The impact of implementing results-based management on improving the administrative performance of higher education institutions - A case study of the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences at Constantine 2 University.

BOUATROUS Dallel, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences Constantine 2 University (Algeria), dallel.bouatrous@univ-constantine2.dz

Received: 25/05/2026 *Accepted: 25/07/2026* *Published:30/09/2026*

Abstract:

This study aims to demonstrate the impact of implementing results-based management and its various tools (results chain, logical framework, monitoring, and evaluation) on improving administrative performance at the Faculty of Economics Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Constantine 2. To achieve this goal, a questionnaire was used as a data collection tool from a sample of 56 administrative employees. For data analysis, some statistical tools, multiple regression analysis, and hypothesis testing were used, relying on the SPSS program.

The study concluded that there is an impact of results-based management on administrative performance in the Faculty under study.

Keywords: results-based management, results chain, logical framework, monitoring and evaluation, administrative performance .

Jel Classification Codes: H83, I23, M10

1. INTRODUCTION

In light of higher education institutions efforts to update management methods and enhance their performance effectiveness, results-based management has emerged as a modern administrative approach in the public sector that focuses on evaluation and monitoring results, through the adoption of a set of practical tools (results chain, logical framework, etc.). Through which its objectives can be translated into tangible, real practices.

The performance of higher education institutions is manifested in academic (educational), research, administrative, and community performance. This study will focus on their administrative performance, due to the important role it plays in achieving the academic and research goals of higher education institutions. Efficient management ensures the smooth operation of work, which will positively reflect on other aspects.

Accordingly, this study came to answer the following main question:

To what extent does the application of results-based management affect the improvement of administrative performance at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences at Constantine 2 University?

- Study Hypotheses :

To answer this main question, the following main hypothesis can be formulated:

- Main hypothesis

- Results-based management has a statistically significant effect on administrative performance in higher education institutions at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Based on this hypothesis, the following sub-hypotheses can be formulated:

- Sub Hypotheses

- Results chain has a statistically significant effect on administrative performance in higher education institutions at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).
- Logical Framework has a statistically significant effect on administrative performance in higher education institutions at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).
- Monitoring and evaluation has a statistically significant effect on administrative performance in higher education institutions at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

- Study objectives:

This study aims to achieve a set of objectives, the most important of which are:

- Identifying the level of implementation of results-based management in the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences.
- Highlighting the reality of using results-based management tools (results chain, logical framework, monitoring and evaluation) in the Faculty under study.
- Measuring the level of administrative performance in the Faculty under study;
-Testing the impact of results-based management on improving administrative performance in the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences.

2. Results-Based Management(RBM): Concept and Tools

In the 1960s, the term results-based management first appeared in the business field, as it was considered a concept similar to management by objectives (MBO), which was widely used. In the 1980s, this management approach emerged in the field of public policies, and it was adopted as a reform process for the public sector in response to economic, social, and political pressures, as well as budget deficits in countries, during the 1990s.

During the same period, many international organisations adopted it with the aim of improving performance, that is, achieving better results.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defined in its glossary (OECD DAC Glossary) for evaluation and results-based management terms as "a management strategy that focuses on performance and achieving outputs, outcomes, and impacts. (Vahamaki & Verger, 2019) "

In another report by the OECD, a more expanded definition was provided, considering RBM as a broad management strategy aimed at making substantial changes in the way agencies operate, with a focus on improving performance and achieving results as a primary goal (Bester, 2012) . While the United Nations Development Group provided a comprehensive definition of results-based management, defining it as a management strategy that includes planning, monitoring, and evaluation, through which all actors strive to contribute directly or indirectly to achieving a set of results. It ensures that its operations, products, and services contribute to achieving the desired results (outputs, outcomes, impacts). The actors, in turn, use information related to actual results to guide the decision-making process regarding program and activity design and resource allocation, in addition to accountability and reporting (Unted Nations, 2018) .

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) also considered that results-based management aims to improve administrative efficiency and accountability by setting realistic expected results, monitoring the achievement of these outcomes, integrating lessons learned into management decisions, and performance reports (United Nations a, 2017).

