assessment focused on indicator reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. In total, 18 indicators were retained in the final measurement model, consisting of six indicators for each construct. The outer loadings for Public Sector Management ranged from 0.781 to 0.868, Government Performance ranged from 0.768 to 0.875, and Public Service Delivery ranged from 0.789 to 0.882. All indicators therefore exceeded the commonly recommended loading level of 0.708, indicating that each observed item explained a substantial proportion of the variance in its corresponding latent construct (Dolintings & Pang, 2022).

Internal consistency reliability was examined using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability. Public Sector Management recorded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.904 and composite reliability of 0.926, while Government Performance produced values of 0.901 and 0.926, respectively. Public Service Delivery showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.915 and composite reliability of 0.933. These coefficients were above the minimum recommended value of 0.70 while remaining below levels that would indicate excessive redundancy among the measurement items. The relatively high reliability coefficients showed consistent responses across the multiple indicators used to operationalize each construct.

Convergent validity was evaluated using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Public Sector Management generated an AVE value of 0.677, Government Performance recorded 0.675, and Public Service Delivery obtained 0.698. Each value exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.50, indicating that the respective constructs accounted for more than half of the variance in their associated indicators. Evaluation of reflective measurement models generally requires simultaneous consideration of indicator loadings, reliability measures, and AVE because these statistics capture different aspects of measurement quality (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 1. Measurement Model Assessment of the Reflective Constructs

Construct	Outer Loading Range	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Public Sector Management	0.781–0.868	0.904	0.926	0.677
Government Performance	0.768–0.875	0.901	0.926	0.675
Public Service Delivery	0.789–0.882	0.915	0.933	0.698

Discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT). The HTMT value between Public Sector Management and Government Performance was 0.742, while the relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service

Delivery generated an HTMT value of 0.716. The highest HTMT value, 0.781, was observed between Government Performance and Public Service Delivery. All pairwise values remained below the more conservative threshold of 0.85. Kishore & Prakashraj (2015) proposed HTMT as a more sensitive approach for identifying potential discriminant validity problems in variance-based structural equation models compared with relying solely on traditional cross-loading or Fornell–Larcker assessments.

The pattern of indicator loadings also showed that indicators loaded most strongly on their theoretically assigned constructs rather than on alternative constructs. For Public Sector Management, individual loadings ranged from 0.781, 0.824, 0.852, 0.794, 0.868, to 0.813. Government Performance indicators produced loadings of 0.768, 0.831, 0.847, 0.799, 0.875, and 0.806, whereas the Public Service Delivery indicators recorded values of 0.789, 0.838, 0.861, 0.817, 0.882, and 0.824. The absence of weak-loading indicators meant that no measurement item was excluded from the subsequent structural analysis.

The HTMT matrix further showed distinguishable empirical relationships among the three latent variables despite their conceptual relatedness. Public Sector Management and Government Performance recorded an HTMT of 0.742, Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery recorded 0.716, and Government Performance and Public Service Delivery recorded 0.781. These values reflected moderate associations without indicating excessive overlap between constructs. This distinction is particularly relevant for the subsequent structural model because Public Sector Management functions as the exogenous construct, Government Performance as the mediating construct, and Public Service Delivery as the endogenous outcome variable.

Structural Model and Direct Effects

Following confirmation of the reliability and validity of the measurement model, the structural model was evaluated to examine the relationships among Public Sector Management, Government Performance, and Public Service Delivery. The assessment included inner variance inflation factor (VIF), coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), and the magnitude and significance of the structural path coefficients. Bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples was applied to estimate standard errors, t-statistics, p-values, and 95% confidence intervals. Structural model assessment using these criteria allows the explanatory capacity of the endogenous constructs and the statistical significance of individual relationships to be evaluated simultaneously (Hair et al., 2021).

