

QUESTION # 01

It is argued that security of job available to civil servants hampers their efficiency and service delivery. Do you agree?

A. SECURITY OF JOB

DEFINITION:

"Job security refers to the assurance and protection provided to an employee that they will not be dismissed, removed, or demoted arbitrarily, and that their employment will continue as long as they perform their duties in accordance with established rules and laws."

B. INTRODUCTION:

Job security for civil servants is a defining feature of bureaucratic systems across the world, including Pakistan. It is often criticized

on the grounds that it breeds inefficiency, complacency, and poor service delivery. However, this argument presents only one side of picture. While excessive job security without accountability can indeed reduce efficiency, job security in itself is not the root cause of poor performance, rather the real issue lies in weak performance evaluation, politicization, and lack of incentives. Therefore, I partially disagree with the statement -

C- UNDERSTANDING THE RATIONALE BEHIND

JOB SECURITY

Job security in civil service is designed to:

- Protect officials from political pressure and arbitrary dismissal -
- Ensure continuity, neutrality, and institutional memory -
- Enable officers to take lawful but unpopular decisions in public interest -

Max Weber's
permanence and impartiality

D- ARGUMENTS FOR JOB SECURITY

1- COMPLACENCY

It is
reduces
promotion
than per-
excel-
(NGGR
ce be
bureau

2- WE

The
sys-
poor
the

Max Weber's model of bureaucracy emphasizes permanence of tenure as essential for rational and impartial administration -

D-ARGUMENTS SUPPORTING THE VIEW (WHY JOB SECURITY MAY HAMPER EFFICIENCY):

1-COMPLACENCY AND LACK OF MOTIVATION:

It is argued that assured job security reduces motivation among civil servants - In Pakistan, promotions are often based on seniority rather than performance, which weakens the incentive to excel - The National Commission for Government Reforms (NCGR) pointed out that absence of performance based rewards has negatively affected bureaucratic efficiency -

2-WEAK ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS:

The Performance Evaluation Report (PER / ACR) system lacks objectivity and rarely penalizes poor performance - This supports the argument that job security, when combined with ineffective

accountability, may indirectly contribute to inefficiency-

3- RESISTANCE TO REFORM AND INNOVATIONS

Scholars of public administration argue that secure bureaucracies tend to resist change. The World Bank governance reports on developing countries highlight that rigid administrative structures often obstruct innovation and citizen-centric service delivery-

4- PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF INEFFICIENCY:

Poor service delivery in sectors like police, revenues, and municipal services reinforces the belief that job security equals inefficiency-
~~As Woodrow Wilson observed,~~

~~"Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics."~~

E-COUNTER-ARGUMENTS (WHY JOB SECURITY DOES NOT NECESSARILY HAMPER EFFICIENCY)

1- PROTECTION FROM POLITICAL INTERFERENCE:

According to Woodrow Wilson,

"Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics."

Job security enables civil servants to make lawful decisions without fear of political victimization. In Pakistan, frequent political interference despite job security shows that inefficiency stems from politicization, not tenure protection itself -

2- ENSURING NEUTRALITY AND CONTINUITY:

Max Weber's bureaucratic model emphasizes that security of tenure ensures continuity, institutional memory, and rule-based governance. Without such protection, civil servants may become instruments of ruling elites -

3- COMPARATIVE INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE:

Countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and France provide strong job security to

Civil servants while maintaining high standards of efficiency through strict accountability, performance audits, and transparent evaluation systems. This demonstrates that job security and efficiency are not mutually exclusive.

4- ROOT CAUSES LIE ELSEWHERE:

The OECD public governance framework identifies that inefficiency stems from

- Poor training and capacity building
- Absence of performance-based incentives -
- Political interference and frequent transfers -
- Outdated rules and procedures -

not job security as primary causes of poor service delivery in developing states -

F- CASE OF PAKISTAN:

In Pakistan,

- Job security exists, but performance management is weak -
- Political interference undermines neutrality despite constitutional protections (Article 240)

• Lack of lateral entry and reward mechanisms discourages excellence -

Thus, blaming job security alone is an oversimplification of a complex administrative failure -

6- WAY FORWARD:

- 1- Introduce performance - based promotions and incentives -
- 2- Strengthen objective performance evaluation -
- 3- Ensure time - bound disciplinary mechanisms -
- 4- Provide continuous training and specialization -
- 5- Protect tenure while enforcing strict accountability -

CONCLUSION:

In light of the foregoing discussion, the argument that job security of civil servants hampers efficiency and service delivery cannot be fully upheld - While job security, when combined with

weak accountability, may contribute to complacency, it is not inherently detrimental to administrative performance. On the contrary, security of tenure remains vital for ensuring bureaucratic neutrality, continuity, and independence from political interference. Consequently, inefficiency in civil service is more accurately attributed to deficiencies in performance management and accountability frameworks rather than job security itself.