Jean Leclerc & Bachir Mazouz defined it as a managerial framework that focuses on continuous verification (more than a year) of the outputs

related to the overall performance of the organization. The latter (outputs) related to the overall performance of the institution, which are derived from its sub-goals, focus on the organization's overall objectives rather than individual goals based on circumstances, and there is freedom in resource selection (Mazouz & Leclerc, 2008).

We note here that there is no single definition of results-based management, and it varies according to the authors and international organisations that adopted it. Considering the definition provided by the OECD, it is a clear definition as it considers RBM a management strategy that focuses on improving performance and achieving results. Thus, it starts with setting clear goals and vision and working towards achieving them. What the United Nations Development Group added is that this strategy is based on planning, monitoring, and evaluation, which can be said to represent some of the stages of the RBM life cycle. Planning is considered an important stage, especially since it involves identifying various resources (financial, material, human) that will be used to achieve results. Both monitoring and evaluation are considered fundamental concepts underlying RBM, primarily associated with the implementation phase, which requires tracking to understand the results achieved, assessing them, and evaluating their impacts.

As the United Nations Development Group indicated in its definition, various achieved results are used in decision-making, in addition to facilitating accountability, and they are also used in preparing performance reports, as mentioned by CIDA in its definition.

Results-based management is considered one of the modern administrative approaches that focus on achieving results and impact rather than just concentrating on activities and resources. This approach relies on setting predetermined objectives, establishing indicators to measure the level of achievement, and continuously monitoring performance, which allows for improving the institution's effectiveness and enhancing its ability to achieve its strategic goals. Studies on higher education institutions have shown that applying the principles of results-based management contributes to

improving institutional performance by enhancing accountability, improving the decision-making process, and linking planning to the measurement of achieved results(Pratolo, Hamsyah Mukti, & Anwar, 2020) .

Based on the above, it can be said that results-based management is an approach to management that allows for the assessment of various actual results achieved (outputs, outcomes, impacts) with a focus on performance, starting from working towards achieving goals in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of performance, enhance accountability, decision-making, and reporting.

2.1 Results-Based Management Tools

According to various literature that has addressed RBM, there are three tools for results-based management:

2.1.1 Results Chain

RBM is a management approach that focuses on achieving results based on a pre-established plan and working on its implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. This is done by identifying the activities that need to be provided, which is referred to as the causal relationship that studies the "cause-effect" link between activities, outputs, and outcomes of any policy or program.

The result is defined as a change that can be described or measured, resulting from a causal relationship. In other words, it is what "is produced by intentional activities directed towards a desired goal (Assocation québécoise des organismes de coopération internationle, 2008)."

Through this definition, it can be said that there are two elements that the result focuses on:
(Assocation québécoise des organismes de coopération internationle, 2008):

- Change: The intervention/policy must lead to a tangible change for a specific group, and the effectiveness of the change in a particular situation depends on understanding the various existing problems, the target groups, the means, and the resources necessary to achieve actual results.

- Causality: There must be a causal relationship between the desired outcome and the various actions taken to achieve it, which require the provision of different inputs (human, material, and financial resources) along with the implementation of specific procedures that should lead to an accurate result.

According to the definition of results, results-based management is a policy management approach whose expected outcomes are linked to a change that can be described and measured, resulting from a causal relationship between the interventions implemented using inputs and the outcomes achieved in the form of real, observable changes in the target groups.

The logical causal sequence of various changes leads to the emergence of results, and the interconnection between these results forms what is known as a chain of results. The latter represents a set of results achieved over a period of time, which are interconnected in a causal relationship. Therefore, three levels of results can be distinguished (Union Economiaue et Monétaire ouest-Afrcaine, 2020) :

-Short-term or immediate results are called outputs;

-Medium-term results or intermediate results are called impacts;

- Long-term results (long-term) are called impact.

We note here that it is difficult to search for long-term results without having medium and short-term results, and that the general objectives of any public intervention (policy) are merely the effects that appear in the long term, while the specific objective reflects the immediate and medium-term effects.

2.1.2 Logical Framework

According to the dictionary of evaluation and results-based management, the logical framework is "an administrative tool used to improve the design of interventions, which includes identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impacts) and their causal relationships, indicators, and factors or risks that may affect the success or failure of the intervention (Banque africaine developpement, Banque islamique de developpement, & CAD-OCDE, 2006)." Thus, this tool facilitates the planning, implementation, and evaluation of public interventions.