The inner VIF assessment showed no problematic collinearity among the predictor constructs. The VIF value for Public Sector Management in predicting Government Performance was 1.000, while the VIF values for Public Sector Management and Government Performance in predicting Public Service Delivery were both approximately 1.600. These values were substantially below the commonly applied critical thresholds in PLS-SEM. The results indicated that the estimated structural paths were not materially affected by excessive overlap among the predictor constructs, allowing the individual effects of Public Sector Management and Government Performance on the endogenous constructs to be examined separately.

The coefficient of determination showed that Public Sector Management explained 37.5% of the variance in Government Performance ($R^2 = 0.375$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$). For Public Service Delivery, the combined contribution of Public Sector Management and Government Performance explained 50.0% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.500$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.497$). The predictive relevance assessment produced a Q^2 value of 0.251 for Government Performance and 0.335 for Public Service Delivery. Both values were above zero, indicating that the model generated

predictive information for the endogenous constructs. Prediction-oriented evaluation is particularly relevant in PLS-SEM because explanatory performance alone does not fully represent a model's capacity to generate useful predictions for endogenous variables (Legate et al., 2023).

The direct path from Public Sector Management to Government Performance was positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.612$, $t = 13.021$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.518, 0.700]). The corresponding effect size was $f^2 = 0.600$, showing a comparatively substantial contribution of Public Sector Management to the explained variance in Government Performance. Thus, variation in strategic management, human resource management, resource utilization, accountability, institutional coordination, and administrative effectiveness was statistically associated with differences in perceived government performance within the sampled Senegalese public institutions.

Public Sector Management also showed a positive direct relationship with Public Service Delivery ($\beta = 0.284$, $t = 4.897$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.169, 0.395]), with an effect size of $f^2 = 0.108$. Government Performance exhibited a stronger direct association with Public Service Delivery, with a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.497$ ($t = 9.036$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.386, 0.600]) and an effect size of $f^2 = 0.329$. The positive coefficients showed that higher scores on both Public Sector Management and Government Performance were associated with higher levels of perceived service accessibility, reliability, timeliness, responsiveness, quality, and citizen-oriented service provision. Effect-size analysis complements statistical significance by indicating the relative contribution of each predictor to the explanatory power of the endogenous construct (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 2. Structural Path Coefficients and Direct Effects

Structural Path	β	t-statistic	P-value	95% CI	f^2	Result
Public Sector Management → Government Performance	0.612	13.021	<0.001	[0.518, 0.700]	0.600	Supported
Public Sector Management → Public Service Delivery	0.284	4.897	<0.001	[0.169, 0.395]	0.108	Supported
Government Performance → Public Service Delivery	0.497	9.036	<0.001	[0.386, 0.600]	0.329	Supported

The relative magnitude of the standardized path coefficients differed across the three direct relationships. The coefficient for Public Sector Management → Government Performance was 0.612, followed by Government Performance → Public Service Delivery at 0.497, while the direct Public Sector Management → Public Service Delivery coefficient was 0.284. The corresponding R^2 , f^2 , and Q^2 statistics provided additional information regarding the explanatory and predictive characteristics of these relationships before assessing the indirect effect of Public Sector Management on Public Service Delivery through Government Performance.

Mediating Role of Government Performance

The mediating role of Government Performance in the relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery was examined using the bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 subsamples. The analysis focused on the specific indirect effect of Public Sector Management on Public Service Delivery through Government Performance. Bootstrapping is particularly appropriate for mediation analysis in PLS-SEM because it directly evaluates the

statistical significance of the indirect effect without requiring an assumption of normality for its sampling distribution (Hair et al., 2021).

The indirect pathway from Public Sector Management → Government Performance → Public Service Delivery was positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.304$, $t = 7.421$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.230, 0.386]). The confidence interval did not contain zero, providing statistical evidence for the presence of an indirect effect. The coefficient was derived from the relationship between Public Sector Management and Government Performance ($\beta = 0.612$) and the subsequent relationship between Government Performance and Public Service Delivery ($\beta = 0.497$). Thus, variations in Public Sector Management were associated with changes in Government Performance, which in turn were associated with differences in Public Service Delivery.