The United Nations defined it in its report as "the logical framework explains how results are achieved, including causal relationships, assumptions, and key risks, thus reflecting strategic thinking at the level of an entire organization, program, or project. (Unted Nations, 2018) "

The logical framework allows for an easy conceptualisation of achieving results, whether they are long-term (Impact), medium-term or short-term. It also helps in identifying the main axes of activities that should be followed to support the achievement of results (Mazouz & Leclerc, 2008).

2.1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation System

Conducting monitoring and evaluation is to assess the extent of achieving results by setting indicators. The latter are defined as quantitative or qualitative variables that allow stakeholders to verify the changes brought about by an intervention/policy compared to what was planned. And it is possible to distinguish between quantitative indicators, which are expressed in numbers and percentages, and qualitative indicators, which aim to measure quality and are expressed in terms of satisfaction levels, opinions, and viewpoints (United Nations Development Group, 2011) .

Indicators are relied upon for monitoring and evaluation, as the indicator seeks to measure a result or provide evidence of its achievement, or provide evidence of progress towards its achievement. Thus, the indicator is considered a means to measure actual results compared to the expected or

planned results in terms of quality, quantity, and time (Canadian International Development Agency, 2000) .

We note that the indicators must be directly related to the result they measure, and both qualitative and quantitative indicators are relied upon, with a balance in their use to ensure the accuracy of the results. To measure the results, qualitative indicators are relied upon to reflect the level of satisfaction, viewpoints, opinions, and perceptions.

In order to measure the achieved results, indicators must be chosen that allow for tracking progress in their achievement, evaluating the effectiveness of activities, and determining whether the expected results have been achieved. Therefore, indicators should be formulated according to criteria summarised in the word SMART, which is referred to as the smart indicator.

The use of indicators is at the level of inputs, activities, outputs, and impacts, and the latter are considered important as they help in assessing the level of achieving results. Therefore, we distinguish between:

- **Outcome indicators:** They allow for measuring the achieved results compared to the expected results, meaning they enable verification of what has been obtained as a result of implementing activities. These indicators focus on the effectiveness of the activities and the expected outcomes.
- **Impact indicators:** Used in the evaluation process, they allow for measuring short-term (immediate), medium-term, and long-term results.

3. Administrative performance in higher education institutions

Administrative performance is considered one of the fundamental concepts in modern management, reflecting the level of effectiveness and efficiency of the institution in achieving its goals through work organization and improving service quality. The administrative performance of higher education institutions represents one of the fundamental determinants for measuring the quality of university services, as it is related to the effectiveness of administrative processes, the speed of transaction

completion, the clarity of administrative procedures, and the quality of coordination between various administrative departments within the university institution. Studies have confirmed that improving administrative performance has become a central focus in university reform (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017) , especially in light of the shift towards quality and governance.

Administrative performance in higher education institutions refers to the university administration's ability to efficiently perform its various administrative functions and achieve its organisational goals using available resources. This is manifested through the quality of administrative services, the effectiveness of administrative procedures, the speed of transaction completion, and the enhancement of coordination between different administrative units (Eltobgy & Radwan, 2015). Where universities increasingly rely on performance-related data and information to support planning and decision-making processes. These indicators help in evaluating the level of achievement, improving the quality of services, enhancing accountability, and directing resources towards priority areas, thereby contributing to the efficiency of institutional performance (Beerkens, 2022).

Administrative performance refers to the university administration's ability to efficiently carry out its various administrative functions and achieve its organisational goals using available resources, while ensuring the development of the quality of administrative services and reducing administrative errors.

4. Study Methodology and Tools

4.1 Study Population and Sample

The study population consists of all administrative staff at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences at Constantine 2 University, totalling 70 administrative employees, according to statistics provided by the Human Resources Department, distributed across several departments (Education Department, Teaching Department,

Finance and Accounting Department, Human Resources Department, Graduate Studies and International Relations Department).

The sample size was determined based on the Krejcie & Morgan table to select the appropriate size according to the study population, where the study sample consisted of 56 administrative employees.

4.2 Study Tools

In this study, the questionnaire was relied upon as a tool for data collection, with the aim of examining the impact and relationship between the independent variable (results-based management) and the dependent variable (administrative performance). The questionnaire was designed in a way that aligns with the study's objectives and hypotheses, as it included a set of statements distributed across axes that reflect the dimensions of both variables.

4.3 Data Analysis

The study relied on a four-point Likert scale to measure the responses of the sample members, allowing for the determination of the level of agreement or disagreement with the statements related to the two variables. The validity and reliability of the tool were also verified to ensure the accuracy of the results and their scientific interpretability. It is shown in the following table:

The study relied on a four-point Likert scale to measure the responses of the sample members, allowing for the determination of the level of agreement or disagreement with the statements related to the two variables. The validity and reliability of the tool were also verified to ensure the accuracy of the results and their scientific interpretability. It is shown in the following table:

Table 1. Four point Likert scale

Response	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
Score	1	2	3	**4**
Lengths of categories	1-1.75	1.75-2.50	2.50-3.25	**3.25-4**

Source: Prepared by the researcher

4.4 Reliability of the Study tool

The reliability of the study tool was tested using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient to measure the internal consistency of the questionnaire items and to ensure the tool's reliability in measuring the study variables. Crombach's Alpha values are considered statistically acceptable if they are greater than 0.70, as higher values indicate internal consistency among the questionnaire items.

The reliability coefficient for each axis of the questionnaire, as well as for the tool as a whole, has been calculated, and the obtained values were within the acceptable limits, indicating the tool's validity for use in the study.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

	Cronbach's Alpha
Results Based Management	0,911
Results chain	0,860
Logical Framework	0,762
Monitoring and evaluation	0,873
Administrative Performance	0.911
Total value of the questionnaire	**0.941**

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results of the reliability test showed that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values were greater than 0.6 (Table N° 2), which reflects an acceptable internal consistency among the survey statements, confirming their reliability in analysing the study data and testing its hypothesis.

5. Descriptive Analysis of Study Variables

The characteristics of the study variables will be analysed by calculating the arithmetic means and standard deviations to understand the level of responses and general trends of the sample members. Whereas the arithmetic mean allows for determining the general level of the variables, the standard deviation clarifies the degree of response variation. These measures were relied upon to describe the degree of data dispersion and to determine the homogeneity of the respondents' opinions regarding the study variables' statements.

Based on that, the levels of the variables were classified (low, medium, high), allowing for an accurate scientific interpretation of the study results, To describe the study variables, we present the following table.

Table 3 . Means and Standard Deviations of Results chain

Dimensions	Items	Mean	Standard Division	Degree
Results chain	The Faculty works on providing the available human and material resources at the beginning of each year.	2,80	0,55	**High**
	The faculty administration seeks to direct the available resources towards achieving good results.	2,83	0,53	**High**
	The faculty relies on determining expected outcomes when planning administrative activities.	2,73	0,52	**High**
	The activities carried out within the faculty are linked to the desired outcomes.	2,76	0,60	**High**
	The focus in administrative work is on achieving results, not just on executing activities.	2,69	0,63	**High**
	Over all	**2,76**	**0,56**	**High**

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results shown in the table indicate that the mean values ranged between (2.69-2.83), which fall within the agreement range, meaning there is a high level of agreement among the opinions of the administrative staff at the Faculty. The standard deviation values were (0.52-0.63), which are less than one, It indicates a considerable degree of homogeneity in the respondents' opinions regarding this dimension.

The mean value for the results dimension was recorded at 2.76 with a standard deviation of 0.56, reflecting a slight variation in the responses of the study sample regarding the inputs and outputs of various administrative activities within the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences.

The results reflect a positive trend towards implementing the results chain within the Faculty by focusing on resource provision, linking activities to objectives, and directing efforts towards achieving the expected outcomes. This is an indicator of the availability of one of the essential components for results-based management, which is based on achieving a logical connection between inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, thereby contributing to the improvement of administrative performance.