The direct effect of Public Sector Management on Public Service Delivery remained statistically significant after Government Performance was incorporated as a mediator ($\beta = 0.284$, $t = 4.897$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.169, 0.395]). At the same time, the indirect effect through Government Performance was also significant and operated in the same positive direction as the direct effect. Following contemporary mediation assessment procedures, the simultaneous presence of significant direct and indirect effects in the same direction represents a pattern of complementary partial mediation rather than full mediation (Nitzl et al., 2016).

The total effect of Public Sector Management on Public Service Delivery, representing the combination of the direct and indirect pathways, was $\beta = 0.588$ ($t = 11.637$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.489, 0.681]). Of this total association, approximately 0.304 was transmitted through Government Performance, whereas 0.284 represented the remaining direct relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery. The mediated component therefore represented approximately 51.7% of the total effect, based on the ratio between the indirect effect (0.304) and total effect (0.588).

Table 3. Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Public Sector Management on Public Service Delivery

Effect	Path	β	t-statistic	p-value	95% CI	Result
Direct Effect	PSM → GP	0.612	13.021	<0.001	[0.518, 0.700]	Supported
Direct Effect	GP → PSD	0.497	9.036	<0.001	[0.386, 0.600]	Supported
Direct Effect	PSM → PSD	0.284	4.897	<0.001	[0.169, 0.395]	Supported
Indirect Effect	PSM → GP → PSD	0.304	7.421	<0.001	[0.230, 0.386]	Supported
Total Effect	PSM → PSD	0.588	11.637	<0.001	[0.489, 0.681]	Significant

The mediation results also provided information regarding the relative roles of managerial practices and institutional performance in the model. Public Sector Management maintained its direct association with Public Service Delivery, while a substantial portion of its relationship with service delivery operated through Government Performance. The indirect coefficient of 0.304 was slightly larger than the remaining direct coefficient of 0.284, showing the quantitative contribution of the mediating pathway within the estimated model. Modern PLS-SEM mediation procedures emphasize evaluating the significance, direction, and confidence

interval of the indirect effect together with the remaining direct effect rather than relying solely on sequential significance testing (Hejazi et al., 2023).

The hypothesis concerning the mediating role of Government Performance was therefore statistically supported by the bootstrapping results. Specifically, H4, which specified an indirect relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery through Government Performance, produced a significant coefficient of $\beta = 0.304$ ($p < 0.001$). The direct relationships corresponding to the preceding structural paths also remained statistically significant, providing the statistical basis for classifying Government Performance as a complementary partial mediator within the estimated structural model.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that Public Sector Management has a substantial positive relationship with Government Performance in Senegal, with this relationship representing the strongest direct path in the structural model ($\beta = 0.612$). This result suggests that improvements in strategic management, human resource management, accountability, resource utilization, institutional coordination, and administrative effectiveness are closely associated with stronger institutional performance. From a public management perspective, managerial practices create the organizational conditions through which public institutions can translate policy objectives and available resources into operational outcomes. Clear organizational priorities, appropriate allocation of human and financial resources, effective coordination, and mechanisms of accountability can reduce administrative fragmentation and facilitate the achievement of institutional objectives. This interpretation corresponds with the broader public-management literature showing that management can influence public-service performance both directly and indirectly through leadership, employee motivation, organizational commitment, and the ability of public employees to perform their responsibilities effectively (Leisink & Boxall, 2021).

Government Performance also demonstrated a strong positive relationship with Public Service Delivery ($\beta = 0.497$), indicating that institutional performance represents an important organizational foundation for delivering accessible, reliable, timely, responsive, and citizen-oriented services. This relationship is particularly important because improvements in internal administrative performance are valuable to citizens only when they are translated into observable improvements in public services. Institutions that operate efficiently, achieve organizational objectives, respond effectively to emerging needs, and maintain adequate administrative capacity are better positioned to manage service processes consistently. The finding is comparable with recent international evidence showing that managerial arrangements, organizational capabilities, innovation, and performance-oriented practices can influence public service quality, although the mechanisms through which these effects occur may vary according to institutional and administrative contexts (Alkaabi et al., 2024).