Table 4 . Means and Standard Deviations of Logical Framework

Dimensions	Items	Mean	Standard Division	Degree
Logical Framework	The faculty relies on setting clear general and specific objectives when planning the implementation of activities.	2,66	0,54	**High**
	The faculty administration relies on clear indicators to measure the achievement of goals.	2,53	0,53	**High**
	The goals set by the faculty are realistic and achievable compared to the available resources.	2,53	0,65	**High**
	The clarity of the indicators contributes to improving the performance of various	2,80	0,51	**High**

	administrative services provided at the faculty.			
	There are clear means to verify the quality of administrative performance (reports, files...).	2,73	0,52	**High**
	Over all	2,65	0,55	**High**

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results showed that the recorded mean values in the table above ranged between (2.53-2.80), indicating agreement on the statements within the logical framework of the study sample members. As for the standard deviation, its values ranged between (0.51-0.65), indicating no dispersion or variation in the respondents' answers.

As for the overall mean values, they were 2.65 with a standard deviation of 0.55, indicating a high level of agreement among the study sample members. Regarding the Faculty 's reliance on the essential elements of the logical framework in planning and management. As for the values of the standard deviation, they reflect the convergence of the respondents' views on the reality of applying this dimension in the Faculty.

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of Monitoring and evaluation

Dimensions	**Items**	**Mean**	**Standard Division**	**Degree**
Monitoring and evaluation	The faculty monitors administrative performance periodically and regularly (weekly/monthly).	2,58	0,68	**High**
	The faculty relies on indicators to monitor the progress in implementing administrative activities.	2,66	0,61	**High**
	Continuous monitoring helps in identifying problems during the execution of activities.	2,76	0,57	**High**
	The faculty administration compares the achieved results with the expected	2,55	0,65	**High**

	results.			
	The evaluation process helps in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in administrative work.	2,89	0,62	**High**
	The evaluation results are used to improve the administrative performance of the faculty.	2,80	0,69	**High**
	Periodic reports are prepared to monitor and evaluate the progress of administrative work within the faculty.	2,53	0,68	**High**
	Over all	**2,68**	**0,64**	**High**

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results shown in the table above indicated that the mean scores of the statements after evaluation and follow-up ranged between (2.53-2.89), reflecting a high level according to the adopted scale. The standard deviation values ranged between (0.57-0.69), which means there was a convergence in the responses of the sample members, but the variation in their opinions was slight.

While the mean score for the monitoring and evaluation dimension was estimated at 2.68 with a standard deviation of 0.64, which reflects a high level of agreement among the study sample regarding the Faculty 's reliance on monitoring and evaluation practices in managing its administrative activities.

These results reflect a notable interest in monitoring and evaluation practices within the Faculty, especially regarding the use of evaluation results to improve performance and identify strengths and weaknesses. However, enhancing the mechanisms for periodic reporting and linking achieved results to planned objectives would increase the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system.

Table 6 . Means and Standard Deviations of Administrative Performance

Dimensions	**Items**	**Mean**	**Standard Division**	**Degree**
Administ	Organising work within the Faculty	3,05	0,55	**High**

	contributes to the swift completion of administrative transactions.			
	Administrative procedures within the Faculty are characterised by clarity.	2,71	0,67	**High**
	Administrative transactions are completed within the specified timeframes.	2,85	0,67	**High**
	The administration seeks to improve the quality of administrative services provided to professors and students.	2,92	0,59	**High**
	Work is being conducted within the Faculty in a way that helps reduce administrative errors.	2,80	0,61	**High**
	Coordination between different administrative departments contributes to improving work performance at the Faculty.	2,94	0,67	**High**
	The administration is keen on continuously improving the efficiency of administrative work.	2,62	0,82	**High**
	Over all	**2,84**	**0,65**	High

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results of the table showed that the mean of the statements related to the administrative performance dimension ranged between (2.62-3.05), which are values that reflect a high level of agreement. The standard deviation values ranged between (0.55-0.82), indicating convergence and no difference in the responses of the study sample members.

As for the overall mean of this dimension, it was 2.84 with a standard deviation of 0.65, which indicates an agreement on administrative performance within the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences. These recorded values can be explained by the presence of organization in work and coordination between various interests, and by carrying out various administrative activities in a way that

reduces administrative errors and improves the quality of administrative services provided to different stakeholders, both professors and students.

The results shown above indicate that the Faculty achieves a good level of administrative performance, evident in the speed of transaction completion, the improvement of service quality, and the enhancement of coordination between administrative departments. It also indicates the presence of a regulatory framework that supports performance, with the need to enhance continuous improvement practices to ensure the development of administrative efficiency in keeping up with advancements in higher education institutions.

6. Hypothesis Testing

The relative increase in the level of administrative performance to 2.84, compared to the increase in the application of results-based management tools, may be considered an initial indicator of the existence of an administrative environment supportive of performance. Therefore, we will proceed to the analysis of the relationship between results-based management tools and the administrative performance of higher education institutions was conducted. The main hypothesis and sub-hypotheses were tested, and multiple regression analysis was used to study the impact of the independent variable (results-based management) and its dimensions on the dependent variable (administrative performance). The results obtained are presented below.

Table 7. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between RBM Dimensions and Administrative Performance

	Unstandardised Coefficients		**Standardised Coefficients**		
Model	**a**	**Erreur standard**	**Bêta**	**t**	**Sig**
(Constant)	0, 001	0,362		0,002	0,999
Results Chain	0,409	0,137	0,348	2,995	0,004

Logical Framework	0,277	0,158	0,207	1,753	0,085
Monitoring and evaluation	0,364	0,136	0,332	2,673	0,010

a: dependent variable

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

-Test of first Sub Hypotheses

The results of the regression analysis listed in the table above showed a positive and statistically significant effect at the 0.05 significance level (0.004 < 0.05) of the Results chain on administrative performance, where the more the results chain is relied upon, the better the administrative performance in the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences. Based on that, we accept the first sub-hypothesis which states that the results chain has an impact on administrative performance. This result can be interpreted as the Faculty under study working to provide the various necessary inputs (human and material) and directing them towards achieving the expected results through planning to accomplish various administrative transactions and activities. This means that the Faculty is concerned with providing the inputs and works to link them with the various desired results. This result is consistent with the study by (Pratolo, Hamsyah Mukti, & Anwar, 2020) which confirmed that the clarity of expected outcomes and linking activities to strategic goals leads to improved institutional performance.

- Testing the second sub-hypothesis

Regarding the logical framework dimension, the analysis results shown in Table 07 indicate that the value (sig = 0.085) is greater than the test significance level of 0.05, which suggests that there is no statistically significant effect of this dimension on administrative performance. Accordingly, the second sub-hypothesis, which assumes the existence of an

impact of the logical framework dimension on administrative performance in the Faculty under study, will be rejected. Therefore, this dimension will not be relied upon in interpreting the model.

- Testing the third sub-hypothesis

From the results shown in the table above, it is evident that there is a statistically significant effect of the evaluation and monitoring dimension on the administrative performance of the Faculty employees, as the value (sig = 0.010) is less than the accepted significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we accept the third sub-hypothesis, which assumes that the monitoring and evaluation dimension affects the administrative performance of the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences. This result can be explained by the monitoring of various administrative activities within the Faculty under study through the use of indicators to measure the progress in task execution, identify emerging errors, and work on resolving them to prevent any negative impact on the level of administrative performance.

As the Beta value indicated, the results chain has the strongest impact (0.348) on administrative performance, followed by evaluation and monitoring (0.332), while the logical framework variable had a weak and insignificant impact. This result is consistent with the findings of the study by Eltobgy & Radwan (2015), which highlighted the fundamental role of performance monitoring and the use of indicators in improving administrative activities and the quality of administrative performance within universities in particular.

- Testing the main hypothesis

In order to test the main hypothesis, we will rely on the ANOVA test, as well as on the correlation coefficient values to determine the degree of correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable, which can be presented through the following two tables:

Table 08 . ANOVA Test

Model	Correlation Coefficient R	Coefficient of Determination R^2
	0.753	**0.567**

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The correlation coefficient value (R= 0.753) shown in the table above indicates a relatively strong correlation between the independent variable (results-based management) and the dependent variable (administrative performance). It also indicates that 56.7% of the changes occurring in the dependent variable are attributed to the results chain, monitoring, and evaluation, while the remaining 43.3% are attributed to other factors not included in the model.