The direct relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery was also statistically significant ($\beta = 0.284$), although its magnitude was smaller than the relationship between management and Government Performance. This difference provides an important interpretation of how management practices operate within public institutions. Strategic planning, accountability, human resource management, resource allocation, and administrative coordination may directly facilitate better service provision, but management practices alone may not automatically produce corresponding improvements at the point of service delivery. Management establishes structures, procedures, resources, and responsibilities, whereas actual service outcomes depend on whether these managerial

arrangements produce improvements in institutional effectiveness and operational performance. The weaker direct effect therefore indicates that the pathway from management to service delivery is not exclusively immediate; part of the influence appears to operate through organizational processes that improve government performance before becoming visible in the delivery of services.

This interpretation is strengthened by the mediation analysis. Government Performance significantly mediated the relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery, with an indirect effect of $\beta = 0.304$. The indirect effect was slightly larger than the remaining direct effect of $\beta = 0.284$ and represented approximately 51.7% of the total relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery. Because both the direct and indirect effects remained positive and statistically significant, the findings indicate complementary partial mediation. Substantively, this means that effective public-sector management can affect service delivery through two interconnected mechanisms. The first operates directly, for example through better allocation of resources, clearer procedures, improved staff management, and stronger coordination of service activities. The second operates indirectly by improving institutional efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, transparency, and goal achievement, which subsequently strengthen the organization's capacity to provide services. Government Performance therefore functions as an organizational transmission mechanism rather than merely an additional independent determinant of service delivery.

The findings are particularly relevant to Senegal's ongoing efforts to strengthen public administration and decentralized institutional performance. Recent public-sector initiatives in Senegal have placed attention on performance-based financing, accountability, transparency, investment management, capacity development, and citizen engagement at the local-government level. The World Bank reported that Senegal's PACASEN initiative strengthened decentralization systems, doubled state transfers to the country's 601 local governments between 2018 and 2024, and supported improvements in investment planning, fiduciary management, safeguards, and citizen engagement among participating local governments. Such developments illustrate why managerial capacity and institutional performance need to be considered together: providing resources or introducing administrative reforms does not by itself determine service outcomes unless institutions possess the capacity to manage those resources, coordinate implementation, monitor performance, and translate organizational improvements into services experienced by citizens (Ruppel & Murray, 2024).

The combined pattern of relationships also extends the interpretation of public service delivery beyond the assumption that better management practices automatically result in better services. The results instead indicate a sequential institutional process in which managerial arrangements strengthen government performance, which subsequently contributes to service-delivery outcomes. For Senegalese public institutions, this means that managerial reforms focused on strategic planning, professional human resource management, effective allocation of resources, accountability, and institutional coordination should be examined alongside measurable changes in efficiency, responsiveness, transparency, institutional capacity, and achievement of organizational objectives. At the same time, because the analysis captures employees' perceptions of service delivery rather than objective service indicators or citizens' direct evaluations, the identified relationships should be interpreted as organizational-level perceptions of how management and performance are connected to service provision. This distinction provides an important basis for future empirical work that combines administrative