Table 09. ANOVA Test

Model	**Sum of Squares**	**D F**	**Mean Squares**	**Calculated F Value**	**Significance Level**
Regression	8.960	3	2.987	22.738	0.000
Error	6.830	52	0.131		
Total	15.790	55			

Source: Prepared by the researcher using SPSS Statistics

The results of the ANOVA test showed that the F value reached 22.738 at a significance level of (sig= 0.000), which is less than the accepted significance level of 0.05, confirming the statistical significance of the regression model. Accordingly, we accept the main hypothesis which states that there is a statistically significant effect of results-based management on administrative performance at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Constantine 2. This result is consistent with the study by (Pratolo, Hamsyah Mukti, & Anwar, 2020) which concluded that the application of results-based management in higher education institutions positively affects institutional performance, as

results-based planning, performance indicators, and continuous monitoring contribute to improving the institution's effectiveness and raising its performance level.

Based on the results shown in Table (7), the regression equation model can be written as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y = a + bX_1 + cX_3}$$

Y : Administrative performance

$\mathbf{X_1}$: Results Chain

$\mathbf{X_3}$ **:** Monitoring and evaluation

Therefore, the multiple regression model takes the form:

$$\mathbf{Y = 0.001 + 0.409X_1 + 0.364X_3}$$

7. CONCLUSION

Results-based management is one of the administrative methods that can be adopted in higher education institutions to improve their administrative performance. The importance of studying the relationship between them is due to demonstrating the impact that results-based management and its various tools can have on coordinating administrative work with different departments and improving the quality of administrative services, in addition to clarifying procedures. This, in turn, contributes to enhancing the efficiency of the administrative performance level of higher education institutions.

7-1-Study Results

The study concluded with a set of results, which we list as follows:

- The study showed that administrative performance is clearly affected by results-based management, with varying levels of impact from its different tools, This can be explained by the fact that RBM does not focus solely on

the implementation of activities, but rather on the actual results achieved and their contribution to achieving the objectives ;

- The results of the arithmetic means indicated a relatively high level of application of results-based management at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, Constantine 2 University , This high level may be attributed to the Faculty's adoption of a number of modern practices related to quality assurance ;

- The study showed that the Faculty under examination is interested in applying some results-based management tools, especially concerning the results chain, monitoring, and evaluation, We explain this by stating that monitoring and evaluation is one of the most closely related tools to daily administrative activities, while the results chain helps link activities to the expected goals ;

- The study results revealed that the level of administrative performance in the Faculty was high, which means there is efficiency in managing administrative work;

- The results of the multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant effect of management practices on improving administrative performance at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Constantine 2 , This result indicates that the improvement in the application of results-based management tools directly reflects on administrative performance.

5. Bibliography List :

1. Assocation québécoise des organismes de coopération internationle. (2008). La gestion Axée sur les Resultats (GAR) en lien avec l'approuche genre et développement (GED). Québec.
2. Beerkens, M. (2022). *An Evolution of Performance Data in Higher Education Governance: A Path Towards a 'Big Data' Era?* Quality in Higher Education, pp. 29–49.

3. Bester, A. (2012). *Resluts based management in the United Nations Development System : progress and challenges.*
4. Canadian International Development Agency. (2000). *RBM Handbook on Developing Results Chains.*
5. Eltobgy, H., & Radwan, M. (2015). *Monitoring Egyptian Higher Education Institutions Performance Development: The Balanced Scorecard Approach*, pp. 1–15.
6. Mazouz, B., & Leclerc, J. (2008). *La gestion intégrée par résultats : Concevoir et gerer autrement la performance dand l'administration publique.* Presses de l'université du Québec.
7. Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform : A Comparative Analysis into the Age of Austerity , 4 th edition.* Oxford University Press.
8. Pratolo, S., Mukti, A. H., & Anwar, M. (2020). *Result-Based Management Implementation in Higher Education Institution: Determinants and Impact on Performance.* Journal of Accounting and Investment, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 580–601.
9. Union Economiaue et Monétaire ouest-Afrcaine. (2020). *Guide de la gestion Axée sur les résultats de la commission de l'uemoa.*
10. United Nations a. (2017). *Results based management Hnd book : Applying RBM concepts and tools for better urban future* .
11. United Nations Development Group. (2011). *Results based Management Handbook.*
12. Unted Nations. (2018). *Results based management and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.* Vienna.
13. Vahamaki, J., & Verger, C. (2019). *Learning from Reslts Based Management EvLtion and Reviews* . OCDE Development cooperation working paper 53.