performance data with citizen-level assessments of accessibility, timeliness, reliability, and service quality.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationships among Public Sector Management, Government Performance, and Public Service Delivery in Senegal and demonstrated that effective management practices play an important role in strengthening institutional performance and improving service outcomes. The findings showed that Public Sector Management had a strong positive effect on Government Performance, indicating that strategic management, human resource management, accountability, resource utilization, institutional coordination, and administrative effectiveness contribute significantly to the capacity of public institutions to achieve organizational objectives. Government Performance also had a substantial positive effect on Public Service Delivery, suggesting that institutions characterized by stronger efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, transparency, and institutional capacity are more capable of delivering accessible, reliable, timely, and citizen-oriented services. Public Sector Management also directly influenced Public Service Delivery, although this effect was weaker than its effect on Government Performance. More importantly, Government Performance significantly mediated the relationship between Public Sector Management and Public Service Delivery, confirming that management practices improve service outcomes not only directly but also by first strengthening institutional performance. This mediating mechanism highlights the importance of viewing public management reform as an integrated institutional process rather than as a set of isolated administrative interventions. For Senegal, the findings imply that efforts to improve public services should prioritize managerial capacity, performance-oriented administration, transparent accountability systems, effective coordination, strategic resource allocation, and professional human resource management. Strengthening these areas can enhance the ability of public institutions to convert administrative reforms and public resources into measurable improvements in government performance and service provision. Future studies may extend this model by incorporating citizen satisfaction, digital governance, institutional trust, or objective administrative performance indicators and by comparing institutions across different levels of government or public-service sectors in Senegal.

References

- Alkaabi, S., Hazzam, J., Wilkins, S., & Dan, S. (2024). The influences of ambidexterity, new public management and innovation on the public service quality of government organizations. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 47(5), 1110-1137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2024.2367130>
- Asunka, J., Torsu, A., & Sanny, J. A. N. (2024). Dignity and respect in African public service delivery: A hidden driver of the global promise to leave no one behind.
- Costumato, L. (2021). Collaboration among public organizations: a systematic literature review on determinants of interinstitutional performance. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 34(3), 247-273. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2020-0069>
- Dobrolyubova, E. (2021). Measuring outcomes of digital transformation in public administration: Literature review and possible steps forward. *NISPAcee Journal of*

- Public Administration and Policy*, 14(1), 61-86. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nispa-2021-0003>
- Dolinting, P. P., & Pang, V. (2022). Assessing the validity and reliability of adapted classroom climates instrument for Malaysian rural schools using PLS-SEM. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 7(47), 383-401. DOI 10.35631/IJEPC.747033
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). Evaluation of reflective measurement models. In *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook* (pp. 75-90). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7_1#DOI
- Hansen, J. A., & Nielsen, P. A. (2022). How do public managers learn from performance information? Experimental evidence on problem focus, innovative search, and change. *Public Administration Review*, 82(5), 946-957. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13533>
- Hejazi, N. S., Rudolph, K. E., Van Der Laan, M. J., & Díaz, I. (2023). Nonparametric causal mediation analysis for stochastic interventional (in) direct effects. *Biostatistics*, 24(3), 686-707. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxac002>
- Kishore, I. A., & Prakashraj, G. (2026). Measurement of Work–Life Balance and Its Correlates in Higher Education Institutions: An HTMT and Fornell–Larcker Comparison within the Framework of Viksit Bharat 2047. *SJCC Management Research Review*, 38-53. <https://doi.org/10.35737/sjccmrr/V16/i1/2026/254>
- Legate, A. E., Hair Jr, J. F., Chretien, J. L., & Risher, J. J. (2023). PLS-SEM: Prediction-oriented solutions for HRD researchers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 34(1), 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21466>
- Leisink, P., & Boxall, P. (2021). HRM and social legitimacy in the public sector. In *Research Handbook on HRM in the Public Sector* (pp. 189-201). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789906622.00022>
- Molines, M., Storme, M., & Guo, C. Y. (2026). When police officers surrender: the effect of citizen incivility on withdrawal and turnover. *International Public Management Journal*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2026.2691398>
- Mthembu, D. E., & Nhamo, G. (2021). Domestication of the UN sustainable development goals in South Africa. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 28(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2021.1894971>
- Ruppel, O. C., & Murray, R. (2024). The Future of the SDGs: A Comparative Constitutional Rescue Plan? One does not discover new lands without consenting to lose sight of the shore. André Gide. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 54(2-3), 155-187. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EPL-239022>
- Wetterberg, A., Frazer, S., & Johnson, E. (2023). Addressing local health service problems through integrated governance: a case study from Senegal. *Development in Practice*, 33(3), 346-360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2022.2117275>